

The Theocratic Kingdom - Part 2

THE THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

PART 2

George N H Peters

Published 1884 - [George N H. Peters](#) (November 30, 1825-October 7, 1909) "was an American [Lutheran](#) minister and author of *The Theocratic Kingdom*. His [premillennial](#) views were in conflict with the majority of [Lutherans](#) who held [amillennial](#) beliefs.^{[1][2]}

"Buy the truth and sell it not; also wisdom, and instruction, and understanding."—Pr 23:23.

"The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him; and He will show them His covenant."—Ps. 25:14.

NOTE: This is Volume 1 of this massive 2189 page work, all written before the typewriter was invented! This is the [quintessential epitome](#) of a person's "[life work](#)!"

INDEX:

- **Volume 1** - Propositions 1 - 106
- **Volume 2** - Propositions 107 - 164
- **Volume 3** - Propositions 165 - 206
- [Index of Scriptures & Subjects](#)

Source: Chart by Tim LaHaye and Thomas Ice - click to enlarge - Millenium on Right Side

Excerpt from Peter's biography - George Peters is remembered primarily because of his three volume work The Theocratic Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus, the Christ, as Covenanted in the Old Testament and Presented in the New Testament. The title is often shortened to simply The Theocratic Kingdom. His references indicate he was well read in theology, history, science and literature. He spent years researching and compiling this study of eschatology, which includes over four thousand quotes from authors ranging from the second century to his own era. The work was first published in 1884 by Funk and Wagnalls. (Isaac Kauffman Funk had graduated from Wittenberg College in 1860 and from its seminary in 1861.) Kregel republished The Theocratic Kingdom in 1952 and 1972, and it was still in print in May 2006. In his preface to the 1952 edition, Wilbur M. Smith wrote "One does not need to agree with all of his [Peters'] statements, nor even with all of his interpretations, to recognize the greatness of this work that must have cost him a lifetime of research, prayer, investigation, and laborious writing – these were the days before typewriters." Surviving manuscripts indicate Peters wrote many books, but The Theocratic Kingdom may have been the only one published, because that is the only title by Peters in bibliographic records in WorldCat. On the handwritten title page of an unpublished work, Peters described himself as an "evangelical Lutheran Minister." ([Source](#))

- [Read some of the reviews by readers](#)

INDEX TO VOLUME 2

1. [PROPOSITION 107](#).—The passages referring to heaven in connection with the saints, do not conflict with, but confirm, our doctrine of the Kingdom
2. [PROP. 108](#).—The formula, "Kingdom of heaven," connected with the parables, confirms our doctrine of the Kingdom
3. [PROP. 109](#).—An examination of the passages of Scripture, supposed to teach the Church-Kingdom theory, will confirm our doctrine of the Kingdom
4. [PROP. 110](#).—The passage most relied on to prove the Church-Kingdom theory, utterly disproves it
5. [PROP. 111](#).—The Kingdom being identified with the elect Jewish nation, it cannot be established without the restoration of that nation
6. [PROP. 112](#).—The Kingdom, if established as predicted, demands the national restoration of the Jews to their own land
7. [PROP. 113](#).—The connection of this Kingdom with Jewish restoration necessitates the realization of their predicted repentance and conversion

8. [PROP. 114](#).—This Kingdom being identified with the elect Jewish nation, its establishment at the restoration embraces the supremacy of the nation over the nations of the earth
9. [PROP. 115](#).—The Kingdom is not established without a period of violence and war
10. [PROP. 116](#).—This Kingdom is a visible, external one, here on the earth, taking the place of earthly Kingdoms
11. [PROP. 117](#).—The Kingdom of God re-established, will form a divinely appointed, and visibly manifested, Theocracy
12. [PROP. 118](#).—This view of the Kingdom is most forcibly sustained by the figure of the Barren Woman
13. [PROP. 119](#).—The Kingdom of God is represented, in the Millennial descriptions, as restoring all the forfeited blessings
14. [PROP. 120](#).—This Kingdom, with its Millennial blessings, can only be introduced through the power of God in Christ Jesus
15. [PROP. 121](#).—This Kingdom, of necessity, requires a Pre-Millennial Personal Advent of Jesus, “the Christ”
16. [PROP. 122](#).—As “Son of Man,” David’s Son, Jesus inherits David’s throne and kingdom, and also the land of Palestine
17. [PROP. 123](#).—The Pre-Millennial Advent and accompanying Kingdom are united with the destruction of Antichrist
18. [PROP. 124](#).—This Kingdom is delayed several thousand years, to raise up a nation or people capable of sustaining it
19. [PROP. 125](#).—The Kingdom to be inherited by these gathered saints requires their resurrection from the dead
20. [PROP. 126](#).—In confirmation of our position, the Old Testament clearly teaches a Pre-Millennial resurrection of the saints
21. [PROP. 127](#).—In support of our view, the Apocalypse unmistakably teaches a Pre-Millennial resurrection of the saints
22. [PROP. 128](#).—The language of the Gospels and Epistles is in strict accord with the requirements of a Pre-Mill. resurrection
23. [PROP. 129](#).—The Jewish view of a Pre-Mill. resurrection, requisite for the introduction of the Messianic Kingdom, is fully sustained by the grammatical sense of the New Testament
24. [PROP. 130](#).—This Kingdom is also preceded by a translation of living saints
25. [PROP. 131](#).—This Kingdom embraces the visible reign of Jesus, the Christ, here on earth
26. [PROP. 132](#).—This view of the Kingdom confirmed by the judgeship of Jesus
27. [PROP. 133](#).—This view of the Kingdom fully sustained by the “Day of Judgment.”
28. [PROP. 134](#).—Our view of the Judgment (and, as a consequence, that also of the Kingdom) is fully sustained by the passage of Scripture, Matt. 25:31–46
29. [PROP. 135](#).—The doctrine of the Kingdom in full accord with the scriptural doctrine of the judgment of believers
30. [PROP. 136](#).—The doctrine of the Kingdom in agreement with the doctrine of the intermediate state
31. [PROP. 137](#).—This doctrine of the Kingdom sustained by the phrase “the world to come”
32. [PROP. 138](#).—This doctrine of the Kingdom fully corroborated by “the day of the Lord Jesus, the Christ”
33. [PROP. 139](#).—The Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, as covenanted, is sustained by what is to take place in “the morning” of “the day of the Christ”
34. [PROP. 140](#).—The doctrine of the Kingdom confirmed by the phraseology of the New Testament respecting “the end of the age”
35. [PROP. 141](#).—This Kingdom necessarily united with the perpetuity of the earth
36. [PROP. 142](#).—The Kingdom being related to the earth (extending over it), and involving the resurrection of the saints (in order to inherit it), is sustained by the promise to the saints of inheriting the earth
37. [PROP. 143](#).—The early church doctrine of the Kingdom is supported by “the Rest,” or the keeping of the Sabbath, mentioned by Paul
38. [PROP. 144](#).—This Kingdom embraces “the times of refreshing,” and “the times of the restitution of all things,” mentioned Acts 3:19–21
39. [PROP. 145](#).—This Kingdom includes “the regeneration” of Matt. 19:28
40. [PROP. 146](#).—This Kingdom is associated with the deliverance of Creation
41. [PROP. 147](#).—This Kingdom is preceded by a wonderful shaking of the heavens and the earth
42. [PROP. 148](#).—This Kingdom embraces the New Heavens and New Earth
43. [PROP. 149](#).—This Kingdom is preceded by the conflagration of 2 Pet. 3:10–13
44. [PROP. 150](#).—The establishment of this Kingdom is not affected by the extent of Peter’s conflagration
45. [PROP. 151](#).—This Kingdom is identified with “the New Heavens and New Earth” of Isa. 65:17 and 66:22; 2 Pet. 3:13; and Rev. 21:1
46. [PROP. 152](#).—This Kingdom is connected with the perpetuation of the human race
47. [PROP. 153](#).—This view of the Kingdom, with its two classes (viz., the translated and resurrected saints, glorified, forming one class, and mortal men the other), is forcibly represented in the transfiguration
48. [PROP. 154](#).—This Theocratic Kingdom includes the visible reign of the risen and glorified saints, here on the earth
49. [PROP. 155](#).—This Kingdom exhibits Jesus not only as “the King,” but also as “the Priest”
50. [PROP. 156](#).—The doctrine of the Kingdom enforces the future priesthood of the saints
51. [PROP. 157](#).—This doctrine of the Kingdom enforces the future ministrations of angels
52. [PROP. 158](#).—The doctrine of the Kingdom aids in locating the Millennial period
53. [PROP. 159](#).—This Theocratic Kingdom of the Lord Jesus, the Christ, will never come to an end

- 54. [PROP. 160](#).—This Kingdom will be set up in the divided state of the Roman Empire
- 55. [PROP. 161](#).—This Kingdom will not be re-established until Antichrist is overthrown
- 56. [PROP. 162](#).—This Kingdom will be preceded by a fearful time of trouble, both in the Church and the world
- 57. [PROP. 163](#).—This Kingdom revealed will be preceded by the predicted “Battle of that great day of God Almighty”
- 58. [PROP. 164](#).—This Kingdom ends the Gentile domination

PROPOSITION 107. The passages referring to heaven in connection with the saints do not conflict with, but confirm our doctrine of the Kingdom.

In urging this Kingdom it is said that such promises as Matt. 5:12; Matt. 19:21, etc., refer to the third heaven, and from thence it is inferred that the Kingdom is the state of the saved, triumphant Church in heaven. But we have already shown (Prop. 108, etc.) that Covenant and prophecy describe a Kingdom here on the earth “under the whole heaven”; that for wise purposes the Kingdom has been postponed; that Christ now remains in heaven until the period of manifestation arrives; that He comes from heaven and the Kingdom is inherited—these and other reasons indicate that there is no conflict between the two, but that, as specifically announced (as e.g. Zech. 14:5) the saints come with Him, and then follows the reign over the earth (as e.g. Zech. 14:9)—hence such passages must not be understood as embracing or inferring the Kingdom itself.

Obs. 1. That large class of writers who concede the renewal of the earth and its occupancy by the saints, etc., do not, of course, press these passages to an eternal inheritance and Kingdom in the third heaven. The concessions that they make are all that are requisite for our view (Props. 140–152).

Obs. 2. The meaning of the phrase “Kingdom of heaven,” and its derivation have already been given (Props. 19, 45, etc.); we now only add that those nearest to the latter, viz., the Jews, disciples, and the early Church, found no difficulty in the phrase in applying it to a Kingdom here on earth established under Divine auspices and power.*

Obs. 3. In the consideration of this subject it must not be overlooked, that “heaven” is employed as a symbol or figure of honor, station, authority, power, and political or civil supremacy. This is admitted by numerous writers, thus e.g. Horne (Index to Symb. Lang., Introd., vol. 2, p. 465) makes it denote in Isa. 51:16 “a political universe,” “a Kingdom and polity”; Alexander, Com. Isa., 34:4, refers it to political states or authorities and Kingdoms; several Coms. explain “the war in heaven,” the casting out of heaven into the earth of Rev. 12:7–9, to denote the overthrow of Satan from power, etc.; Barnes, Rev. 6:14, makes it equivalent to “the high places of the earth,” and explains this to mean places of power, station, etc.; many writers regard the “new heavens” of Isa. 65 and 66, as indicating prosperity, honor, exaltation, and others as delineating a new civil and religious union, etc. Such references, which can be found in every variety and form, show that the word is also employed to denote things on the earth. Hence, Prof. Bush and others define it when thus used, a symbol of “a state or position of great conspicuity”; but we incline rather to that of others which explain it as “a position or state of authority or dominion.” In Luke 10:18 “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven,” Neander explains: “from the pinnacle of power which he had thus far held among men.”* This Observation is corroborated by the use made of the word in connection with Satan, as in Eph. 6:12 where he is represented as being in “the heavenly places,” or “heavenlies.” See the marginal reading, and notice that it is the same place precisely that the saints shall occupy, Eph. 1:3. Satan now has the Kingdoms or heavenlies of this world (hence the offer made at temptation); he is “the Prince of this world”; he is “the Prince of the power of the air” (referring to the fact that the political powers, etc., typified by Sun, Moon, and Stars, are in his power); and we are assured that the time is coming when this power shall be taken from him and be bestowed upon the saints. It is promised to believers that they shall possess the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven; that they shall occupy the high places of the earth; and this again is represented as an occupancy of the “principalities and powers in the heavenlies” (Eph. 3:10, 11), and as being “blessed in the heavenlies in Christ,” Eph. 1:3. Keeping in view that future blessings are spoken of (Prop. 65, Obs. 9) as present owing to the present heirship of these heavenlies in Christ and to the certainty of attaining to them when the appointed time comes for the overthrow of him who has usurped those heavenlies, there is no difficulty in determining the general design of such passages. It throws additional light upon the phrase “Kingdom of heaven,” as indicative of a Kingdom of power and dominion, a Kingdom manifesting, like that of heaven itself, the highest stations of honor and irresistible power over the earth. We are now sitting “together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus,” just as we have arrived at the New Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22), that is prospectively, and this will be shown under the Prop. (154) of the reign of the saints. The reconciliation of things in heaven (Col. 1:10), and the gathering of all things in the heavenlies in Christ (“in the dispensation of the fulness of times,” Eph. 1:10), are also in a great measure to be applied to the restoration of authority and dominion over the world; for, as all prophecy unhesitatingly directs, it is still some time in the future when these Kingdoms, these heavenlies, now in the possession of Satan, shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ. These “heavenlies” also may thus be called, because the authority in them rightfully belongs to God, which authority is now fettered by them and remains more or less unacknowledged.

Obs. 4. The predicted Kingdom of the Messiah, David’s Son, is nowhere specified to be a Kingdom in the third heaven (Prop. 103),

but “of heaven” or rather “of heavens” or “of heavenlies.” According to the Covenant it could not be in heaven, but it is of heaven; that is, given by God, made as God designs it, fashioned after the will of heaven, and containing in itself “heavens,” or “heavenlies,” i.e. most eminent stations of power and dominion. Besides this, whatever might be allowed in this intermediate (always excepting the Kingdom itself) state, we find that at the period of time designated for the setting up of this very Kingdom, Christ Himself, as the Inheritor, the Son of man, leaves heaven and with His saints proceeds to establish this identical Kingdom of heaven, and His saints inherit it. The fact that He thus leaves heaven and appears on earth, that a Kingdom specially His is connected with His appearing, etc.—this should impress us not to draw inferences from passages and directly oppose them to the general current of the Word. Thus e.g. that class like the following: “Rejoice, for great is your reward in heaven,” Matt. 5:12, and others of similar import. Aside from the plural form “in heavens” or “heavenlies” which is in accord with what has been stated, we might dismiss this with the remark that what “heavens” are denoted is simply taken for granted. But grant that the third heaven is meant, and that the plural form is used to impart grandeur, etc., even then it is easy of explanation without confining the parties themselves to the third heaven to obtain the reward of the Kingdom. God in heaven takes cognizance of actions and it is represented that a book of remembrance is kept (Daniel informs us that some Books are opened when the Kingdom is established), and that at the Coming of the Judge the award will be assigned. The reward of every one then in view of conduct, is awarded, and that award is kept in heaven, as in the case of the seventy returning who were (Luke 10:20) “rather to rejoice because your names are written in heaven,” and of the disciples (Luke 12:32) to whom it was said “it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.” The reason of this resolves itself in a reward determined on before the period of its reception, a principle that all theologians adopt. Christ who is our life is in heaven, and what we shall do or endure for His sake, shall elevate us as joint heirs with Him at His Coming; the reward itself being increased or diminished, so far as mere rank, position, etc., is concerned, proportioned to our use of talents, privileges, etc. But these positions are predetermined for certain characters; hence Jesus said, that no one should occupy His right or left hand, excepting him to whom the Father may give the honor. This is the key-note to all such passages. All positions, according to the will and foreknowledge of God, are prepared for this manifestation of the Sons of God, Mark 10:40. This inspires hope; hence in Col. 1:5 we read of “the hope which is laid up for you in heaven,” and which hope is to be realized when Christ shall appear, 1 John 3:2, 3; Tit. 2:13, etc. Just as the hope does not remain in heaven but descends to earth a blessed reality, so we find by a comparison of Scripture that in every case the reward designed for us is only realized at the Sec. Advent upon earth. Thus to illustrate: in Phil. 3:20, “our conversation (citizenship, community, political society, Parkhurst, Wahl, Bloomfield, etc.) is in heaven”—the predetermined order or arrangement or “administration” is there, the title or award that gives adoption or heirship or judgeship, but to avoid the very inference that so many make and to remove any objection that any might allege from the stand-point of the Covenant, the Apostle adds, “from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ,” etc., thus uniting its realization with the Advent of Christ (comp. Meyer’s Com. loci). So the Hebrews (Heb. 10:34–37) are told that in view of their enduring sufferings and spoilings “ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance” but well-knowing “the hope of Israel,” he guards it by adding: “for ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and He that shall come will come and will not tarry.” Thus placing the reception of the promise where the entire tenor of the Record does, viz., at the Second Advent. In 2 Tim. 4:8, the crown laid up in heaven for Paul is to be given only in the day of the Lord’s appearing; in 1 Pet. 1:4, 5, 7, the inheritance “reserved in heaven” is “ready to be revealed in the last time,” “at the appearing of Jesus Christ;” in 2 Cor. 5:2 it is “the house which is from heaven,” and which when exalted to the heavenlies is eternally in the same; and in Rev. 21:2 the New Jerusalem, itself in heaven, is “coming down from God out of heaven,” and the Bible leaves it here without a withdrawal. Taking these and other illustrations, all pointing to the future, not in heaven but here on earth, for a realization of reward, crown, etc., awarded, we see the force of the express passages which refer this period to the time when the Son of man sits on the throne of His glory, and the inheriting of the Kingdom, the reception of the peculiar stations of honor and authority, the bestowment of “the heavenlies,” once usurped by Satan, shall be duly and happily experienced.*

PROPOSITION 108. The formula “Kingdom of heaven” connected with the parables confirms our doctrine of the Kingdom.

The contrary is asserted by all opposed to us, and as the Church-Kingdom view mainly obtains as a Scriptural basis its rise and defence from it, it deserves attention.

Obs. 1. A few preliminary thoughts are, however, in place. (1) The reader will recall our Prop. concerning the mysteries of the Kingdom. The parables were given respecting the secrets of the Kingdom and were in themselves designed to conceal some things that were necessary. Lange (Com., Matt. 13) correctly shows that the common notion (viz., that they were adapted to weak and carnal understandings) entertained, is erroneous. But Lange does not go far enough, for if we are to take the testimony of Jesus Himself, they were far from being designed for popular instruction, being in point of fact employed to conceal some very important truths. Jesus says that He spoke plainly to His disciples, but in parables to the people, clearly distinguishing between plain and hidden truth. In Matt. 13:13; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10, He says that the parable is used that the people may not comprehend. The reason for this lies in their foreknown depravity and rejection of the Messiah, in their being unable to receive the intended

postponement of the Kingdom and contemplated ingrafting of the Gentiles. To appreciate the parables in all their fulness it is absolutely necessary to keep in view the Covenant and the Divine Purpose in its fulfilment, as shown in previous Propositions. (2) The depth of these parables cannot be apprehended unless we especially keep in mind what afterward occurred, viz., the postponement of the Kingdom, which, impressed by the foreknowledge of Jesus, gave a coloring to them highly marked and distinctive. By doing this, we avoid the perplexity of commentators in reconciling the one with the other (as e.g. the parable of the Leaven with that of the Tares); and we make them accurately correspond with Covenant, prophecy, and the actual history of the Church. The parables having reference to the Kingdom of God must, as is the case, have reference to the rejection of Jesus and the consequences resulting therefrom, otherwise they would not be adapted to meet the exigencies of Christ's position. (3) If the parables delineate the Kingdom of God in the Church as now currently believed, why is it that the Apostles did not ascertain this fact and use them as now popularly employed? If e.g. the parable of the Leaven, or of the Mustard Seed means what Neander and a multitude inform us, how comes it that those under special instruction and guidance did not so understand them, as admitted by Neander and these writers, and as proven beyond all dispute by Acts 1:6? Why did they still labor under "a sensuous interpretation," "Jewish opinions," etc., when as we are confidently told, "the reference to the Kingdom is so plain;" and why was this ignorance of the Apostles perpetuated in the churches founded by them; and why was it left for an uninspired man (such a doubtful source) as Origen to present the leverage by which the parables were lifted to their generally accepted position? Strange that it took several centuries before men arose who were able to obtain a correct understanding of them! In this estimate of the Apostle's knowledge of the parables—for we take that given by eminent men—no account is taken of the special private instruction of the Apostles, but because these, as they concede, did not militate against the notion of the Kingdom as entertained by the pious Jews (witness Acts 1:6), did not prevent the retention of "Jewish conceptions," they are not to be regarded. If the parables really mean what so many popular works ascribe to them, the Thessalonians and others might have received a ready and crushing answer to their views of the Kingdom; and the Apostles themselves could not have consistently preached a near, expectant Advent. Let any man with unprejudiced mind consider the opinions that the Disciples, Apostles and early Church entertained, and then compare them with those now so prevalent, and he will see abundant reason for a most careful re-examination of the whole subject, for between the two there is a most decided conflict. If the parables were designed, as some assert (Lange Com., Matt., vol. 1, p. 237), to show the difference between the true Kingdom of Christ and "the carnal" expectations of the Jews; how comes it then that they did not restrain such "carnal" anticipations—with private instruction and the express declaration that they should understand them added—in the disciples and Apostles themselves? This must be satisfactorily answered, or else the very preachers of the Kingdom stand before us self-deceived and ignorant. Our doctrine, however, clears them of such inconsistency, and places them in a position of correct knowledge and proper appreciation of the parables. (4) In this discussion, the vital difference that exists between our view and that of others is, that we hold that the parables teach what is preparatory or introductory to the Kingdom, whilst they maintain that the parables refer directly to a Kingdom already in existence, and describe its condition, etc. The latter opinion is brought out in the general affirmation (Lange's Com., cap. to Matt. 13), that Christ presents in them "the founding and development of His Kingdom through all its phases, from its beginning to its end." Aside from the fact that they themselves tell us that the Church was founded previously and hence could not, on their own showing, be founded then, this caption affirms more than can be proven, but nevertheless is taken for granted, without decisive—only inferential—proof, and forms the keynote of the entire interpretation. The former idea, forced upon us by the exact promise of the Theocratic Davidic Kingdom, prophecy, history of the Church, example of the disciples, etc., forms, on the other hand, the guide for our interpretation of the parables. In the application of these two principles we now propose to test the language of the parables themselves and see to which one they most accurately correspond. There is no difference, of account, between us as to the definition of a parable, and with them we hold that the main thing to be sought for is the truth pointed out, or taught by the narrative, or course of action presented. (5) We are not to be understood as basing our doctrine on the parables, for we cheerfully adopt the rule given by Horne (vol. 1, Intro., p. 395) and others, that no doctrine, or article of faith, is to be established from a parable, simply because all such, however illustrative and confirmatory, in order to be understood and appreciated, presuppose and require a previous acquaintance with doctrine. It is in this respect that so great a man as Neander fails to give satisfaction. In the introduction to his admirable Church History, he founds his doctrine of the Church-Kingdom upon the parable of the Leaven; and the entire History and other works are pervaded by its influence. It was in this direction that his sincere mind sought to escape from difficulties alleged against Christianity; but whatever the motive, it certainly was a mistake to draw so important an inference from so slight a source. A doctrine permeating such noble monuments of learning and research should have had a stronger foundation underneath it than a parabolic one. (6) Covenant and prophecy promise only one, and that a permanent, Kingdom to the Messiah, David's Son. Nothing is said of an inferior and then superior one, of one existing before the Sec. Advent as a prelude to another, of several successive stages in a progressive direction; for the decided impression made is, that one Kingdom alone is described as existing under "the reign of the Messiah." Hence, this theory of successive stages, etc., so conveniently grafted on the parables to make them, if possible, consistent with each other, ought, if correct, to find corroborating evidence in its support outside of the parables, either in Covenant or prediction. But unfortunately the only proof adduced in its behalf comes from two of the parables themselves. The parabolic form is a convenient refuge for all mystical interpretations, being admirably adapted to secure, as some do, a Kingdom in the visible Church, or, if necessary, in the invisible, or even in both, owing to its caption. (7) Again, it must be borne in mind that quite a number of the parables, as many writers (especially Greswell) have shown, are prophetic in their nature. They predict matters which relate to the Kingdom of God. This prophetic meaning is so self-evident that

it needs no discussion. We only refer to it to add that, if they possess such a characteristic (as any good classification at once indicates), then they ought to be explained, not isolated but in accord with the general tenor of prophecy.

Obs. 2. If the Kingdom of God is what is so popularly represented, viz., "God's rule," or "God's reign in the heart," or "the body of believers," then, as a matter of course, if they are synonymous, it would be appropriate to substitute one or the other of these in the place of the heading of the parables. Let any one test this, and he must see by its evident unfitness that such is not the case. Hence having found by Covenant and prophecy in the Old Test. the Kingdom of God, let us come to the parables and regard them from this position, and see whether they do not fully correspond with the one Kingdom promised and predicted. In this way we avoid making the unfounded distinction of a select higher measure of information for the initiated and an inferior degree for the unlearned, which Fairbairn justly condemns; and at the same time preserve the more private instruction afforded to the disciples from degenerating into substantially (Acts 1:6) what all received, i.e. they remained, with their special advantages (according to our opposers) just as ignorant. This removes the notion that there are secret doctrines imparted by them that should not be made known to all over against the precise declaration, Matt. 10:27. And also, it proposes to correct the idea entertained by many writers, that the parables "tended virtually with the mass of His hearers to increase their ignorance and misapprehension of the truth" (Fairbairn, note to p. 26, *Intro. to Lisco's Parables*). This sadly reflects on the ministry of Jesus. If the Kingdom is what Fairbairn pronounces it to be, a purely spiritual affair, then indeed we admit this was the case, and Christ the Light appears with an obscured disk. But take our doctrine of the Kingdom and apply it, and the Light is untarnished, for then, instead, the Kingdom is truthfully and correctly represented, its postponement intimated, the preparatory stage of gathering out portrayed, and the unbelief and rejection of the truth by the Jews is rendered the more culpable. We unhesitatingly say that, if the Kingdom, the main leading covenanted subject preached, is what so many style it, then it was the duty of Christ to so plainly proclaim it that, at least, His own disciples should not say what they did, Acts 1:6. Having already vindicated Christ's preaching, it is not necessary to enlarge. Therefore, we only add: that the Jews did not receive the truth because a spiritual Kingdom was presented in it for their acceptance, but for the reason that these parables, before the setting up of the Kingdom, imposed upon them preparatory duties and intimated a period of time to intervene, which was unpalatable to their hearts and expectations. Hence the parable itself, the real truth contained in it, proved to be instrumental, just as Paul indicates 2 Cor. 2:14–17. Truths hitherto concealed may indeed be found in them, reference to higher truths still future may be indicated, but never is the leading subject, that of the Kingdom, thus concealed. Covenanted as it is, firmly bound by the oath of the Almighty, it cannot be transmuted into a mystical or spiritual Kingdom by a hidden process, without a violation of unity, language, and Covenant.*

Obs. 3. In passing over the parables we shall only select that class which have the formula "Kingdom of heaven" attached to them, being supposed specially to favor the prevailing view. If these are satisfactorily explained, the rest will need none.

1. The parable of the Tares and Wheat, Matt. 13:24–30 and 37–43. Keeping in view the covenanted Kingdom as it was promised, the peculiar position of hearers and the Speaker, the former expecting this Kingdom and the latter foreknowing its rejection and postponement, we have the only practical key to the formula itself. Something is understood, which the then present general expectations of the Jewish hearers (Prop. 20, etc.), supplied, viz., the Kingdom you expect is to be introduced as follows; or the Kingdom of heaven that you anticipate requires the following. As a preacher of "the Gospel of the Kingdom," the parables fall within His Mission, and above all things His hearers desire to know when it will be established. The call to repentance leaves it indefinite and dependent; hence Jesus, as the Divine Teacher, proceeds to satisfy a pious curiosity or laudable desire, and in this parable locates the establishment of the Kingdom at the period of the harvest. To obtain the force of the parable it is requisite to supply the idea of the setting up of the Kingdom as to manner and time and then notice what things Jesus teaches are required before this will be done. The Kingdom is not likened to any particular one thing in the parable but to the final result, the end. For if it were, then it would be likened to "a man," for, taking the theories prevailing, that is expressly asserted. But it is not likened to "a man" or to his acts, or to "the good seed" which grows into wheat, or to "the field" which is the world, or to "the tares" which are mixed with the wheat, or even to "the harvest;" but all these are used to indicate how certain things must be accomplished until "the end of the age," when the righteous, the gathered wheat, shall "shine forth as the Sun" in the Kingdom. That this is a correct interpretation of the parable will appear from the following: (1) by linking the Kingdom only with the harvest as do Joel and John; (2) by expressly mentioning the Kingdom as following the harvest; (3) by locating the Kingdom at the end of the age; (4) by the correspondence existing between the parable and Matt. 25:31–46; (5) by otherwise making the Kingdom (if the Church) a mixed one, utterly opposed to covenant promise; (6) a mixed condition of tares and wheat down to the very end of the age itself, forbids the fulfilment of Millennial descriptions, as e.g. "all shall be righteous," etc. The positive manner in which Christ puts His language is also expressive of what Paul says Rom. 4:17, "callet those things which be not as though they were,"—the present tense is employed, as the Kingdom, although future, is regarded by the Divine Mind as a certainty, a determined realization. Hence the Kingdom of heaven, an ordained, fixed arrangement, is to be obtained in this way and time. This is the meaning of Jesus, a meaning in accord with all other Scripture.

2. Then follows the parable of the Mustard Seed, Matt. 13:31, 32, to which the same principle must be applied. According to our position it would denote that the promised Kingdom of heaven is not brought into existence at once as they, the hearers, expected; it

demands time and preparation; it requires small beginnings, a small seed, a Christian Church, or first an individual, then a family, then a nation, then a people adopted into that nation, until finally, when all this preparative growth has been experienced, the tree, i.e. the Kingdom appears and it will be found greater than all herbs (i.e. other kingdoms), affording abundant shelter. The tree alone represents the Kingdom, and this Kingdom is shown to be the result of an intervening growth or work, a constant accretion or gathering. A tree too is significant of a Kingdom, Dan. 4:10, 20; Ezek. 31:3. The small flock by constant accessions to its number will ultimately at the manifestation of the Sons of God become a mighty nation, a strong people, etc. "When it is grown" it "becometh a tree." If we turn to Mark 4:34 in immediate connection with this parable, it is said, "and when they were alone He expounded all things to His disciples." In this private explanation, the interpretation suggested by us was undoubtedly the one impressed upon the disciples as their preaching the Kingdom proves, for they knew nothing of the modern ideas grafted on this parable, as Acts 1:6 clearly indicates. Either the expounding of Jesus amounted to nothing or availed nothing, or else it confirmed the disciples in the covenanted Kingdom as believed in by them. The latter is the truth, honorable both to Jesus and Apostles.

3. The most important of the parables is that of the Leaven. Matt. 13:33; Luke 13:20–21; it being employed more than any other in the development Church-Kingdom theory. The opinion that this refers to the Church is beset with difficulties, for then this parable contradicts that of the Tares and Wheat, which asserts that instead of the whole being leavened there shall be down to the Advent a mixed condition. Many passages corroborate this, that neither the world nor the Church shall be thus leavened. Besides this, if the leavening process is carried out, it is constantly progressive, and does not accord with the relapses, retrogressions that history records. In the efforts to reconcile this parable with a theory, one (Lange, vol. 1, 248) says: "the woman is an apt figure of the Church;" another (as Trench, Lisco, etc.) makes the leaven the Kingdom; another (Lange, loci) informs us that the three measures of meal is the visible Church (Welt-Kirche). Many find refuge in the invisible Church, others in the Gospel Kingdom, or the Gospel truth, or Christianity. Some, to avoid a contradiction of the parable of Tares and Wheat, confine it exclusively to a delineation of piety in the heart of the individual believer, and make the Kingdom existing in the individual. Another class (as e.g. Vtringa, Gurtler, Teelman, Cyril, Darby, Paine, Seiss, etc.) make this leaven used in a bad sense, equivalent to error, false doctrine, corruption, and apply it in the history of the Church. Thus a variety of views are entertained concerning its meaning, indicating that, from the desire of nearly all to unite it in some way with an existing Kingdom, the Church is selected, either visible or invisible, either in its aggregate or individuality, as the Kingdom denoted.

But remove the notion, taken for granted, that the Kingdom must now be found and the parable corresponds with the preceding ones. As in usage the leavening process is only a preparatory one, so it is here; the leaven is the Divine Word of the Kingdom, it leavens a definite measure of meal, i.e. a predetermined number who are to be adopted as the Sons of God. The gathering out process, and the detention of the Kingdom until this is accomplished, is thus presented, preserving the unity of Scripture. The leavened meal is initiatory to the formation of bread, so this Divine Process is introductory to the Divine Purpose of establishing the Kingdom. The people and the disciples are taught, that previous to the setting up of the Kingdom a definite number of the elect must first be obtained, and the manner in which this is done, by gradual appropriation through Divine truth, is also intimated. If it denotes, what so many believe, is it not strange that the disciples, preachers of the Kingdom and having the advantages of private instruction concerning it, should not be able to comprehend its meaning to be, as alleged, a complete overthrow of their expectations of a covenanted Kingdom. It is true, that Christ most delicately, and thus vindicating His Divine foreknowledge, teaches them that their hopes cannot be at once realized, that a postponement or preparatory stage or leavening process is necessary, but He does not, and cannot as a Covenant-sealing Saviour, destroy their hopes of the Kingdom. The confidence with which they preached the Kingdom proclaims this fact. With this view we can adopt and incorporate many valuable remarks recorded by the various writers on the parables, discarding the engrafted Origenistic Church-Kingdom idea, and adhering to the one that the Kingdom of heaven will appear when the certain number, represented by the three (sacred number) measures of meal, are obtained by the power of the truth. In this manner we preserve the unity of Scripture, the consistent preaching of instructed disciples. Again, by reference to the connection of this parable in Matt. 13:34, 35, we find that it embraces "things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world." Now it is taken for granted that "the secret thing" pertains to the nature, the spirituality of the Kingdom, but that this is a wrong inference is apparent from the declarations of the Apostles who found this secret or mystery in the postponement and consequent call of the Gentiles, as is proven by Eph., 3:4–6; Col. 1:26, 27, etc., thus fully according with our interpretation.

4. The parables of the Treasure and of the Pearl, Matt. 13:44–46, need no special notice, as the simple idea running through them is this: that as men exhibit their interest in, and willingness to sacrifice all for, something that is very precious and costly, so we ought to do the same in behalf of the Kingdom of God. It again indicates a preparatory stage in the individual and that he can obtain an abiding interest, inheritance, in the Kingdom itself. No one but can see that if we press the captions of these two parables, as is done in others, they become at once contradictory—for the one likens the Kingdom to the treasure and the other likens the Kingdom, not to the pearl but to the merchantman, thus indicating that Christ's design was only to show what spirit should actuate us in seeking His Kingdom. This excludes all those forced and constrained expositions which abound in several writers, especially in Vtringa. Faith seizes upon the treasure God offers, and is willing to surrender all to obtain the abiding hope which it inspires, and its ultimate enjoyment.

5. The parable of the Net, Matt. 13:47–50, resembles that of the Tares and Wheat, and therefore requires no explanation. The

design of this dispensation is represented, the postponement indicated in a preparatory gathering which shall continue until the end of the age. The mixed condition until the final separation is a prominent feature. The Kingdom, owing to its rejection by the nation, requires this previous casting of the net and its results.

6. The parable of the King and his Servants, or of the Unmerciful Servant, Matt. 18:23–35, shows the correctness of our deductions concerning the heading of the parable; for our entrance into the Kingdom of heaven is here conditioned on our brotherly forgiveness. As the servants render their account to the King, so shall we also finally to the great King. A preparatory qualification is requisite. Of the same tenor is the one of the Laborers in the Vineyard, Matt. 20:1–16, showing that previous to the bestowment of the reward a preparatory service is demanded, and that all thus engaged will receive their just dues. Lange, and others, make the vineyard the Kingdom of God, but it is likened to the householder who is represented as following a certain course of action, illustrative of what God will also do in the final settlement. We are taught that certain things are necessary before we can enter into that Kingdom, and that the principle actuating the householder will eventually influence the Judge in his arbitration of affairs. The parable of the Royal Wedding, or the Wedding Garment, Matt. 22:1–14, clearly points out that the Church is not the Kingdom of God, because the parties are represented merely as invited to the wedding. Before the Kingdom is introduced, represented under the figure of the Son's wedding, a preliminary stage is introduced; and owing to the conduct of the guests first invited a further postponement is indicated until a certain gathering is obtained, thus accurately corresponding with our line of argument. This dispensation of grace, resulting from the perverse refusal of the invited Jewish nation, is designed to secure the requisite guests for the marriage feast at the end of the age.

7. As we proceed the parables become still more distinctive of our position. The parable of the Ten Virgins, Matt. 25:1–13, refers us by the word "then" directly to the period of the Second Advent, as is admitted by all our best critics. We are by its peculiar arrangement and connection limited to a certain period of time when such a separation of the wise and foolish shall be made. The time of the Kingdom and that of the coming of the Bridegroom and marriage are the same; and in view of an indefinite (i.e. to man) postponement of the same, and of a preparatory state of preparation, we are exhorted to be watchful, occupying the position of wise virgins. The parable following, that of the Talents, Matt. 25:13–14, inculcates still more forcibly this preliminary, intervening period before the Kingdom can be established. For we have (1) the allotment of specific duties, (2) the withdrawal of the person into "a far country," leaving his servants behind, (3) "after a long time the lord of these servants cometh and reckoneth with them," (4) the reward of the faithful servants is the assignment of rulership in the Kingdom, (5) and its connection with what follows, verses 31–46. Here is a pointed and significant delineation of the postponement of the Kingdom as various Propositions inculcate.

8. Thus we might pass over all the parables and in each case show how they fully correspond with the interpretation given. This, however, is unnecessary in view of the ample illustrations already presented. But we cannot in justice to ourselves close without directing marked attention to the parable of the Ten Pounds, Luke 19:11–27, which most forcibly confirms our position. This parable was introduced as follows: "He added and spake a parable, because He was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear." It is reasonable to suppose that the parable will throw light on the anticipated appearance of the Kingdom, especially as it was supposed to be connected with His then visit to Jerusalem. Now let any unprejudiced reader study this Divine utterance, expressly given to meet the notion of a speedy establishment of the Kingdom, and he must, if language has any force, arise from such a contemplation of it with a deep conviction that it teaches distinctly and vividly a protracted postponement of the Kingdom, the identical postponement so repeatedly advocated in these pages. We have (1) a nobleman going into a far country; (2) the design of going is to obtain the title, right, etc., to a Kingdom; (3) then he will return; (4) but his stay is a prolonged one, for time is given for trading, etc. (as in the parable of the Talents "after a long time the lord of those servants cometh," etc.); (5) the Kingdom that he receives is located where the nobleman lived, "his citizens," etc.; (6) he returns, having received the right of ruling; (7) during his absence his servants are required to be faithful to an imposed trust; (8) when he comes back to reign he has a reckoning with his servants; (9) and assigns to the faithful a rulership in his received Kingdom. Here is a decided answer to the theory that the Kingdom was established at the First Advent or shortly after, for we have in the nobleman an undoubted representation of Jesus, of His removal, of His injunctions upon His servants during the period of His departure, of His return with authority to appear as the covenanted King, of "His appearing in His Kingdom" (2 Tim. 4:1), and of His awarding stations of honor and ruling to the faithful.

Obs. 4. It would be an easy matter to criticise the inconsistencies and contradictions engrafted on these parables by the Church-Kingdom theory, but such a course is not needed by our argument, seeing that they are readily detected and exposed. Yet an illustration may be in place because of the influence exerted by the distinguished writer. If we take the last parable we find that Dr. Neander, in order to make the Church the Kingdom, handles it in a very illogical manner. He makes this absence of Christ, His return, and the establishment of the Kingdom to refer to a very brief period—to His death, ascension, and immediate return (the servants having a few days to trade in, etc.). He vainly endeavors to conceal the difficulties environing his interpretation by general phrases (which do not exclude the Second Coming), and utterly fails to make his interpretation fit into his own theory. The proof is this: Previously (Life of Christ) he informs us that the Kingdom of God had already come, that it was even then in progress of development, and declares that while Christ is absent during this brief interval "His agents advanced His Kingdom," that when Christ

ascended to heaven He was “appointed Theocratic King,” and immediately after such an appointment returns (spiritually is our conjecture) to exercise His royal power. Here he has a Kingdom already founded, then this Kingdom is left for the purpose of being appointed “Theocratic King,” and then a return is made to exercise this kingly authority thus received, so that the reply that Christ gave to those who thought that the Kingdom would immediately appear was in substance the following: You are mistaken; the Kingdom is already here; the interval of my absence makes no difference in its existence; that interval embraces but a few years at most, etc. (see p. 239 Life of Christ). But even this interval is reduced to a few days, for in Sec. 243 he interprets the triumphal entry into Jerusalem as expressive “that the Kingdom of God had come and that He was the promised Theocratic King,” so that the departure and the appointment were unnecessary for the appearing of the Kingdom. Such a style of interpretation needs no comment beside the language of the parable itself; and, we may add, it never would have been attempted by so able a man if he had not been fettered by a preconceived doctrine that the Church is the Kingdom of God. Alas! when so great and good men fall into such palpable contradictions.*

PROPOSITION 109. An examination of the passages of Scripture supposed to teach the Church-Kingdom theory will confirm our doctrine of the Kingdom.

The Propositions already given, and the concessions of candid writers like Neander concerning the apostolic views, indicate that all such passages are susceptible, by a fair comparison of the Word and interpretation, of a consistent explanation in accord with covenant, prophecy, and the position of the early Church.

Obs. 1. The passage usually quoted against us is the one in John 18:36, “My Kingdom is not of this world; if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my Kingdom not from hence.” There is not the remotest declaration here that the Church is the Kingdom, but it is inferred on the ground that a Kingdom was established and that this describes a purely spiritual one which must be the Church. Leaving the parties who use this Scripture against our doctrine of a visible, real world-dominion to reconcile it with their own alleged objections drawn from it, when advocating the same visible world-dominion in describing Millennial portrayals, etc., we content ourselves with merely giving the reasons why this passage is not only not hostile but in actual harmony with our doctrine. The view that we have all along maintained is this, viz., that this Kingdom, Theocratic-Davidic, is of divine origin and is specially claimed as God’s, He Himself being the Ruler in and through the reigning King; that this Kingdom, being not of worldly but divine outgrowth, is promised to Jesus Christ as the promised David’s Son; and that, owing to the foreknown rejection of the Messiah, etc., is postponed to the ending of this age or dispensation. The language of Christ accurately corresponds with our previous propositions, for we have (1) “My Kingdom,” a Kingdom belonging to Jesus as covenanted; (2) “is not of this world”—it is a Kingdom, as we have already shown, not of a human-devised order of arrangement, not of earthly derivation, but heaven-derived and belonging to a renewed order of arrangement, in the future, to “the world to come,” having been, as prophets and as Jesus Himself, previously predicted, postponed; (3) “if My Kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews,” i.e. if it were not of “the world to come,” if it were not postponed to the end of the age and to a new order of things, then would I not be in the power of the Jews for then even my servants would fight, but the Kingdom being postponed from the First to the Second Advent, my servants do not interfere with the authority of Cæsar; (4) “but now is My Kingdom not from hence,” i.e. but now, during the present order of things, owing to this very postponement my Kingdom is not of this world. This itself would forbid the idea of the Church Kingdom, and as the emphasis is on the word “now” there is implied that at some future time, as our argument demands, His Kingdom would be established. Besides this, the peculiar and significant “but now” implies even more, viz., that His Kingdom will ultimately, although not at present, embrace a jurisdiction or dominion over the world, crushing and overcoming all resistance, which corresponds with what is predicted, Rev. 11:15, “the Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever.” Our view causes no antagonism between the two passages, but receives and harmonizes both of them; for, as the prophets describe the Kingdom, it is not world-derived but will at a certain period of time manifest itself in the appearing of the King and exhibit a world-dominion.*

Obs. 2. Rom. 14:17, “For the Kingdom of God is not meat or drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.” From this is inferred that the Church or piety is the Kingdom. But this passage must be explained in accordance with the general tenor of the Word, and if this is done then the idea of the Apostle is that the Kingdom we hope to enter is not one of (leading to or tending to, e.g. Rom. 8:6, etc.) meat and drink (hence no need of the contention, etc., previously mentioned concerning meats), but one of righteousness, peace, and joy. Or, the Kingdom is not obtained by meat and drink but by righteousness, etc. If we are to understand it differently and by way of inference, then some passage direct and explicit, teaching that the Church is the Kingdom, ought to be produced to prove its correctness (comp. Meyer, Com. loci). Matt. 6:32, “But seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness” only has reference to seeking an interest in the Kingdom; for, as many commentators admit, the connection in which it stands in Luke 12:31 shows this, Jesus having immediately added: “Fear not. little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the Kingdom,” etc. The passage in Luke 16:16, “the law and the prophets were until John; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it” (also Matt. 11:11–12) has already been alluded to, and the satisfactory explanation

given by Judge Jones (Notes on Matt. 11:12) proves that instead of every man pressing into it, every man, i.e. the generality of men pressed against or resisted it, which accords with the historical facts as given by John 1:11; 12:37; Rom. 11:8, 11, 12; Matt. 23:13, etc. This interpretation sustained by the language prevents it becoming contradictory to others.* The passages found in Matt. 16:28; Mark 9:1; Luke 9:27; Matt. 10:23, will be examined in connection with the transfiguration, Prop. 153. The language addressed to Nicodemus, John 3:3, 5, is of such a nature that we have a preparatory work described preliminary to a future seeing and entering into the Kingdom, or, as will be shown under the Prop. relating to the resurrection it is so far-reaching that it also includes that birth of the Spirit which Jesus Himself experienced, viz., that of the resurrection from the dead, which is preliminary to the inheriting, etc., of the future Kingdom.*

Obs. 3. It is supposed that the most direct Scripture in support of the Church-Kingdom theory is found in Col. 1:13, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us into the Kingdom of His dear Son." This undoubtedly is the strongest proof text that can be presented in favor of the prevailing view. But (1) if we receive our version as it stands the language is easily reconcilable with the principle that future blessings are spoken of as present, as exemplified in Heb. 12:22, 23, etc. (comp. Prop. 65, Obs. 9). This is a peculiarity of Paul's, so that in Rom. 8:30 he has those who are justified also glorified, when, as is taught in the same chapter, the period of glorification is still future. In the context itself the allusion to the inheritance of the saints and deliverance from darkness indicates the same, seeing that "the inheritance" is only bestowed at the Sec. Advent and that a complete deliverance from darkness (which includes death and the grave) is only obtained at the Coming of Christ. This Scripture must be explained according to the general analogy of Scripture, and it is too indefinite to form the foundation of so important a doctrine as that of the Church-Kingdom. (2) Some authors, however, give a different rendering from our version, making the reading "changed us for the Kingdom of His dear Son," contending that the preposition "eis" should be translated "for" as, e.g. in Luke 9:62, etc. Either view will secure uniformity of promise, etc. A passage from which it is inferred that John was then in the Kingdom (i.e. Church) is found in Rev. 1:9, "I, John, who am your brother and companion in tribulation and in the Kingdom and patience of Christ." The best comment on this is to be found in 2 Tim. 2:12, "If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him," or in Rom. 8:17, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together." Commentators (as e.g. Bloomfield, loci) frankly admit this explanation and think that reference is made to the hope of the Kingdom expressed in verse 6. Hence John declares in the most decided manner his strong faith and hope of sharing in the Kingdom.

Obs. 4. Several other passages are occasionally urged against our view that may be worthy of attention. Thus 1 Cor. 4:20, "For the Kingdom of God is not in word but in power," is thus employed, but it really sustains our position because we all along contend that it is not produced or established by "word" but by "power," not by speech but by authority. If the ancient (Bloomfield, loci) and some modern commentators are correct in making the word "power" an equivalent for "miraculous power," then it is still stronger on our side. At least the language is a rebuke to certain ones who thought that they were rulers, possessed authority, etc., and the appeal is that if they were such their power should be manifested, although Paul himself professes not yet to reign. But if the passage does refer to the power exhibited through the Apostle himself (as in ch. 2:4), then the idea is that the Kingdom of God is proclaimed, preached by him not in word, "not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." In any case the verb, being omitted, must be supplied by the force of the context, and therefore is not very decisive in a question of this kind, especially as the word "power," on which critics differ, has a material influence in deciding what is to be supplied. Again, such passages as Luke 22:16; Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, require no particular notice, since over against the few who make a fulfilment in the Church in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the immense majority of those who hold to the Church-Kingdom view concede that it has no reference to the Church here in this dispensation. They indeed refer it to the third heaven, etc., while we regard its fulfilment connected with Luke 22:29, 30. Finally many inconclusive inferences are drawn from the phrase in the Lord's Prayer "Thy Kingdom come," the main one being that it is praying for a Kingdom already present, and that its power, etc., may be extended, etc. But this is in direct opposition to the words of the petition which is—as the last saint will do—praying for something to come; the force of which is admitted by later Fathers, commentators, and others, so that they (as e.g. Cyprian, Augustine, etc.) tell us that the Kingdom meant is the Kingdom of glory or the third heaven. That it has an undoubted reference to the future is evident from the annexed clause, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven," which by numerous passages we find will not be done before but after the Second Advent. Besides this the prayer is given to the people with the then prevailing belief that the Kingdom of promise was still future, and as we have seen from Jewish expectations, etc., fully accords with the preaching of the Kingdom. A theory must be hard pressed for argument that can change "Thy Kingdom come" into a present, existing one. The Church-Kingdom is grafted upon it irrespective of real fitness and against the protests even of many of our opposers.*

PROPOSITION 110. The passage most relied on to prove the Church-Kingdom theory utterly disproves it.

Desirous to call especial attention to this passage of Scripture, it is reserved for a separate Proposition. In a careful reading and study of the Church-Kingdom theory, it will be found the most frequently quoted, and adduced as an authority, from Origen down to

recent writers as Dr. McCosh, and including a host. In view of the learning, ability, and high standing of those who thus employ it, this Scripture (viz., Luke 17:21) deserves marked attention.

Obs. 1. Before discussing the passage itself we may briefly advert to the manner in which it is employed. It is amazing that, notwithstanding the just criticisms of able commentators, the most prominent men will continue to quote it in support of a spiritual Kingdom without the least attempt to show how it can be consistently and logically thus applied. They use it as if no difficulties of any kind were attached to it, and as if it did not prove too much for their own theory. To give a recent example: Dr. McCosh in replying to Renan (*Christ. and Posit.*, p. 245) adduces the passage to prove that "the Kingdom was to be a reign of God in men's hearts" without seeing that if such is its meaning then the wicked Pharisees had already this Kingdom "within" them, for the words were directly addressed to them. When men of acknowledged ability will quote Scripture so loosely it is saddening to the heart, and causes but little hope that many will duly weigh and examine the passage. It is true some allowance must be made for the manner in which such an interpretation is intrenched in the Church itself, and thus becomes unless particular attention is directed to it, part of its theological equipments. Thus, e.g. Dr. Woodhouse (*Transl. of Apoc.*) lays down as a canon of interpretation that the Kingdom predicted in Revelation is a spiritual Kingdom and to prove it quotes, italicizing it, "the Kingdom of God, says our Lord, is within you, Luke 17:21," which canon is indorsed and adopted by Horne (*Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 383). Thus it is erected even as a foundation upon which to build an interpretation. Neander is more guarded, translating (*Life of Christ*, s. 213) "Behold the Kingdom of God is among you," and in a foot-note opposes the rendering "within you" as inconsistent because it "would not suit the persons addressed, for they were as yet strangers to the Kingdom of God," etc. But bound by his theory to find the spiritual Kingdom he apprehends it in the preceding phrase, which he renders "the Kingdom of God cometh not with outward show (cannot be outwardly seen by human eyes), and in a note adds: "The antithesis is, that it reveals itself invisibly, so as to be seen only by the eye of faith." He afterward forgets and contradicts his own definition of this Kingdom, making it in the course of development a real, outward, visible world-dominion. Many such illustrations can be given, found in commentaries, etc., which find here a spiritual Kingdom in one or the other of these sentences, and then make this same inward, invisible Kingdom—a Kingdom only seen by the eye of faith—transform itself somehow into a visible outward Kingdom. This singular transformation notion, so hostile to what they call "a higher spiritual conception," is evidence that there must be something faulty in the theory itself. The reader need scarcely be reminded that this passage, with the interpretation that it denotes "God's reign in the heart," is a favorite one with Spiritualists, etc., to confirm spirit revelations, claims to inspiration, etc. Various sects have built largely on it as indicating special inward light, knowledge, authority, etc.*

Obs. 2. The passage, Luke 17:20, 21, must be taken in its entire connection. (1) "And when He was demanded of the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God should come." The question when the Kingdom should come determines the answer. And we may well ask the question whether Jesus will give that information to the Pharisees which He uniformly denied to His own disciples during His ministry (Mark 13:32) and even after His resurrection (Acts 1:7). Would He give that (i.e. exact time) to His enemies which He withheld from His friends? (2) "He answered them and said, the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Perhaps no word has received such singular treatment as the word "observation" here; its primary, distinctive meaning is discarded and a meaning given to it which Judge Jones (*Essays on the Com. of the Kingdom of God*, p. 51) justly remarks "cannot be extracted from it," and as a further proof of it the reader may be challenged to produce another place, either in sacred or secular literature, where any critic has attempted to force any one of these meanings (i.e. outward show, pomp, splendor, etc.) either upon the word 'parateresis' or 'observatio.' " Discarding then all those far-fetched secondary engrafted meanings, and leaving even the highly ingenious (perhaps correct) and critical interpretation of Judge Jones, we are willing to accept of the plain meaning of the word as given by critics, viz., denoting (Olshausen) "the act of perceiving or of observing," (Kypke) "scrupulous attention or observation," etc. Thus then, the Kingdom of God cometh, not as something whose approach may be attentively perceived, observed, considered, i.e. like that of a visible object gradually or even swiftly approaching. It will not come indicating its coming by sending forth any observable signs. This is the simple meaning and it corresponds with the general tenor of the word. This Kingdom is linked, as we have shown, with the Sec. Advent; "the appearing and the Kingdom" (as in the following verses) are united, 2 Tim. 4:1. No one will be able to observe its coming, for it comes as the Advent itself, suddenly, unexpectedly, like a thief, illustrated in the parable of the Ten Virgins and by its comparison with the lightning and the days of Noah. So concealed is its approach that it becomes "a snare" to the world, and even to the Church; for its coming is dependent on the fulfilment of "the times of the Gentiles," the completion of a certain number of the elect, the Advent of Christ Himself, which things are not observable to man, being known only to God. There is nothing in the Kingdom itself to indicate the time of its establishment. (3) "Neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there!" Not being observable for the reasons just assigned no one is able to direct attention to it in the manner indicated.

(4) "For, behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." Surely He did not mean that the Pharisees who addressed Him and to whom He spoke, had the Kingdom within them individually, personally. The phrase "within you" is susceptible of an easy and consistent solution. Let the reader consider the Propositions in which we showed conclusively that this Kingdom is covenanted to the Jewish nation; that it is an elect nation; that this Kingdom belonged so exclusively to them that the public ministry of John, Jesus and the disciples was confined (Prop. 54) to that nation; that the Kingdom was tendered to it; that on its refusal (through its representative men) to repent, the Kingdom is postponed and the people who are to receive it as an inheritance with Christ are grafted into that

elect nation, etc., and all these considerations show at once how this Kingdom was “within” them. It was truly “within” the nation, it being the elect nation. The persons addressed were part of the nation and chief men of it, and Christ, in strict accordance with covenant relationship and fact, told those very unbelievers, that in view of the tender of this Kingdom to the people of the nation, and of its being preached within the nation, and of its being identified with the nation in the throne and Kingdom of David, this Kingdom is within them. It is connected with them, and within their reach on condition of repentance. It is also equivalent to the expression in Luke 11:20, “the Kingdom of God is come upon you,” or Matt. 12:28, “come unto you,” i.e. has attained unto you or pertains to you. The word “within” receives its force from the restriction thrown around the Kingdom by the covenant relationship of the nation, and therefore it has or it is, come “upon” them, “among” them, “within” them, as it could not at that time come to any other nation or people. This is evidenced from the fact that this very Kingdom thus come within the nation is taken from it and given to another engrafted people. If it did not in a high and peculiar sense belong to the nation, it could not be taken from it. Hence the “within you” addressed to these unbelieving Jews is most expressive of their covenanted relationship and the glorious privileges that they as a nation enjoyed. Restricted as it was to that nation, the opportunity was presented of a blessed change, but instead of repentance and faith and a consequent establishment of the Kingdom, a sad history of wickedness intervened.

(5) If the context following is noticed it confirms our interpretation. He now addresses the disciples: “the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it” (v. 22). This, in reply to the question when Kingdom shall come, indicates what we have already proven, the indefinite postponement of the Kingdom; for the line of Christ’s remarks makes the decided impression that the Kingdom will not soon be established, owing to His departure, and that the time of His return and its manifestation is concealed. None of the disciples then living shall see and enjoy it during their lives; and, comparing John 17:11, 12, 13; Matt. 9:15, etc., these days of absence extend down to our own time, and will only end when the day of the Lord Jesus (Phil. 1:6; 1 Cor. 1:5, 8; 2 Cor. 1:14; 1 Thess. 5:2, etc.) shall be revealed. In verse 23 He cautions against deceivers who shall pretend to found this Kingdom, which again intimates that it will not come very soon. In reply to the question when, He, taking the fundamental fact that the Kingdom itself is dependent on His appearing, directs attention to the sudden and unmistakable (v. 24) Coming of the King, of the Son of man “in His day.” And (v. 25) directly shows that the Kingdom cannot soon appear, because of His suffering and rejection by that generation. Then He points out the condition of the world at the period of His Advent, that it will be a season of forgetfulness, unbelief, etc., as in the days of Noah and Lot. And yet at such a period, when men almost generally shall discard the notion of the imminency of His coming and the setting up of His Kingdom, this question of the Pharisees shall be realized, for “even thus will it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.” This is followed up by a parable representing a period of trial as intervening, that although such trials were before them men should pray and not faint, because although God “bear long with them” (expressive of delay) He shall finally deliver them, concluding with the deeply impressive question (alas, so abundantly verified in this day), “Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?” Jews and Gentiles, with here and there an exception, discard all faith in this personal Coming of the Son of man, and the Kingdom covenanted to Him and identified with that Coming. The delay is to them ample evidence that it never will be witnessed. Now in the direct answer to the Pharisees, and the added remarks to the disciples, together with the corroborating state of the Church and world, we have reiterated, what has already been proven, that the Kingdom was nigh to the Jewish nation, that, owing to their sinfulness, it was not established but is postponed to an indefinite period in the future, viz., “to the day when the Son of man is revealed” (comp. Props. 56–68).

Obs. 3. Because of the free use made of this passage, a few more remarks on the meaning of “observation” are in place. Coming to this Scripture with a preconceived notion of a Kingdom spiritual and invisible in this dispensation, the multitude engraft on the original word such expressions as “outward show,” “splendor,” “pomp,” “outward display,” “external display of majesty,” etc., which do not legitimately belong to the word translated “observation,” but are given to it, to suit a theory, on the ground that such things are observed! As Judge Jones (Philo-Basilicus, Essays) has at length shown, nowhere else is it even attempted to render such a meaning.* Commentators who employ this secondary sense (as e.g. Bloomfield, Olshausen, etc.) frankly admit that this secondary sense only becomes a conjectural one, because they cannot find another example to verify it. Surely this in itself should be already sufficient reason for the student to regard the secondary sense with suspicion, but we have two additional ones to add. (1) This secondary sense is not true even of the Church. The Church comes with observation, as e.g. on the day of Pentecost. It was established with “outward show” and is perpetuated with the same, having a preached Word, ministers, officers, external ordinances, etc., and the saints are to be a light, a witness of the truth to the world. The faithful body of believers is to manifest itself as a testimony to all, and, of course, this cannot be done unless they can be observed, etc. (2) This secondary sense is not correct concerning the Kingdom of Christ. Let the reader notice what the Covenant demands, what the prophets predict, respecting this Kingdom. Is it not to come with such “outward show,” such “splendor” and “external majesty,” that it shall arrest the attention of, and be witnessed by, all living? Is it not to occupy the place of other kingdoms and to be exalted to the sovereignty of the world? Multitudes of passages teach this; and the least consideration of the predicted glory of the Kingdom, its universality, the restoration of the Jews connected with it, the worship of nations, etc., will at once show that, when it arrives, it will be the great and absorbing object of “observation.” Indeed so evident is this, that we find admissions on all sides conceding it, even although opposed to a previous interpretation of the first part of the passage Thus, e.g. Schmidt (Bib. Theol. of the N. T., p. 246), after spiritualizing this Kingdom, admits that “the Lord also depicts in v. 24 this same Kingdom as appearing visibly.” Olshausen (Com. loci) advocating the

spirituality of the Kingdom in the reply to the Pharisees also claims that in the same chapter it is alluded to as external, external in its perfection. Having already pointed out the inconsistency of this development theory of a claimed higher (spiritual) position to a lower one, it is only necessary to add that all such admissions prove the correctness of our interpretation of the chapter, and the incoherency of their own theory.*

Obs. 4. The meaning that so many deduce from the expression “within you,” is not only opposed by ourselves but finds opponents among many who have no sympathy with our doctrine, and who are in doctrinal position with the Church-Kingdom party. Advocating a spiritual Kingdom, yet they cannot find it a consistent measure to take the phrase “within you” as indicative of God’s reign in the heart,” etc., for, as they tell us, this would prove too much of the unbelieving party addressed. Hence Neander takes the position (see Obs. 1, above) that it ought to be rendered “among you.” Olshausen informs us that Paulus, Fleck, Borneman, De Wette explain it, “among you.” The marg. reading also gives “among you.” Bloomfield (loci) gives “among you.” Barnes (Com. loci) gives both “within” and “among you.” On the other hand Dr. Campbell, Dr. Jones, and many others insist on retaining “within you.” So far as the sense of the passage is concerned, either one or the other would suffice, although our preference is for the latter. Again, in the efforts to avoid the prevailing application of the “within you,” some, as Dr. Neander, assert that “the Kingdom of God was manifested in his own appearance,” and, as Prof. Whiting explains it, “the King is among you.” So also Dr. Thomas and the Christadelphians generally. Whatever truth (Prop. 56) there may be in King and Kingdom being convertible, yet the peculiarity of the expression embracing a word that legitimately means “within,” and the use of the previous word “observation” forbids the application of this to the person of Jesus Christ, for then He would be “within” those unbelievers and He could not be observed. Besides this, such an explanation is forced, being derived from the third one given by Cornelius à Lapide,* and which was based on the Divine Sovereignty of God; while the Kingship of Christ, in view of the foreseen rejection, is held in abeyance, being founded on His covenanted humanity and His relationship to God, after the performance of an allotted mission (Props. 81–90). The explanation given under Obs. 2 is in correspondence with and unites the statements of the Old and New Testaments, and accurately accords with the then existing status of the Jewish nation.

Obs. 5. This Kingdom “within you” could not be the Christian Church, for that was afterward instituted and it was not anything that the Pharisees were in personal actual enjoyment of, and to apply it either to the person of Christ or to a spiritual reign is to bring it into conflict with covenanted expectations and the preaching of John the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples (Props. 19–23 and 38–49).*

Obs. 6. While the approach of the Kingdom itself is not discoverable by any observation, being dependent on the secret knowledge of God Himself as to the time and to the completion of the number of the elect, yet this does not forbid a certain approximative knowledge concerning the period of its approach. While not in itself giving forth any visible signs of its Coming, yet the Divine Spirit has given us other signs, other events as a kind of guide by which we may know, more or less, the nearness of its Coming. Jesus Himself enumerates a lengthy series of events, and emphatically adds, Luke 21:31; “So likewise, ye when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand.” Having already used this passage in sustaining the postponement of the Kingdom, it is only necessary to say that neither the Church, visible or invisible, nor “God’s reign in the heart,” could be denoted, since “these things” specified are running their course down to the present day. Still attention is directed to “these things” to urge us to watchfulness and anticipation of the Coming of the Kingdom undiscoverable by any outward, visible signs. Even the believing, owing to this lack of external observation of the Kingdom, are represented as in danger of having its approach coming upon them most unexpectedly, while the world, rejecting those merciful and gracious predictions, is buried in slumber and caught in “a snare,” or “net.” But few, wholly dependent on faith and not on the Kingdom itself presenting preliminary external signs for observation, will accept of the prophecies pertaining to this matter and be looking for, watching for, and awaiting with hope the Kingdom. These signs, not of the Kingdom itself but of things existing when it is to come, will be enumerated under another Proposition (comp. Props. 173 and 174).*

PROPOSITION 111. The Kingdom being identified with the elect Jewish nation, it cannot be established without the restoration of that nation.

This has been proven in preceding Propositions, but as the proof is abundant and cumulative, additional ones may be assigned. For, if the Kingdom is the Theocratic-Davidic, then embracing the throne, Kingdom, and land of David, it must also include the nation to whom it was alone specially covenanted; that is, the Jewish people, one branch of Abraham’s natural seed, viz., in the line of the Patriarchs and their descendants. Hence, the restoration of this nation naturally falls in with the Divine Purpose—is fully identified with it.*

Obs. 1. The only objection of force that can be urged against our view is, that these promises of restoration are conditional, but this has been met under Props. 18 and 46–52. If we can make the Covenant—confirmed by God’s oath, and its ultimate fulfilment again

and again affirmed by holy men—conditional, then everything else is conditional; then the foundations of Christian hope crumble away beneath us, and nothing stable remains. It is a fact of weight in this discussion to note, that a vast number of writers, opposed to our doctrine, and inclined to spiritualize the predictions as much as possible, are still forced by the singularly effective language of the prophets to admit a restoration of the Jews to their own land. The powerfully converging testimony is too strong even for them to refuse credence to it; and they give us, urging with just and conclusive reasons, the scriptural ground for such a faith, although it badly fits into their system, owing to its being, more or less, in antagonism to their theory of exclusive spiritual blessings, of the abandonment of the wall of partition between nations, and of the remaining portions attached to the same predictions. Even such a writer as Whitby acknowledges, owing to the force of Luke 21:24; Jer. 31:27–40, etc., such a restoration and the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Indeed, some even see that its unconditionality is asserted in various places; that they are restored not on account of their own holiness but to preserve the faithfulness of God; and that Israel being carefully distinguished from the Gentiles (as e.g. Isa. 49, Marg. reading, etc.) must, in order to preserve the Divine arrangement, also be gathered. The application of passages relating to the earthly Jerusalem by Waggoner (Ref. of Age to Come) to the New Jerusalem, because the Old is cast out and the Son of the Free Woman is the heir, misapprehends the Barren Woman (see Prop. 118), does not distinguish between the heir and the subject, unites things which God has separated, violates the promises of God to His own ancient city and people, and, in brief, ignores the inheritance of Christ, as David's Son.

Obs. 2. This too is shown by the election of this Jewish nation (see Props. 24, 54, 55, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, etc., on Election). No nation on earth, saving the Jewish, has God chosen, over whom He condescends to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler. No nation save it alone has been thus favored with a Theocratic rule. Owing to the sinfulness of the nation this Kingdom was indeed overthrown, and the nation itself, as a nation, driven from its land and placed in a scattered and subject condition among the nations of the earth. It has abundantly been shown that they are still the elect nation, not perpetually cut off. Indeed, if this election were to entirely cease, or if it were diverted to any other nation or nations, then it would be impossible to verify the Covenant promises made directly to it. This subject having been elucidated, it is only necessary to add: the election of the nation, evidenced even now by the necessity Gentiles are under to be grafted into it, continues on by virtue of its covenanted relationship to the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, and if such election is manifested in the establishment of the Kingdom, it involves, fully embraces, its restoration to Palestine.*

Obs. 3. It is important to keep in view, in the consideration of this subject, that the Jews, living at the time of the First Advent and afterward, believed that the prophets linked a complete restoration of the nation with the Kingdom of the Messiah. This is admitted by all; but if the admission is made, then the question arises, unless the doctrine is true, how comes it that the New Test. employs (as e.g. Rom. 11) language to confirm the Jews in their opinions? Ernesti's one-sided criticism making Rom. 11 to mean a mere possibility of being saved or restored without its being accomplished, is contradicted by the positive language of Paul, his eulogy of the nation, his confident expressions, and the accordance of the same with generally entertained expectations. The application of New Test. passages solely to a conversion of the Jews, and not to a future restoration, is met not only by the same, but also by the directness of passages which teach that the dispersion, desolation, and the treading down of Jerusalem shall continue for an appointed time (and then cease), as well as by the references to this election and covenanted relationship, and by the connection in which such a conversion stands to a restoration to the land.*

Obs. 4. The Jews, influenced by the plain language of Covenant and prophecy, universally held that the Messianic Kingdom was to be accompanied by a complete restoration of the nation; both ideas were inseparably united, the one being regarded an impossibility without the other. So wedded were they to this view, that they objected to Jesus being the Messiah because it was not realized at the First Advent (the early Christians answered by locating the fulfilment at the Second Advent of this Jesus). Now observe, that with this prevailing Jewish doctrine, so dear to the Jewish heart, before them, Jesus and the Apostles use the very language pre-eminently calculated to cherish and confirm the Jews in their opinion of restoration, and the proof that it was thus adapted and intended is found in the simple historical fact, that both believing Jews and Gentiles in the early Church held to, and taught, the doctrine. A glance at various passages—keeping in mind the existing belief of the hearers—is amply sufficient to show this distinctly. Thus e.g. “the regeneration,” Matt. 19:28, the removal of the desolation from “the house” Matt. 23:37–39, the Messianic reign over the house of Jacob on the throne of David, Luke 1:32, 33, the deliverance from enemies, Luke 1:74, the removal of Jerusalem's down-trodden condition when the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, Luke 21:24, the times of refreshing and restitution, Acts 3:19–21, the rebuilding again of the fallen-down Davidic tabernacle, Acts 15:16, the Jewish hope to be realized, Acts 26:6, 7, etc.—all is adapted to strengthen the hope of ultimate restoration, just as Covenant and prophecy promise. Hence we need not be surprised at the Apostolic and Primitve Church cleaving to such a future restoration at the Sec. Advent of the Messiah.*

Obs. 5. As in the following Props, our proof, given in detail, shall be mainly drawn from the Old Test., it may be well to state why the New Test. does not enter into the subject of the restoration so extendedly as the Old. For, although pointedly mentioned and often implied, yet such magnificent portraiture of it as the Old Test. contains, are lacking. (1) It is taken for granted that the instruction of the New will be combined with the Old (both being one, etc., comp. Prop. 16), where a sufficiency is given to every one who will “search the Scriptures.” (2) The union of the doctrine of the restoration with the events of the Second Advent make it easy for any

believer to join the declarations of the Old with those of the New Test. (3) In the condition of the early Church and of the Jewish nation at, and after, the First Advent, a more detailed statement would unnecessarily (in view of the lengthy postponement) have prejudiced the Roman Power (already embittered) against the nation and Church.*

Obs. 6. In view of the elect position of the nation (Prop. 24) and its consequent Theocratic position, the restoration is so essential, such a prerequisite, that two remarkable forms of expression are employed to indicate it. (1) God restores the nation for His own sake, to vindicate His covenant-keeping mercy, and thus magnify His own name. For example, Ezek. 36:22 declares, in connection with a restoration which has never yet been realized, "Thus saith the Lord God: I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for mine holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went," and v. 32, "Not for your sakes do I this, saith the Lord God, be it known unto you: be ashamed and confounded for your own ways, O house of Israel." The condition in which both Judah and Israel are at the time of the restoration, viz., that of unbelief, shows that God evidences mercy because the time has eventually arrived for the re-establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom, and hence to exalt His own truthfulness, "because" the nation has been overthrown and its uplifting is a necessity, "because" the heathen ridicule the Covenant and its promises, God will perform this work, and, by an astonishing process, bring this rebellious nation to heart-felt obedience and most fervent allegiance. (2) He will do it for the Father's sake, in behalf of that portion who have been believing and God-fearing. Paul appeals to this, Rom. 11:28, "beloved for the fathers' sakes," to whom the Covenant was given. Now turn to Lev. 26:42-45, which Paul evidently had in view, and it is asserted, that although the nation be dispersed, God "will remember" His "Covenant" and "the land," and it is affirmed that in their dispersion He will not "utterly cast them away, or abhor, or destroy" and thus (by an utter destruction) "break His covenant with them, for I am the Lord, their God. But I will for their sakes remember the Covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God: I am the Lord." The restoration, therefore, is impregnably fixed, upon God's honor as a covenant-keeping God, and upon His promises given to the Fathers, which will be realized.*

PROPOSITION 112. The Kingdom, if established as predicted, demands the national restoration of the Jews in their own land.

This we have all along proven, viz., that such a connection is positively required by Covenant and election, promise and prophecy. Now it remains to prove in a more specific form a national re-establishment of the nation, which, of course, confirms our doctrinal position. Besides, the reign and Kingdom, as will be seen, is invariably associated with such a restoration (comp. preceding Prop.).*

Obs. 1. Before continuing our proof, several preliminaries must be considered which materially add to the force of the prophecies. (a) The perpetuity of the Jewish nation, owing to their election, is asserted, and with it their separation from all other nations. This is distinctly stated in Numb. 23:9, and from this arises the declarations of God not to make a full end of them as He may do with other nations, Lev. 26:44; Jer. 30:11; Jer. 46:28, etc.; Deut. 32:26, 27; Amos 9:8; Ezek. 11:16. As explained in previous Props. this nation is chosen, out of all others, to be the peculiar instrumentality by which the Divine Purpose in Redemption and Government is to be carried out, and hence of them it is said, 1 Chron. 17:21, 22; Psl. 136:4; Jer. 31:35-37, etc. This, of course, is an indispensable feature in our argument which must by no means be overlooked. (b) This perpetuity of the nation thus promised, together with the reasons which impose it, and with the added predictions derived from it, involves the final restoration of the nation to its old state of special favor and nearness to God. Several writers, as McNeile, Noel, Bh. Newton, Kurtz, etc., employ this promised perpetuity as a powerful reason favoring the restoration. (c) This nation, owing to unfaithfulness, is driven from its land and scattered among the nations. History has made this so familiar, that a mere mention of it will suffice. (d) But such removal, as Moses and the prophets taught, being designed for correction and punishment is not perpetual. It is for a limited, appointed time, the Knowledge of which God has reserved to Himself. That this period of tribulation, long as it may be, is a limited one, all the prophets testify and Christ Himself pointedly specifies. To deny this, is simply to reject some of the plainest statements in the Word of God and the entire current of prediction. The Scripture bearing on this point has already been partly given, and hence needs no repetition. (e) The Jews, therefore, owing to their nationally promised perpetuity and future position as a nation in the yet unfulfilled Purposes of God, are preserved down to the present day as a people, separate and distinct from all others, who, if such were the Divine Will, can at any moment be reorganized into a distinctive nationality among the nations. The preservation of the people is distinctly predicted, not in the possession of king, government, etc., characteristic of a nation properly organized but, in a dispersed and utterly disorganized condition, retaining national peculiarities, such as rites, practices, customs, doctrines, etc. The astonishing verification of these predictions in the history of the Jews has been noticed by numerous able writers, and has been aptly styled "a standing miracle"; and from it also has been derived an argument favoring the literal restoration. Many writers of history, science, etc., have noticed, that while some individuals have been absorbed by other nations yet the vast body of them, in the midst of the nations, have preserved their Jewish individuality and national peculiarities, remaining a separate, and for ages an isolated, people.³ The confident prediction of Celsus that the Jews as a race would become extinct is not verified. Dispersed among powerful nations, they continue to exist, while these nations disappear. Denied the privilege of living under their own magistrates, etc., debarred for

centuries from all civil rights; suffering frequently the most terrible persecutions that ever afflicted a people; driven from country to country and made a "hissing," "by-word," etc., among nations not wise, but cruel; in brief, enduring, as history shows, what no other nation on earth has ever passed through, yet they still remain a peculiar, distinctive people, ready at almost any time, if the way were prepared, for a national reorganization. Their powerful enemies have perished or decayed, and they remain numerous and a significant power in the earth. But all this is necessary, preparatory to another phase in their remarkable history. If God intends to fulfil His promises concerning their national restoration, it certainly is essential to preserve them, while the preservation itself thus becomes—being predicted and fulfilled—evidence that the Divine Purpose in reference to them is in regular course of fulfilment, and leads on to the ultimate end intended. God has been, even when scattered, "a little sanctuary" (Ezek. 11:16) to them, thus saving them from extinction that His own Word may stand. (f) The plaintive representation of Isa. 63:18, "The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while," contrasted with the promises and with the protracted tribulation, has pertinence. The comparative brief possession of the Holy Land when compared with the prophetic intimations, clearly evinces that something great and lasting in this direction must be held in abeyance for this same nation. (g) Certain promises of restoration are made to the Jewish nation, not to Gentile nations or even to Gentiles adopted into the nation (although the latter are included in the way hereafter shown, viz., as inheritors, etc.), but to the one distinctive Jewish nation. The Church is not composed of "the outcasts of Israel," of those cut off under the anger of God, possessing the sad traits and experiencing the forsaken condition attributed to this nation. The Church has not the throne and Kingdom of David in ruins, the city of God desolate and in the hands of enemies, etc., and hence the Church cannot be denoted. The same nation which experienced this heavy tribulation is also to realize the blessings of restoration. There is nothing so sad and absurd in the interpretation of the Bible as that, alas! so prevalent with many, to give all the threatenings, curses, and afflictions to the Jews, and appropriate the promises and blessings to the Gentiles or to the Church. It is not only wrong but dishonoring to the Word, and opens a wide field of arbitrary exposition. The threatenings and reverses have been literally fulfilled, even to the minutest particular, so also must the predicted blessings, standing as they do in the same connection with this scattered, etc., people. History indorses a literal interpretation of these prophecies, and its testimony thus far forbids the seeking and applying a hidden, mystical, or spiritual meaning to the remainder. God Himself appeals to the justness of such a conclusion, Jer. 32:42, 44, "For thus saith the Lord: Like as I have brought this great evil upon this people, so I will bring upon them all the good that I have promised them." "For, I will cause their captivity to return, saith the Lord." Let the reader compare as unanswerable, Jer. 31:27, 28. (h) The dispersion and the restoration, the tribulation and the blessings cannot be contemporaneous. In the predictions, the latter invariably follows the former. To reverse this Divine Order is to violate all propriety of language; and yet this is done by multitudes of even learned and able divines, under the mistaken notion that the Jewish nation having forfeited the blessings, they are now bestowed upon the Gentiles. And what confirms them in the opinion is, that some Scriptures are quoted by the Apostles merely to prove that Gentiles are also called, shall also participate in the blessings, etc. (just as the Jews also at that day believed), and the conclusion is formed that this denotes that the Gentiles take the place assigned at one time to the Jews. But before such deductions, so destructive to the unity and symmetry of prophecy, are drawn, would it not be best to ask and decide, whether the nation, as such, has forever forfeited these blessings; and whether there is not a specific period appointed during which the nation is to experience the just anger of God; and whether the mention of the present era as "the times of the Gentiles" is not sufficiently suggestive of their ending, etc.; Important considerations, which we have passed over, are brought in view which forbid this wholesale appropriation of promises given only to the Jewish nation. The fact that the threatenings prophesied run down to the present day and continue on in the future (for they are not quite all fulfilled, as e.g. Zech. 14:1), is positive evidence, if we will only receive it, that the blessings are still future. Those blessings cannot be applied to the Church; for it is highly improper and a dissevering of prophecy, to say that the evils predicted of the nation and the blessings prophesied of the same nation can coexist. (i) The promise that this nation shall be restored to their own land cannot be understood of the Church. It is fashionable to make the land of Canaan a type of the Church or of heaven. Aside from the reasons already urged against such a perversion of the prophecies, it would appear sufficient to consider, that it is the same land out of which the nation has been driven; a land lying desolate for many generations until the restoration; a land that shall be tilled and sown, its ruined cities rebuilt and inhabited, man and beast multiplied upon it; a land specially covenanted to the Fathers who lived in it at one time, and which shall be settled again after "the old estates" and as at "the first;" a land for a long time in the possession of their enemies; a land formerly occupied by the Kingdom of David; a land whose geographical boundaries are fixed; in brief, a land which, by a great variety of allusions and specifications, can only be Palestine. To convert this land into something else is not only most arbitrary; impossible to reconcile with language, unity of prediction, etc., but it is a virtual impeachment of the veracity of the Word, and an expressed doubt of God's intention to fulfil His Word as written. If no reliability is found here in the plainest of all predictions; if to obtain the true meaning an astonishing and most awkward transposition of a spiritual nature must take place; then truly the Bible may denote almost anything that fancy can attribute to it. (j) In the investigation of this subject, other things are worthy of notice, which can only be briefly alluded to, such as (1) that certain prophecies have never, in any sense, been fulfilled, as Ezek. chs. 36, 39, etc.; Isa. 11:11, 12, etc.; (2) that the promises of Deut. and Lev. cannot be explained in any other way than referring to the Jewish nation; (3) that the prophecies referring to restoration distinguish between Judah and Israel; (4) that the division into "two kingdoms," formerly existing, is stated and the union into "one nation" in the same land predicted; (5) Jerusalem and the Jewish nation are in the restoration distinguished from the Gentiles; (6) the action, position, etc., assigned to the Jewish nation at and after the restoration; (7) the prosperity and the results of the restoration point to the future; (8) the astounding reception and acknowledgment of the crucified Saviour by the nation, which

can only be predicted of the personal interview described by the prophets; (9) the refining process, terrible but glorious.

Obs. 2. It is requisite here to meet another objection urged against our view, on the ground that the predictions of restoration were met by the return from Babylon. Having noticed this before, some repetition is necessary to bring it before the reader in this connection. Leaving the reasons first announced in this and preceding Propositions which bear against such a theory it is sufficient to add, that the promises of restoration were never realized in the return from Babylon; not in the King that was to reign over them, not in the magnitude of the return, not in the dwelling safely, removal of sorrow, imparting of prosperity, etc., not in the union of the two Kingdoms, or in the protection from enemies and perpetuity of the Kingdom, or in a manifestation of the Branch, or in repentance of the nation occurring as described, or in an engrafting of Gentiles, or in a gathering of nations against Jerusalem and a sudden deliverance, or in a fearful overthrow of nations and corresponding exaltation of the nation, or in a removal from nations so far off that they then did not know them (Zech. 7:14), etc. Such reasons can be multiplied by looking over the prophecies; and this notion is even more groundless and objectionable than that which makes the predictions conditional, seeing that they belittle the Word, making the Spirit give an exaggerated (after Oriental style) bombastic description of a restoration which, as history attests, falls far short of the description. No! The Divine Spirit deals in sober, actual, blessed truth and, as fulfilment down to the present day abundantly testifies, never deals in Oriental eulogies with their engrafted exaggerations. It is amazing that believers in Holy Writ can overlook the fact that not only prophets before, but prophets at and after, the return from Babylon predict the same glorious restoration. Let any one e.g. compare Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi, with previous prophets and a restoration very different from the one experienced is seen to be foretold. The one from Babylon was designed and carried out to provide the necessary preliminary conditions for the First Advent; the one in the future is identified with the Second Advent. To bring up the rule of the Maccabees as a fulfilment against our view, is to overlook the requirements of prophecy, which demand that not Asmoneans or Levites but those of the lineage of David are to bear rule; that not tributary princes should govern, but One independent of, and superior to, all others should have dominion. It is sad to reflect on the lack of faith existing in God's promises, and how, to accommodate such want of faith, human reason seeks after an apologetic fulfilment which diminishes the lustre of the Divine Record, bringing its prophetic portion down to the level of the uninspired productions of man. Well may it be asked, if the return from Babylon with its small colony, under Persian rule, struggling painfully on, etc., is all that is meant by those glowing portrayals of restoration, dominion, and exaltation, where, in the light of historical fact, is the boasted foreknowledge of the Spirit which these prophets professed to be guided by, and what becomes then of the credibility of their utterances in other respects? Such manipulation of Scripture is not only unwarranted but dangerous, leading as it does (as infidels have shown in seizing this Maccabean theory) to a direct impeachment of the truthfulness of the Divine Word.

Obs. 3. Unless the student keeps before him the actual condition of the Jewish nation at the time of this great deliverance and restoration, it is impossible for him to preserve the unity of the Divine statements on the subject, or to locate the period of the restoration at the time assigned to it by the Spirit. That condition has been briefly noticed, and shows us that when the restoration, and the Theocratic Kingdom united with it, is to be witnessed, it will find the Jews and Jerusalem in a fearful extremity. It was, as commentaries, etc., inform us, an opinion current among the Jews, derived from prophecy, that only in a time of sore trial would the Messiah come to deliver and establish His Kingdom. This opinion is correct, and is fully indorsed by Christ Himself, who in Matt. 24, etc., identifies His Coming, the deliverance, etc., with the direful situation of an oppressed nation and down-trodden city. The tribulation described by Jesus is by no means confined to that inflicted by the Romans, it continues down, as expressly stated, through Gentile nations, until these "times of the Gentiles" are fulfilled. That they are not yet fulfilled, the condition of the city and nation painfully indicate. What the future has in store for the same, is also described by the sacred writers. Planting ourselves on the past literal fulfilment, unswerving faith accepts of what is recorded still relating to the future of city and nation, as that which shall become historical verity. Occupying this stand-point, there is no difficulty in ascertaining the exact position in which these will be placed when God will arise to be again merciful to His ancient people, and restore the Theocratic-Davidic rule. If the reader will turn to Zech. 12:1-14, he has (1) the multitude gathered against Jerusalem besieging it; (2) the Lord interfering in behalf of the people; (3) Jerusalem becomes "a cup of trembling," "a burdensome stone" to the nations; (4) the complete overthrow of all enemies; (5) the subsequent exaltation of "the house of David," etc. In Zech. 14 we have, taking the preceding context, (1) the smiting of the Shepherd, (2) the scattering of the sheep, (3) a period of tribulation, (4) the gathering of nations against Jerusalem, (4) the Lord interfering, "his feet standing upon the mount of Olives," (5) the saints coming with Him, (6) the destruction of the enemies, (7) the reign of Christ, (8) Jerusalem safely inhabited, exalted, etc. Dan. 12 has, (1) a time of trouble, resulting from a gathering of nations against Jerusalem, (2) special Divine interposition in behalf of the nation, (3) a gracious deliverance vouchsafed. Joel 3 has (1) the same gathering of nations, (2) deliverance by the Lord and His "mighty ones," (3) the complete removal of all enemies, (4) the Lord dwelling in the holy mountain, (5) the safety, happiness, etc., of Jerusalem. Without discussing the order of events, or how they are to be brought about, the simple fact of the Jews being in a state of extremity at this stage, just immediately before their national deliverance, is proven by these passages. It is impossible to apply them to the extremity under the Romans, for the events represented to follow, did not then take place; there was no deliverance and triumph of the nation, no Divine interposition and destruction of enemies, no Millennial glory, etc. The same all-wise Spirit, as if to direct attention to the matter, repeats this testimony again and again. The leading predictions are those found in Ezek. chs. 38, 39, where (1) a confederation of nations is formed

against Jerusalem, (2) the Lord will directly interfere for the land of Israel and His people, (3) a terrible overthrow of those nations, (4) the cessation of captivity and gathering of the Jews "out of their enemies' lands" "unto their own land," etc. References to this period are scattered here and there through the Word, which only become distinctive when viewed by the medium of the more enlarged, detailed prophecies. Thus, e.g. Jer. 30:4–11, where the same order comes in, (1) a time of dire trouble, (2) deliverance, (3) the nation "shall return from the land of their captivity," (4) and in that time "they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king." Comp. Zeph. 3:8–20, Psl. 124 (which would be even more expressive if it be allowable to take the rendering of some in the last verse: "Our help is in the name of the Word of the Lord" (Dr. Clarke Com. loci), taking that Word to be the one described by John), Isa. 51:17–23; Isa. 11:4; Isa. 1:27, 28, etc. The introduction of a number of Millennial descriptions accords with what we have stated, viz., the straitened condition of the people, the triumph of God's enemies cut short by His righteous judgments, etc. Hence, the conclusion must be formed that the nation has not yet experienced its full tribulation, and that until all is fulfilled respecting them the restoration bestowed directly by God (not by a nation, as may, and in all probability will, partially be done), cannot possibly be effected. It will also be noticed, how this still future extremity of the Jews helps us to estimate the theories of fulfilment at return from Babylon, in the Church, etc.

Obs. 4. Finally we come to additional prophecies which, taken in their entire scope, leave no doubt of the national restoration of the Jews and of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom. Isa. 11:10–16 is conceded by many commentators, as even by Scott, Nägelsbach, etc., to teach a literal restoration. The "second time," v. 11, cannot refer either to deliverance from Egypt or from Babylon because in neither case were the Jews recovered from the lands here enumerated; and it cannot refer merely to a conversion (as some hold) of the people because it is linked with "a cutting off of the adversaries of Judah" (Obs. 9), with "a gathering of the outcasts of Israel and the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth," with a removal of the enmity between the two kingdoms, etc. It must relate to the future, and the miraculous events "like it was to Israel in the day that he came out of the land of Egypt," the special Divine interposition, the "spoil" that shall then accrue to them (comp. Zech. 14, etc.), the power that shall be given, its connection with Millennial era (context preceding and following) fully identify it with the period of time and manner of introduction held by us. But even this prediction must be regarded in the light of plainer ones. Thus in Ezek. 36:8–38 there is a profusion of circumstances irreconcilable with any other view than the one adopted. In the enumeration of them there are (1) the gathering out of all countries and the bringing again into their own land; (2) they shall dwell in the land given to their fathers; (3) they shall be also converted; (4) the desolate land is to be tilled and sown; (5) man and beast are to be multiplied on it; (6) the cities shall again be inherited and the wastes builded; (7) they shall be settled after their "old estates"; (8) God "will do better unto you than at your beginnings"; (9) the land shall be for an inheritance; (10) the land shall no more be bereaved; (11) it shall not be burdened with the shame of the heathen; (12) the identical land defiled by Israel's sins is the one thus again obtained; (13) the removal from the land caused by sin; (14) the return to it caused by God's mercy and faithfulness; (15) the fruit of the tree and the increase of the field so sure as to prevent famine; (17) the land once desolate to become like the Garden of Eden; (18) the heathen that are left shall acknowledge the Lord's power when this is done; (19) the house of Israel shall be increased with flocks of men and the waste cities with the same. So circumstantial and minute are details given that no unprejudiced mind can resist their force.* But in the very next chapter (37th) the prophet reiterates and adds to them. After describing the resurrection which (as shown Prop. 126) is also related to this period, he tells us (1) that the children of Israel shall be gathered from among the heathen and be brought into their own land; (2) that they shall be "one nation" and not "two kingdoms" as of old; (3) that they shall have "one king," even "David my servant"; (4) that they shall no more be "defiled" being "cleansed"; (5) that "they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt"; (6) that they and their descendants "shall dwell in it forever" (for the ages, so some); (7) that during these ages, or forever, David shall be their Prince; (8) that they shall have peace and be multiplied; (9) that God's sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forever; (10) that their situation shall be as in Rev. 21:3; (11) that the Gentiles shall acknowledge the great power of God when this is accomplished. Comp. Jer. 32:37–44 (notice contrast with which comp. Jer. 31:28); Jer. 33 (noticing "the building as at first," the cities and even "streets of Jerusalem" filled with rejoicing, the reigning of the Branch a descendant of David's, the Covenant shall not be broken, etc.); Jer. 3:14–18 (observing that then Jerusalem shall be called "the throne of the Lord," that nations shall be gathered unto it, and that they come "to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers"); Ezek. 11:16–20 ("cast far off" shall still be brought into "the land of Israel," etc.); Jer. 23:5–8 (so complete is this restoration under the supervision of David's seed that it is compared with that from Egypt, etc.); Ezek. 34:11–31 (sheep delivered "in a dark and cloudy day," and the "servant David" shall be "the Prince," delivering them from "the yoke" so that they shall no longer be "a prey"); Zeph. 3:8–20; Zech. 8; Jer. 31; Micah, chs. 4, 5, and 7; Hos. 2:14, etc; Isa. 43 and 52, etc. Bp. Newton well remarked, "innumerable are the prophecies concerning the conversion and restoration of this people"; for we find them on all sides, imbedded in nearly all prophetic utterances; and, as the reader must observe, if the Covenant and its fulfilment, if the promises of God respecting Kingdom and perfected salvation are so directly and fundamentally identified with this people, then it is reasonable to anticipate that much should be said of it. If the reason be asked why, although not ignored but expressly mentioned and implied, comparatively so little is stated on the subject in the New Test. the answer is given by Jesus and the Apostles themselves, viz., that the prophets are to be fulfilled, and that it is taken for granted that we possess, read, study and believe in them. The Old Test. is not superseded by the New (Prop. 16), and we are urged to observe the intimate and enduring connection existing between them. Both form the Word of God, and therefore it is our duty on a subject like this to consult both, and ascertain what God has been pleased to reveal. If we take the particulars thus given; notice of

whom they are predicted; how they are related to each other; that they never have been fulfilled; that they cannot without violence be applied to any other people; how the most sacred of all pledges support them, etc., the only consistent conclusion that we can arrive at is that contained in the Proposition. If some will be like those spoken of in Ezek. 11:15, saying that the land shall not be given to this people in possession but pertains to others, the reply coming from God Himself immediately follows, for He will sanctify Himself (Ezek. 20:41–44) before the Gentiles, and manifest (Zech. 8:6) that the work is not difficult of accomplishment. Hence the Spirit of the New Test. as we show in various places, accords in upholding “the hope of Israel.”

Obs. 5. There is only one objection that at first thought appears plausible urged against this restoration, which we feel unable to answer as it probably deserves. It is this: “the whole house of Israel,” both “Judah and Israel” are to be restored, but if so, where are the ten tribes? Thus far the question asked is legitimate, but when it is added: “if their present situation cannot be certainly and satisfactorily established it is impossible to accept of a restoration,” then the objector goes beyond his commission. (1) Where are the ten tribes? Entire volumes have been written on this interesting point, one writer finding traces of them in the American Indians; another in various nations in Central Asia; one in Abyssinia and on the coast of Africa; another in South America, etc. Eminent linguists (as Jones, etc.), travellers (Wolf, etc.), and others, have found in some tribes and nations peculiarities of language, custom, rites, etc., resembling those of the Jews. But amid the diversity of view who can positively give us the proper information? No one, with any degree of assurance, although in some instances we may grant a high degree of probability. This may, however, be taken as an indication that their existence, owing to such existing peculiarities cannot on the other hand be positively denied. This would be both illogical and unscholarly. (2) Is it, however, necessary to know, or, according to the Word, can we ever know their location, etc.? This is doubtful, for it is proper to consider in such an investigation several particulars more or less, overlooked. 1. This restoration is not appointed for man to perform, or for the nation itself to undertake; it is constantly and invariably designated as God’s designed work, specially delegated to His Son Jesus Christ. Hence, if God knows where they are, that is all-sufficient. If, on the other hand, the work were ours, then we ought to know. 2. In view of this being God’s work He has specifically declared that His watchful eye is constantly fixed upon them, and that, however commingled among the nations and as individuals concealed in the mass of humanity, He takes cognizance of every one of them. Thus e.g. Amos 9:9; Ezek. 12:15; Jer. 46:28; Deut. 28:62, etc., in connection with the ascriptions of perfect knowledge, a knowledge and power that extendeth to all things, it is unworthy of faith and of reason to stumble over our lack of knowledge in the face of so many plain predictions. The resurrection, and other doctrines might on the same plea be discarded. It is sufficient to stay ourselves upon God, Isa. 64:4. 3. But when we come to scan the prophecies more narrowly it will be found that this very undecided information is predicted and forms an additional proof both of the inspiration of the prophets and of the necessity of faith in this return. For the ten tribes being more idolatrous than Judah and having first dishonored the Theocratic ordering, meet with special abhorrence, and, as the Word teaches, suffer proportionately. They are “the outcasts of Israel,” distinguished from “the dispersed of Judah,” Isa. 11:12, cut off long before Judah, and not restored at the return from Babylon;* and as Brookes (El. Proph. Inter., p. 198) has shown, their return is a matter of surprise, the question being asked: “then where had they been?” Isa. 49:21. Being more idolatrous than Judah they are more given up to it according to the threat of Deut. 4:27, 28; Deut. 28:36, 64; Jer. 16:13, and implied as realized in Ezek. 36:25, etc.; consequently a portion of the nation thus adopting the worship and usages of idolatrous nations, although kept more or less separate in the very forms used by them, would be difficult to distinguish.* And some even think that a hidden, concealed condition is implied in Isa. 16:3, 4, etc. Fully admitting the difficulties attached to this point, yet over and against them is the Word of God; and the believer is at no loss in making his decision when God says: Jer. 31:35–37. What our eyes now behold in the perhaps now unconscious witnesses of God (Isa. 43:10–13; Isa. 44:8, etc.) causes us firmly to hold to the testimony of the future that is yet to be added in the eyes of all nations. In the light of a thousand predictions like Ezek. 39:28; Deut. 30:3, 4; Isa. 43:5, 6, etc., who, that receives the Word as given by the Almighty, can reject such a restoration.*

Obs. 6. Our argument on this point would be incomplete if a brief synopsis of Paul’s reasoning in Romans, alluded to, were not appended, thus more completely binding the Old and New Tests. together in the same doctrinal position. Leaving the filling up of minor details to the reader, the leading ideas of the Apostle are presented by us in the following order: In ch. 9 we have: (1) His sorrow for the Jews; (2) the covenant relationship of the Jews; (3) their election; (4) “the children of promise are counted for the seed”; (5) that Gentiles by faith can also become such a seed; (6) that the nation being in unbelief, still a part, together with engrafted Gentiles shall be saved; (7) to prove this calling of the Gentiles he quotes Hos. 2:23, but to observe the force and propriety of the quotation we turn to Hosea and find it connected with a restoration of the Jews which has never yet been realized; hence it is presented (a) because it clearly indicates that the Gentiles can and will thus be called, and (b) that they being thus also grafted in shall, as taught in many places, participate in the glory, etc., of the restoration. He then produces Hos. 1:10, which applies in the same way, and next Isa. 10:22, 23 (Sep. Ver. Horne 1, p. 302); Isa. 28:22; Isa. 1:9, the immediate contexts of which confirm our statement; for in them we have (a) the Jewish nation cast away on account of their sinfulness; (b) this consumption decreed; (c) but during this period a remnant shall be saved, a seed is to be raised up lest God’s purposes and promises fail; (d) this consumption shall be removed, for the nation after suffering for its sins shall be restored. Therefore, the Apostle only selects the points which show, (1) the foretold rejection of the nation, and (2) the raising up of a seed, even out of Gentiles, during this time, leaving the reader from his own knowledge of the prophets to fill up the remainder which was not needed just then in his train of

thought. (8) Lastly, the great offence, which led to their complete overthrow, as predicted by the prophets, and to the engrafting of Gentiles, is shown to be their stumbling over “the stumbling stone” Jesus Christ. In ch. 10 is stated: (1) the desire of the Apostle that the Jews might be saved by faith in Christ; (2) that both Jews and Gentiles that thus believe shall be saved; (3) that comparatively few of the Jews would receive the truth preached in Christ; (4) that as Moses and Isaiah predicted, others, even Gentiles would be called and be adopted. But as Paul assumes the undoubted fulfilment of these prophecies on the one point, it is just that we believe that the remainder is equally worthy of credit. Let us see then what stands in the context of the passages referred to by Paul. Isa. 51:1 describes (a) the sufferings and death of Christ; (b) that many shall be justified through Him; (c) that Jesus shall obtain a great portion; (d) then follows “the Barren Woman” (see Prop. 118), and a glorious Millennial description, including the restoration of the very nation that rejected this stricken Saviour. Paul appropriately, as his argument here only required, uses it to show, (1) that the Jews nationally would not believe, (2) that others would. Deut. 32:21 has, (a) the Jews on account of sin are rejected by God; (b) during this time of God’s withdrawal, He will provoke them by gathering out another people; (c) while this gathering is in process the Jewish nation shall be scattered and suffering; (d) but lest others should exalt themselves, etc., God will relent toward His covenanted people, punish their enemies, and be merciful to them and to their land. Isa. 65:1 gives us (a) in preceding ch. God’s anger toward, and punishment of, the nation; (b) a people notwithstanding gathered, even, as Paul intimates by quoting, Gentiles; (c) God will not utterly destroy the nation; (d) this followed by a prediction of their final restoration. The unity of order, etc., preserved by the Spirit is something remarkable; and Paul’s quotations instead of reversing, or transposing, or spiritualizing the prophets, establishes their literal understanding. In ch. 11, the first question is suggested by the previous reasoning; for if the Jews are nationally rejected and others gathered in, the inquiry would naturally follow: “Hath God cast away His people,”—mark, “His people,” i.e. a people sustaining peculiar covenant relationship to Him—and Paul proceeds to answer it negatively by two powerful reasons: (1) that a remnant, some Jews like himself, would believe and hence were accounted still “His people”; and (2) that the same nation that stumbled and fell would finally be restored and be acknowledged as “His people.” Let us follow the Apostle and we find, (1) the question as stated; (2) the first reply, that God has reserved some, including himself, who were not cast away; (3) and even this is guarded and distinguished from the national election (see Prop. 24, etc.) by saying that this “is a remnant according to the election of grace,” i.e. this favor is bestowed not on account of their relationship (which for the time God does not regard, having rejected during a determined time the nation as such,) but on the same basis by which Gentiles are received; (4) this election, made such, by faith, will obtain the promises; (5) the rest of the Jews are blinded, and, owing to unbelief, are cut off from the exalted position once occupied, viz., that of being the only people who nationally sustained a present special covenant relationship with God. Here is the order still existing down to the present day, viz., (a) the Jews, as a nation, suffering a rejection; (b) a remnant still saved, like the Gentiles, by faith, to continue the elect people, or the seed of Abraham; (c) the rest remaining in unbelief. 6. He reiterates that this was predicted, and quotes Isa. 29:10 as proof, and when reference is made to the passage, precisely (a) such blindness is prophesied of the nation; (b) that the anger of God shall fall upon them; (c) that at some future time this blindness shall be removed; (d) and that “the house of Jacob” shall no longer be ashamed. Ps. 69:22, 23, is also given, and in the context is found (1) the sufferings and death of Jesus; (2) the blindness of the Jews in this matter; (3) indignation poured upon them; (4) they, however, that seek the Lord shall live; (5) and then follows (v. 35, 36) the restoration of this people, the rebuilding of the cities of Judah, etc. 7. Now he asks of the nation, “Have they stumbled that they should fall,” which is answered, “God forbid.” The reasons for believing that the nation, as such, will ultimately be reinstated in its condition forfeited by unbelief follow. 8. They have fallen for the present that salvation—the promises to Abraham—may also be tendered to Gentiles, thus provoking them to jealousy. This direct allusion again to Deut. clearly indicates that this fall is merely temporary, and that the Apostle so regarded it in appealing to the very Scripture which necessarily, owing to the context in which it stands, implies and teaches it. 9. (a) “Now if the fall of them (b) be the riches of the world, and (a) the diminishing of them, (b) the riches of the Gentiles: (c) how much more their fulness.” Observe of whom the Apostle predicates this “fall” and “diminishing,” and it is of the same party (not another as the believing portion) that this “fulness” is stated. The only question is, what does Paul mean by the word “fulness.” That the charge of forcing a meaning may not be preferred against us, we cordially accept of the definition of an opponent. Thus Barnes (Com. loci) “the word ‘fulness’ means that which fills up or completes anything. Thus it is applied to that which fills a vessel or cup; also to the piece of cloth which is put in to fill up the rent in a garment, Matt. 9:16. To the fragments which were left when Christ had fed the five thousand, Mark 8:20; Rom. 13:10. ‘Love is the fulfilling of the law,’ i.e. it is the filling up of the law, or that which renders the obedience complete. See Gal. 5:14. Here it stands opposed to their fall and their diminution, and evidently means their complete restoration to the favor of God; their recovery from unbelief and apostacy.” It does not refer to individuals as such, for those who thus shamefully treated Christ and were punished shall never have this said of them, but, as in many other places, of the nation as such. But if restored thus to the favor of God, what does this imply? Precisely what the Apostle continues to present, the restoration of the nation into its once obtained but delayed Theocratic-Davidic position. In the word “fulness” the Apostle embraces that “filling up” in the Divine Plan, that sublime “filling up” or complement in the future history of the nation as given by the prophets just quoted by him. 10. This is more plainly stated: “For (1) if the casting away of them (2) be the reconciling of the world” (Gospel now tendered to all), (3) “what shall the receiving of them be (4) but life from the dead.” The same nation “cast away” is the one “received,” and, as above, when thus again restored to Divine favor as a nation it shall prove (so the prophets declare of this national restoration, and which we shall describe from them farther on) a greater blessing (“much more”) to the Gentiles. 11. Then follows an illustration of which Barnes (Com. loci) says: “By this illustration (of first-fruits) Paul doubtless means to say that the Jewish nation, as a people, were set apart to the service of God, and

were so regarded by Him.” Taking this admission and legitimately following it out, it indicates that when thus restored it occupies again the same position; which is corroborated by the tenor of the prophets. 12. The natural branches are broken off (i.e. on account of unbelief, rejected as unworthy of the covenanted blessings), and Gentiles are grafted in and borne by the root, viz., by being adopted and incorporated as the seed of Abraham (to whom the Covenant was given), they with Abraham receive the promises. 13. This nation thus cut off, God is able to graft in again, i.e. restore them as formerly, especially if they yield up their unbelief as predicted. Will God graft them in again? 14. That He will do it is positively asserted in the next verse, and made the stronger by declaring that if Gentiles could be adopted, etc., “how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree.” But why “how much more”? Simply because, as Covenant and prophecy unitedly affirm, the Divine Purpose pertaining to perfected salvation is inseparably connected with the Jewish nation as such, and absolutely requires its restoration. Hence the provision that is specially made when the time arrives for the removal of this national unbelief, etc. 15. The Apostle taking this restoration as an established fact in the Divine Plan, now asserts when it will be accomplished. (a) He speaks of it as “a mystery” because the Jews could not understand how the blessings exclusively promised to a covenanted people, the natural seed of Abraham, could be extended to others and themselves be rejected, which, however, is explained by the adoption by faith into the covenanted people of Abraham, and by the additional fact that this rejection of the nation is not perpetual but only for a limited period. (b) In describing how long this blindness or hardness or casting away is to continue, he emphatically limits it to “until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in.” This may denote either until the filling up of the predetermined elect (Props. 118, 153, 154, etc.) out of the Gentiles is accomplished, or until, as in Christ’s declaration, the filling up, the complement of “the times of the Gentiles” is finished. In either case the rejection of the nation is not final but bounded by a definite period known to God. 16. Then, i.e. after this order has been fulfilled, viz., the continued blindness of the nation until this fulness of the Gentiles has come in, then comes, “And so all Israel shall be saved.” Then Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the pious, believing dead shall arise to inherit the promises; then the Gentiles grafted in by faith, the dead of centuries shall also arise and inherit with them; and then too the nation once blind, rejected and sorely punished shall return to their former station of special consecration to God, and “all Israel,” not part (comp. Ezek. 39:28) but all, thus saved shall prove an inestimable blessing to the world. 17. But, as Paul well knew, this requires supernatural agency, direct Divine interposition, and therefore—mark well—he locates in the future, as our whole argument evinces that it must, after this continued blindness and after this gathering of Gentiles or the completion of their times, the Coming of the Lord Jesus, as “the Deliverer,” which, in the very nature of the case, seeing that we yet live during the time of this blindness and gathering, or Gentile era, must refer to the Coming of this Deliverer “the second time unto salvation.” 18. That “the Deliverer” comes at this time (and not at the First Advent) is evident by studying the connection in which the passage quoted is found in Isaiah. There it stands related to (1) a time when the sins of Israel have separated them from God; (2) when their calamities shall be great and they need deliverance; (3) when God will come with vengeance (not upon them but) upon their enemies; (4) the nation, as a nation, will repent; (5) when this vengeance shall cause a general fear to prevail; (6) when the Jews shall become a holy nation and ever retain the truth; (7) and when Millennial glory and blessedness shall prevail. 19. The Covenant promises demand this, as we see from the covenanted Theocratic arrangement which God has proposed to fulfil, which, as its basis, requires for its successful operation, “a holy people,” and as a consequence a national repentance and acceptance of David’s Son, Jesus “the Christ.” 20. All this comes to pass, because, although now “enemies” of the Gospel, they are “as touching the election, beloved for the Father’s sake,” i.e. they are a covenanted people to whom nationally certain promises given to the Fathers belong, and, therefore, to verify these promises their restoration is a necessity. 21. For, God does not change or repent; His promises to this nation, notwithstanding its rebellion, etc., are sure. Otherwise with His foreknowledge, powers, etc., He would not have made and called them. 22. He concludes, in view of all this, to express his admiration of the mercy, wisdom, and knowledge of God, of the profound, deeply laid Divine arrangements for salvation, of the marvellous advancement of them as then witnessed, of His performing and perfecting them according to His own will, and of being the source and end for which all things exist. How can we resist such reasoning which falls directly within the anticipated expectations of pious Jews and Christian believers; which expressly warns Gentiles against falling into the blunder, alas! now so general, of denying to this nation its covenanted position in the Kingdom of God, and which preserves a united testimony of inspired men upon a doctrine momentous as to results in the future history of the world. Indeed so amazing is the developing order of events in the call of the Jewish nation, in its fall, in the gathering going on, in the continued blindness, in the assurance of the removal of the veil and the re-establishment, etc., that we may well say with James, when expressing his belief in the same (Acts 15:16–18), “known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world.” Surely the early Church more fully appreciated the Divine Purposes of God in Redemption by keeping close to the Record, than modern theology (with here and there an exception) with all its boasted enlightenment and deeper spirituality. Spirituality indeed belongs to it, as they also evinced, but it does not transpose or alter the Divine arrangements.

Obs. 7. The reader will consider how unnatural—even cruel—it would be, if the doctrine of a restoration is not to be received, to give so many predictions which in their plain grammatical sense teach a future glorious national restoration of the Jews to their once possessed land. Why thus excite the expectations and hopes of a multitude for many centuries of oppression and exile, if they are never to be realized? Would such a course of procedure be honorable even in man, knowing as he must the deception that would accrue from it? To trifle with the dearest, most heart-felt hopes of a nation by language pre-eminently calculated to excite the same, is not Divine, and we earnestly repudiate every theory which either directly or indirectly charges Holy Writ with such a mode of

procedure. No! God's Word is the truth, and the grammatical sense—the sense which all men agree is the most legitimate in language—contains the plain truth, which God will fulfil at the appointed time.*

Obs. 8. The reader will specially notice (what completely meets a class of objections contained e.g. in Letters to a Millenarian, etc.) that Moses after the delivery of the ceremonial law and after the establishment of the Theocratic ordering, predicts, Deut. 32, the restoration of the nation (e.g. vs. 36–43) after the call and gathering (v. 21 comp. with Rom. 10:19) of the Gentiles. This exactly corresponds with James's declaration (Acts 15:16) that after the Gentiles are gathered out then the Davidic house or Kingdom will be restored. Here we have conclusive evidence (fully sustained by the general analogy of prophecy) that all efforts to apply these predictions to the Ch. Church, in part or in whole, are seriously defective, and opposed to the most decisive (chronological) statements. Indeed, as our argument unmistakably shows, supported by abundant testimony of Scripture, the fulfilment is associated with the Second Advent of Jesus, David's Son (comp, next Prop.).

PROPOSITION 113. The connection of this Kingdom with Jewish restoration, necessitates the realization of their predicted repentance and conversion.

The restored Theocratic Kingdom is a holy Kingdom. God Himself, in the Person of His Son, again condescends to act as earthly Ruler, but as He reveals Himself and His associated Rulers in a higher and more intimate personal relationship, and as the design is to make this a powerful and all-pervading Kingdom, those who stand nationally in a covenanted and elect relationship must become morally qualified for its establishment. Hence the predicted repentance and conversion of the nation.

Obs. 1. We have passed over Rom. 11, which combines the conversion and restoration. So self-evident is this, that our leading opponents concede this to us. Thus e.g. Dr. Brown (Com., Rom. 8, etc.) interprets the chapter as plainly teaching a national conversion and restoration of the Jews; he rejects its application to "individual Jews," and insists upon a "national recovery of Israel." We append a few statements of its spirit. "Until the fulness of the Gentiles be (have) come in, i.e. not the general conversion of the world to Christ, as many take it; for this would seem to contradict the latter part of this chapter, and throw the national recovery of Israel too far into the future; besides in v. 15, the Apostle seems to speak of the receiving of Israel, not as following, but as contributing largely to bring about the general conversion of the world—but, until the Gentiles have had their full time of the visible Church all to themselves, while the Jews are out, which the Jews had till the Gentiles were brought in."*

Obs. 2. The conversion and the restoration both result from a personal Coming of Jesus. Paul informs us (Rom. 11:25, 26) that when the fulness of the Gentiles is come in, then the blindness befallen Israel shall also be removed, because (as the Jews believed), "there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer," etc., owing, as our argument has shown, to the Covenant, "for this is my Covenant unto them," etc. The Apostle could not well use stronger language than this to indicate this Pre-Millennial Advent, and the resulting conversion and restoration; because he well knew that the Jews understood Zech. 14, etc., to present the same Advent and with the same results; that they held a portion, at least, of Zech. 12 to be connected with that period with which he identifies in a crucified Saviour held up as the Messiah Coming a second time unto salvation, the prediction: "they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him," etc., linked with the time when their sins shall be removed and the nation shall be exalted. This work is specifically assigned to Jesus, as e.g. in Isa. 49:5, 6; Isa. 63:17, 18, etc.; Deut. 18:18, 19 (for the prophet "like unto me" includes a deliverer of the people, but greater than Moses), Deut. 32:36, etc.; Ezek. 34:11, 12, etc. Compared with passages which plainly designate this Shepherd of the lost sheep of the house of Israel, Isa. 56:8, etc. Hence the Messiah, in view of this restoration, received from the Jews the significant title of "the Consolation of Israel" (Dr. Clarke's Com., Luke 2:25). This restoration is even foretold in the 80th Psalm, where after asking how long God would be angry with His people, making them a sport to their enemies, etc., this people is represented by a vine brought out of Egypt which God planted in the land, after removing the heathen from it, but which is plucked, wasted, devoured, burned, and cut down. God is urged to return, and visit, and restore the same vine, not another, and the confidence is expressed in verse 17 that this will be done by "the man of Thy right hand," "the Son of man whom Thou madest strong for thyself." The most explicit prophecies are given. Thus Amos 9:11, etc., and Acts 15:16, etc., after describing the dispersion of the Jewish nation, we have (1) The tabernacle of David fallen and in ruins; (2) the return of God in its behalf; (3) the rebuilding of the same tabernacle fallen and in ruins; and (4) to avoid mistake it is added: "I will build it as in the days of old," i.e. the same Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom will be restored under, as covenanted, David's Son; (5) it is "the Lord that doeth this"; (6) this is done when "I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them," etc.; (7) and when this takes place, and they are planted on their land, "they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." In Micah 5:1, 2, 3 (which in this connection will bear repeating), there is (1) the birthplace of the Messiah; (2) His Rulership; (3) that He should be smitten; (4) owing to this smiting He "gives them up," i.e. to captivity, etc., for an appointed time; (5) then the nation will be restored, Christ manifesting His rule in breaking down the confederation of wickedness. Compare Ps. 102:16 and context, Ps. 148:2; Isa. 60:1; Isa. 16:5, etc. In Hos. 3:4, 5 the same succession is presented: (1) the complete overthrow of the Kingdom, so that "the children of Israel shall remain many days without a king and without a Prince"; (2)

so entire is the dispersion that they are even without a sacrifice, etc.; (3) but “afterward (in the latter days) shall the children of Israel return,” i.e. the same nation that endured this overthrow; (4) and shall acknowledge “David their King.” Indeed, the restoration of the people is indispensable, seeing that they form the Kingdom as seen in its inauguration (Ex. 19:6), and as evinced in the Covenant with David, so that the presence of David’s Son, of the nation in the land where the Kingdom existed is requisite. The decided impression made by many predictions, as e.g. Ps. 89, 132, etc., is that David’s Son, shall at some future time sit on David’s throne, reigning gloriously here on the earth; the magnificence, extent, duration, etc., of which reign, as predicted, has not yet been witnessed. The explicit declarations of His obtaining the throne of His Father David (not that of another), Luke 1:32; Isa. 9:7; Acts 2:30, etc., is in accord with the Covenant promise. But all such predictions, in the nature of the case, imply, and in many places are actually connected with, the restoration of the nation. For, as David expresses it, Ps. 135, “the Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for his peculiar treasure”; and having power to perform all things, and being gracious He will relent, verify His memorial, establish them “in the land given for a heritage unto Israel His people,” He, at the same time, “dwelling at Jerusalem.” Unless we accept of the Divine Order laid down, it is impossible to explain the numerous prophecies which describe the Jewish nation, as a nation, to experience a blessedness unexampled here on earth. If we say, this has been fulfilled, then we belittle the Word of God, and challenge His foreknowledge; if we divert these prophecies to a fulfilment in the Church, then we violate the plainest rules of language and make Scripture to utter and give hopes which were never intended to be realized. No! let us receive the Word as it promises, and believe in the fulfilment in the future where God locates it, and light and unity at once abound. Then the language of Jesus, e.g. Matt. 23:37; Luke 13:35, etc., receives a force unknown to any other explanation. Thus, in the passages just alluded to, we then have (1) the rejection of Jesus by the Jews; (2) the Davidic house left desolate (for the city and temple were not desolate when He spoke); (3) Christ’s removal from them; (4) His return to them some time in the future; (5) the removal of the desolation implied at His return; (6) which implication is fully sustained by what the Jews shall then say, “Blessed is He that cometh.” etc., as is seen by the universal Jewish application of this by Jews to the restoration of that house, and by reference to Ps. 118:26, which stands related with a special deliverance of “Israel.” It is simply to be faithless if we deny this, because Christ is “the man ordained” to perform it; and the assurance is given that, strange and astonishing as it may seem to the world, He will do it, Isa. 49:6; Isa. 62:1, 2; Ezek. 34:11–13, etc. Hence Jesus, never in word or act, discountenanced in His followers His connection with David’s throne and Kingdom, and the necessary restoration of the nation. He defended the acclamations of the people when He entered the city, foreshadowing His royal claim, although linked, as the prophets and Covenant, with the Davidic Kingdom. He left His own disciples down to the very last moment (Acts 1:6), in the belief that His Kingdom was truly one connected with the restored nation under the Theocratic-Davidic rule. The only error that He attempted to correct was that in relation to the time when it was to be performed, leaving it either indefinitely in the future or limiting it with a future (unknown as to time) personal Coming. The fact is, that the restoration is so blended with the personal reign of Christ, as David’s Son, that they cannot, without gross violence, be separated, and therefore, on this very ground alone, some reject such a restoration, declaring that if the one is admitted, the other must follow, for the David, the Lord, then reigning over them is also with them in the land, etc.

Obs. 3. This repentance, over against Ernesti and others, is positively covenanted to them, Isa. 44:22, 23; Rom. 11:26, 27; Isa. 59:19, 20, 21; Jer. 31:2, 3, etc. The inchoate fulfilment of Joel 2:28, etc., as described in Acts 2:17, etc., is no impediment but a confirmation of our view, because the application of Joel to certain events, miraculous and astounding in their nature, not only indicates them as typical or an earnest of a future realization (Prop. 170), but affords a positive assurance that the entire prophecy as it stands shall surely be fulfilled. In Joel it is connected (1) with the terrible day of the Lord, time of vengeance; (2) with the bringing back again “the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem”; (3) with the recovery of my “heritage Israel” “scattered among the nations”; (4) with the Coming of the Lord, the harvest, the complete overthrow of God’s enemies, the dwelling of God (as He once did as a ruler) in Zion, the blessedness of the nation, the then holiness of Jerusalem, the continued and everlasting prosperity of the people and of Jerusalem. We dare not separate what God has thus joined; and as God has evidenced His faithfulness and power in a partial, inchoate fulfilment, we reverently trust in the same faithfulness and power for an ample verification of all the particulars enumerated by the prophet. The judgments on the Jewish nation, as we have repeatedly shown, exist down to the Sec. Advent (as e.g. Matt. 23:27; Matt. 24; Zech. 14, etc.), but these same judgments, Isa. 32:15, continue down “until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high”; and this Spirit we are assured is “then” bestowed, Ezek. 36:24–26, when “I will take you from among the heathen,” etc., and restore “to their own land that I gave to your fathers”—fruitfulness, etc., being predicated of the land. See when the Lord will “turn to the people a pure language” etc., Zeph. 3:8, 9, and is it not when He will “rise up to the prey” “gather the nations and kingdoms,” “to pour upon them His fierce anger,” etc., thus describing the period at the Sec. Advent? Look at the promises, so numerous, that when this nation is converted, obtains this happy deliverance, it shall never more be afflicted, etc., and should there be any difficulty in locating their fulfilment, if we truly believe in their realization, when it is positively taught that down to the personal Advent of Jesus, tribulation shall, more or less, accompany the nation? This repentance, conversion, restoration, as prophet after prophet declares, if once experienced is effectual, needs no repetition, etc., Ezek. 16:63; Zeph. 3:9; Isa. 62:1–2; Jer. 31:31–34; Isa. 45:17, etc. Indeed, to produce proof on this point, nearly every prophet can be extensively quoted. And, a remarkable feature pervading all the predictions is this: that God, although men may disallow it, will so order all things that when the period of fulfilment arrives, when the time that the realization of the Covenant comes, this very nation so long stubborn and unrepentant, so long the rejecters of the Messiah, shall be repentant and believing; that after protracted correction, it will again experience mercy, and always

in the land from which it was driven. The miraculous events connected with this period cause many to stumble in their acceptance of it, but this is not strange, if we consider the design of all this, viz., that it is part of the Divine Plan, and an important factor, in promoting the salvation of the race. The events themselves are of a nature impossible for man or mortal or physical forces to accomplish, demanding, if performed at all, direct Divine aid. The taunt so long used by scientists and others, that if such a God as the Bible describes does exist, He should then manifest Himself by direct Divine interference, will then be effectually removed. For, then God, so long withdrawn, will again, as He has promised, reveal Himself to man and exert His marvellous power in his behalf, but, mark it, only in the one direction always observed by Him, viz., in that of the only nation under heaven favored with a covenanted Theocratic relationship. This relationship, for a time held practically in abeyance, He cannot restore until the time comes of His return. The Divine Sovereignty now exercised in a way only susceptible to faith and to reason under the influence of grace, will again give place to that direct manifestation of power, etc., under the restored Theocratic rule. Hence it is important in regarding this repentance to notice (what, alas! so many overlook) that it is controlled by the principles of the incoming dispensation. "The times of the Gentiles" having ended, Jewish times are again in the ascendancy, so that in reference to the manner of this repentance, the order laid down, the miraculous influences connected with it, the time in which the work is to be effected, etc., we are to be governed solely by what is predicted; and no attempt should be made to prescribe how it must be done, or to force it within the limits assigned to present times. It is sufficient for us to know, that God's mode of procedure has always been at variance with that which man in his wisdom vainly proposes; and that when a new era has arrived, it has been inaugurated strictly in accord with His own Word but never in accord with popular expectations. The views so universally prevalent on this subject, so opposite to the simple language of the Bible and the child-like faith of the early Church, are, on this ground alone, open to suspicion. It is enough for us to receive predictions, and, actuated by the past literal fulfilment, by faith in God, to believe in them as recorded without the addition of another and differing sense, and of apologies for ancient weakness and credulity.

Obs. 4. The mention of this repentance and restoration is designed to meet the objection of some (e.g. Dr. Oswald, *The Kingdom*, and *The Saints' Inheritance* by Hill) that only the spiritual Israel, dead and living, are brought to the land and inherit it, and that the nation now dispersed, etc., is never to be restored. The strong language employed in declaring that no such restoration as we present is taught by the prophets, is refuted by numerous converging statements. We may well ask, What then becomes of the election of that nation; is it cast off forever? What becomes of the direct Covenant made only with that nation; is it altered or spiritualized to exclude the nation as such? What becomes of the Davidic throne and Kingdom; can it exist unless the nation with which it is identified (not a spiritualized nation) is restored? If all that are restored are only the spiritual seed, why this repentance necessary in their case? If the restored are only such, what are we to do with the multiplication of the race, the rebuilding, etc.—is this all conditional, or is it all to be spiritualized? If the nation as a nation is excluded, what becomes of Moses's declarations respecting that nation in Deut. etc.; what of Solomon's prayer in 2 Chron. 6; what of David's expressed hopes pertaining to it, etc.? The reader, if he has carefully followed the Propositions, step by step, can multiply just such questions. The mistake mentioned arises from not observing the nature of this Kingdom and to whom covenanted; the continued election of this people; the wall of partition only broken down between believers and not between the Jewish nation and other nations; the difference the Word makes between those who inherit the Kingdom and the subjects of it; that Paul and prophets speak of the Israel cut off for a time and, with no discrimination as is supposed, have the same nation brought back again; the design intended to be accomplished by this Kingdom, etc. The blunders that men may commit in endeavoring to present the order of events, is no reason why we should discard a doctrine so clearly annunciated, and so dearly held by the early Church. Indeed, if this doctrine were not found in the Bible, then an essential link in the Divine plan were lacking. That it is taught, is evidenced by the universally admitted fact that in the grammatical usage of the language it is undoubtedly contained therein; our opponents rejecting it only on two grounds: either, that it is conditional, or, that another sense, unknown to the ancient worthies and first produced by Origen, is to be engrafted upon the prophecies. The very simplicity of the plan causes men to discard it for something, in their estimation, higher and better. The truth of the matter is this: if men were not influenced by a previously entertained theory, they would see at once that the experience alleged in the case of Israel's restoration is so distinctively that of a nation unconverted and in the flesh—a nation long under punishment for sin and coming under converting influences only when God comes to punish the nations of the earth; a nation of whom, when thus newly converted and restored, an abundant increase of children, beasts, etc., is predicated, that in no consistent shape or sense can be applied to the saints of this and former dispensations without a resort to Origen's system of interpretation, and a consequent violation of the plainest rules of language. No! No!! let brethren (whom we love) pardon our zeal if it seems too strong in this matter, for we feel this doctrine to be exceedingly precious and intimately connected with the Divine Honor and Purpose. Let men say what they will, it is self-evident that God never would convey an utterly erroneous doctrine in the face of language itself, and deceive an entire nation with the assurance of a special and continued Covenant and election that does not exist. The apology, that God meant to finally spiritualize this, avails not, since God nowhere asserts such a change; since it is sheer inference drawn from previously formed ones; since the Covenant itself and the promises derived from it stand to-day unchanged, uncanceled. It is best to add here, leaving the matter for future explanation and extension, that while it is true that the saints will be fully identified with the Jewish restoration—their resurrection and translation preceding it—being also of "the seed of Abraham," yet as intimated, and as will be shown (Prop. 118, 154, 156, etc.) they are separate and distinct in honor, position, etc., from the Jewish and spared nations, forming with Christ an associated body of rulers having peculiar privileges, etc., not bestowed upon any others. A fruitful source of

error on the restoration arises from not discriminating between the saints and others, between the exalted brethren and coheirs of Christ and the subjects over whom they reign with Christ, between the inheritors of the Kingdom and the Kingdom itself. Planting ourselves with unswerving faith on the Covenant, credulous as it may seem, it embraces God's promises as recorded, as e.g. Lev. 26:40–45, etc., that He will fulfil the same.*

Obs. 5. The restoration of the nation cannot, and will not, take place without a repentance; and therefore it becomes essential to notice some more particulars relating to it. It is no ordinary repentance, and not merely that of individuals, but extraordinary and national in its extent, Micah 7:15–20, etc. It is caused by the judgments of God, Mal. 3:2–4; Hos. 5:15; Isa. 30:18–19, and the personal presence of the King, Micah 2:12–13; Ezek. 20:33–44; Zeph. 3:15. It is done that God's faithfulness may appear, Ezek. 36:22; Isa. 43:25; Isa. 44:22–26. It is bestowed in the land given to their fathers into which they are brought, Ezek. 36:24–35; Jer. 33:7–16; Jer. 32:37–44; Jer. 31, etc. The reign of the Messiah is intimately connected with it, as e.g. in Jer. 23:3–8; Ezek. 34:23–31, etc. The absence of such national repentance for the last eighteen hundred years is no proof that it never will be accomplished. On the other hand, it is decisive that it will yet come to pass, if we but consider that this very absence of repentance—excepting in individual cases—this “veil” of unbelief covering them, is also predicted. Seeing the prophecy in the one case verified before our eyes, it is faithless to deny the other. Paul tells us (Rom. 11; 2 Cor. 3:16) that this “vail” shall finally be removed, corroborating the testimony of the prophets. There is a divine unity in all the writers on this point, worthy of a revelation from God; and it becomes distinctive just in proportion as a comparison of their utterances is instituted. So striking is this, that men of all classes, even the most hostile to our belief, fully admit it, however some may be inclined to spiritualize certain portions of it, as the Coming and reign of the Messiah. The repentance and restoration is so much the burden of prophecy, runs through and enters into the Divine Plan so thoroughly, that its almost universal admission is presented by a witness so impartial (owing to his opposition to our doctrine) that all will acknowledge its force. Dr. Whitby on Rom. 11, speaking of this repentance and restoration of the Jews emphatically says: “it hath been the constant doctrine of the Church of Christ, owned by the Greek and Latin Fathers, and by all commentators I have met on this place.” But right here is an inconsistency in many modern writers, to which allusion has been made, and which deserves repeated notice. They acknowledge that the prophecies describe a literal repentance and restoration but refuse credence to the time, and manner, and accompaniments of the same as also portrayed by the prophets. Why this change of time after, to one before the Advent; of this supernatural interposition into one of ordinary means;* of this personal presence of David's Son, and introducing a spiritual Coming in its place; of this transposition of a visible Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom into an invisible reign, etc.? What satisfactory reason can be assigned for introducing an entire new element of interpretation which emasculates some of the most precious of God's promises to man? Where is the authority for this most arbitrary dealing with the Word? Are the rules for such a proceeding given authoritatively by God or man; and if so, where found? Simple consistency, if nothing else, demands that if one portion of these prophecies is conceded to be literal (i.e. to mean what the laws of language present) then the other portion must be understood in like manner. For, having applied the literal interpretation, compatibility requires its continuance, unless God Himself, the only Being having authority to indicate a change, in express terms revokes it, or informs us that it is to be understood differently. Besides, it is this literal interpretation that becomes history, doctrine, evidence of inspiration, etc. Is it not time, in this matter, to discriminate between the Word and human opinions attached to it? Therefore, cleaving to the Word, as it reads, our argument holds that, having no authority to make any change, we must receive this repentance, restoration, and the reign and Kingdom identified with it, precisely on the same ground of interpretation. And, it will not answer for the believer in God's Word, in the face of the Incarnation, etc., to reject any portion of these promises because he cannot tell how, if accepted as the Word plainly indicates, they can be fulfilled; for God, the All-sufficient, is abundantly able to take care of their fulfilment.

Obs. 6. The attention of the reader is called, briefly, to the order of repentance as foretold by the Divine Spirit. The fulfilment being future, we must be entirely guided, in our own estimate of it, by the predictions of the Word. Now, first of all, the fact must be kept in view that a part of the Jewish nation (those of Judah and Benjamin) is restored to the land and occupy Jerusalem previous to the open Parousia of Jesus with His saints. This is distinctly foreshown in Zech. 14:2, where the forces of Antichrist are represented as victorious over a portion of the nation which has reoccupied Jerusalem, when the Lord Himself shall directly interfere in their behalf, and Judah is subsequently (v. 14) mentioned as especially related to the city. This is repeated, Zech. 12:2, where the hosts of Antichrist are declared to “be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem.” A part of the nation under political influences, and probably under the auspices of some government favorably disposed (various writers refer to England), is thus restored to Palestine in a state of unbelief, and thus drinks the last dregs of Jewish tribulation. This partial restoration must be carefully distinguished from the one under the Messiah, for this is a restoration which means suffering and terrible persecution by Antichrist, while the other is full of blessing. This restoration will be, in all probability, between the two stages of the Sec. Advent, and, owing to the unbelief of the nation in Jesus as the Messiah, will result in the re-establishment of a temple, a splendid temple service, a return to the Mosaic ritual and former distinctive national usages. This persistent rejection of Jesus as the true Messiah will cause the fearful tribulation predicted to overwhelm them and plunge them in despair. But when their fond dreams of nationality and prosperity are cruelly crushed under the tyrannical reign of Antichrist (whom they first receive, and then in some way offend); when the day of the Lord Jesus has arrived and the nation, covenanted and elect, is at last to be qualified for the contemplated Theocratic ordering, then we find (Zech. 14 and 12) that the Lord and His saints shall come in behalf of the distressed portion of the nation, and bestow

(through the sanguinary overthrow of Antichrist) to the distressed the prayed-for deliverance. The Lord shall save "Judah first" (Zech. 12:7) and He (v. 10) "will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem," etc. (Some representatives of the ten tribes are also present, as in "house of Levi, family of Shimei," or Sep., "Simeon," but Judah is largely predominant and hence most prominently mentioned.) When these unbelieving Jews are thus brought through terrible chastening to find their fond hopes crushed and themselves in a direful extremity, the sudden, supernatural appearance of Jesus on the Mount of Olives with His associated army—the magnificence of the King and the splendor of His companions—the Divine exertion of power on their enemies—the astonishing and sublime accompaniments of the Advent evidencing the miraculous—the glory transcending all that mortal eye ever before witnessed—the Spirit of God impressing this upon hearts softened by fearful suffering—the words of authority, mercy, and love enforced by Divine power—all this will so affect these Jews that the most heart-felt repentance will ensue. God has predicted it, and it will, therefore, be verified.

Judah is saved by the personal interference of Jesus, the Messiah, while Antichrist is crushed before them (the remainder of Judah being afterward gathered and added), but Israel (the ten tribes) is brought in at least forty years after the overthrow of Antichrist and after the restoration of Judah. The evidence of a separate conversion and restoration in time, is overwhelming, and has been noticed by numerous ancient and modern writers. If we turn to Ezek. 37:15–28 we are assured that the ten tribes shall be joined to Judah so that they form one nation and one kingdom in their own land, wherein their fathers dwelt, where God will cleanse them, multiply and abundantly bless them under the rule of the glorious David. But they must first pass through a purifying process, for in Ezek. 20:33–44, when God "will bring you out from the people and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm and with fury poured out," it is added, to indicate the process: "And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the Covenant; and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel; and ye shall know that I am the Lord." When thus purged they shall be brought "into the land of Israel, into the country for the which I lifted up mine hand to give it to your fathers," deeply penitent (for "ye shall loathe yourselves in your own sight for all your evils that ye have committed"), and God shall be sanctified in them.

Why this preference is shown to Judah is known to God; but past history suggests that it may be done because Judah is more directly in line attached to the Davidic house, manifested its adhesion to it more strongly, was less addicted to idolatry, and has the King Himself in tribal lineage. If it be objected (as some do), that if Jesus thus appears for the conversion of the nation, it is then "a special favor" and He thus becomes "a respecter of persons,"—this is a confounding of things that differ. The prophets speak of it as a special, distinguishing favor, for which the nation is indebted to God's mercy and love, and which grows out of the elect covenanted position of the nation, and must, of necessity, be manifested to realize the Theocratic Kingdom, which becomes an inestimable blessing to Jew and Gentile. Paul's argument in Rom. 11 culminates in the declaration that this very favor of reception and restoration results in increased riches and happiness to the Gentiles. This promised mercy precedes the call of the Gentiles, and belongs to the nation as covenanted and confirmed by oath. Now, in this dispensation, God, in view of the fall of the nation, is no respecter of persons, but receives both Jew and Gentile, but in the new dispensation and ordering, God, who has not limited Himself or His promises, can and will, owing to the then instituted Theocracy, fulfil His covenanted promises given to the nation, and which take fundamental precedence of all other things. We must not forget that "the times of the Gentiles" are to end, and a new period, the gracious day of the Lord Jesus, is to be inaugurated. We must not overlook the lesson taught e.g. in Rom. 9:18–21; 2 Tim. 2:20, etc., and sit in judgment over that which God has determined to perform. A believer's position is that of faith, and a "Thus saith the Lord," is the end of controversy.

In this repentance of the nation, whether it be Judah and his companions in Palestine, or Judah and others notified by the escaped of the nations (Isa. 66:19–20), or the tribes in the wilderness, all of them, according to the prophets must, and will, acknowledge two things: first, their iniquity, and second, their just punishment, followed by a hearty and reverent submission to the Messiah given to them. The conditionality of some promises pertaining to the dispersion (for God must necessarily, ever foreseeing the result, tender mercy in view of confession and submission—as He does to-day to those who will refuse to the end) must not outweigh in our estimation the absolute, unconditional declarations that such a repentance shall assuredly occur, which is confirmed by detailed statements of the blessedness and glory that shall follow. The Spirit employs a variety of expressions to indicate the time of national repentance, and one of the most remarkable is to be found in Hosea 5:14–15, and 6:1–3, where (comp. Prop. 137, Obs. 5), after declaring how God will fear Ephraim and tear Judah as a lion, and will go away to His place, then when none can rescue, it is said: "in their affliction they will seek me early," or, as many critics, "they will seek me in the morning," which is the evident meaning, corresponding (as general analogy proves) with "the morning" of "the day of the Lord Jesus, the Christ." This is confirmed additionally by ch. 6:3, where reference is made to the Lord's Coming in the morning, and by v. 2, where the time is specified by days (a thousand years as one day in the sight of the Lord) of their fearful dispersion, and in the third day God will raise them up.

The work of conversion and restoration shall proceed, after the wicked one (2 Thess. 2:8) is slain, as seen e.g. in Isa. 11:4–16; Isa. 66:15–24; Zeph. 3:8–20, etc., until every one is gathered, and Gentiles shall assist in bringing them to the land.

One feature of this subject must be briefly alluded to, viz., the mission of Elijah to the Jewish nation. The prediction is plainly recorded in Mal. 4:5, 6. The success of his efforts and the time of his coming are clearly mentioned, and this prediction cannot be regarded as fulfilled (excepting in spirit) in John the Baptist. The reasons for looking beyond John to the future for a realization of this prophecy are given in detail under Props. 38–41, 144, 174, etc., to which the reader is referred. Elijah is a forerunner of the Sec. Advent (the open Parousia) just as John was a forerunner of the First Advent (the public appearance of the Messiah). Now, owing to the exceeding brevity of the prophecy, where no details are given, we can only—judging from the general order and material given in other places—hazard an opinion as to the time and manner of Elijah's work. Down to the siege of Jerusalem by Antichrist (Zech. 14, etc.), he has not appeared, as is evidenced by the sad fate which has overtaken Judah and his companions, but when the city is taken, etc., then he comes to relieve the despair of "the residue of the people" who have not been driven from the city. The words of hope imparted by him are eagerly cherished; the descriptions of a speedy Coming Messiah, David's Son, as a Deliverer, are ardently contemplated; and we may reasonably believe that by an appeal to the prophets and the history of Jesus as well as to their own past history as a nation, Elijah will prove the Messiahship of Jesus, and thus prepare the way for the hearty reception of Jesus when He comes to Mount Olivet with His saints. The personal appearance of Jesus, etc., fully confirms the mission of the prophet. Then, again, he may be sent to the wilderness to meet the ten tribes as a forerunner, preparing them for Him who shall "plead with them face to face." Other missions, for aught we know, may be in store for him in behalf of the nation. However we may locate the exact period of his appearing and work, one thing is certain, that he will be an important agent in this grand work of leading the nation to repentance.

We conclude with this declaration: Whatever agencies God may employ in this conversion, and whatever wonders of an astounding nature He may vouchsafe to manifest, He immeasurably exalts Himself and forever enshrines Himself in the love of a recovered people: for "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of His heritage? He retaineth not His anger forever, because He delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, He will have compassion upon us; He will subdue our iniquities; and Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea. Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which Thou hath sworn unto our Fathers from the days of old." Amen.

PROPOSITION 114. This Kingdom, being identified with the elect Jewish nation, its establishment at the restoration embraces the supremacy of that nation over the nations of the earth.

This follows legitimately in view of the mutual and inseparable relationship. The Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom committed to, and organized in, that nation, makes it the special depository of the trust of the Kingdom itself. It is covenanted to the nation, and only in and through the nation, by the power of David's Son, will it be re-established, and from this establishment extend its sway over the nations of the earth. The result is, that the nation, so highly favored and honored, must, in virtue of so distinguished a relationship, sustain a certain well-defined pre-eminence among and over the other nations. It is the natural outgrowth of Covenant and promise; the result of Theocratic ordering.

Obs. 1. This is abundantly confirmed by the direct teaching of the prophets. Thus Micah 4:8, "And Thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion, the Kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." The context shows that this is spoken of the same Zion and Jerusalem that was ploughed and in ruins, which are to be restored and made glorious. The same idea pervades even other expressions contained in the chapter: "But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains and it shall be exalted above the hills," etc. To "be established in the top of the mountains" and to be "exalted above the hills" denotes supremacy; for mountains and hills, being symbolic of kingdoms and nations, the meaning is, that the first position among the nations, an elevation above all others, is assigned to this "mountain of the house of the Lord." That "the house of the Lord" is the Davidic house has been frequently proven, He having incorporated it in His Theocratic rule, and claimed it in view of His Son and David's Son, in one person, being destined to rule therein. What "the mountain" of this house is can be readily seen by what the Spirit says, Zech. 8:3; and when God thus defined it, man can only accept of the definition.*

Obs. 2. The same is taught by Dan. 7:27, etc., which, while particularly describing the ascendancy and rulership of "the people of the saints," a peculiar and distinguished class (Props. 118 and 156), yet in virtue of their being also "the seed of Abraham," grafted into the elected nation, it indicates, since this rulership is exercised at and during the restoration, that the dominion of power is to be attributed to connection with the King of the Jews, the fulfilment of the Abrahamic-Davidic Covenants, and the restoration of the nation. Hence "the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven" given to them, only proves the exaltation of the Jews through the appointed Seed. The reigning of the twelve Apostles over the twelve tribes, the reign of the saints as coheirs with Christ, in the Davidic Kingdom, etc., enhances the pre-eminence and glory of the nation, through whom alone all covenanted blessings can be

obtained. This rule of Christ and of the saints cannot be separated from Jewish supremacy; while some of the promises more particularly relate to the saints, the first-fruits (as shall be explained hereafter), yet in view of an elected relationship they are also indicative of the high position of the Jewish nation and Kingdom. This is easily corroborated by an abundance of predictions, such as the following: 1. By that class of passages in which “the horn” (symbol of power, etc.) of this nation shall be exalted, as e.g. Ps. 89:17–18; Ps. 148:14, etc. 2. All nations then shall regard Jerusalem the centre of worship, Micah 4:2–3; Isa. 2:3; and notice, this in the same Jerusalem formerly destroyed. Let the reader refer to Zech. 14, and see the connection and the yearly worship at Jerusalem (v. 16), and the punishment threatened against those who refuse, and no other conclusion can be consistently formed than the one given by us. And indeed, if such a Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom as predicted is established, it is eminently suitable that, aside from the spiritual worship extending everywhere, there should be a national acknowledgment of nations through their representatives of the Theocratic King and Kingdom. It is not conceivable how such “a world-dominion” having its centre at one point can exist without a fixed public acknowledgment of it, etc. 3. They also shall esteem Jerusalem the centre of power. Let once the idea of this covenanted Theocratic Davidic rule be admitted, and the beauty and propriety of various prophecies appears, such as Mich. 4:2; Isa. 2:3, “the law shall go forth of Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem”; Zech. 8:22, “Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord” (comp. Amos 9:12; Zech. 12, etc.). 4. The nations shall regard it as the centre of glory. This arises from its being the metropolis of the Kingdom (Prop. 168), being “the city of the great King” “the throne of the Lord,” etc. Millennial descriptions fully portray this feeling of reverence, etc., for the city, as universal (Isa. 62:2, etc.) over the earth. 5. The nations shall respect and honor the Jewish nation on account of its special relationship. Thus, e.g. Isa. 61:9, “And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people; all that see them shall acknowledge them that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed.” Even the individual Jews in that day shall be highly esteemed; “Thus saith the Lord of hosts (Zech. 8:23), in those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying: We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you.” 6. All nations shall contribute to their prosperity, wealth, riches, etc. Thus e.g. Isa. 60, 61, etc. 7. The Gentiles shall fear and reverence the Jewish nation. Thus e.g. Isa. 49:22, 23:8. The nation shall be a praise among all nations, where it formerly was treated with derision. Thus Zeph. 3:19, 20, “I will get them praise and fame in every land where they have been put to shame. At that time will I bring you again, even in the time that I gather you, for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the Lord.” 9. The Gentiles shall aid in glorifying this nation. Thus, e.g. Isa. 66:12. 10. Those nations that shall not acknowledge this supremacy shall perish. Thus e.g. Isa. 60:12; Zech. 14:12–19.

Obs. 3. The simple fact that Jesus, David’s Son, “the King of the Jews,” is to be the Mighty King over them, evinces this pre-eminency. It is true that He is not only to be King over the Jews but also over the whole earth, for “the sovereignty or Kingdom of this world” is to become His, and “-all dominions shall serve and obey Him,” yet we must constantly keep in mind the covenanted fact, that this reign is manifested on David’s throne and from David’s Kingdom. Therefore it follows, that the nation identified with this throne or Kingdom is exalted proportionately with the extent and splendor of the reign of Him who sits on that throne thus associated with the nation. It is this that gives them that peculiar and honorable distinction, so lauded by the prophets. This is reasonable and just; for surely the people from whom the King is descended according to the flesh; who hold in covenanted possession the throne and Kingdom of His inheritance; who are restored by His power that the throne and Kingdom may be re-established in its integrity; who enjoy the privilege of having His throne and majesty in their midst; who are under the particular rule of appointed judges, coheirs with Him—must realize, from the nature and extent of their position and blessings, an eminence far above that of all others, viz., that stated in Ex: 19:5, 6.

Obs. 4. If the question is asked, why this supremacy is given to the Jewish nation in preference to all others, the answer is given Rom. 11:28, 29. It has always enjoyed a peculiar, near relationship to God; and it should not surprise us to see it restored to its high and distinguishing privilege of being the nation through whom the Theocratic rule will again be exhibited in a more glorious manner, being still “beloved for the Father’s sake,” an elect nation, now indeed suffering for unfaithfulness but destined to a recovery (Deut. 32:36), because God’s calling and Covenant relationship to them, bound by oath, is unchangeable; His mercy and Divine attributes are glorified through it; His dear Son, also the seed of Abraham and David, is exalted thereby; and His rule as a gracious, condescending earthly Ruler, the veritable King, is through it extended over the whole earth. Men may, in estimated superior wisdom, deny such a Divine Theocratic manifestation through His ancient people, and speak of it as derogatory to the Saviour, etc. Let such, however, see to it that they be not found speaking against the most blessed and exalted position of David’s Son, and of that nation which is His by “inheritance” and by “redemption” When the prophets say so much respecting this, and eulogize it in the highest terms, surely we ought to be guarded in saying anything that may be reproachful of it.*

Obs. 5. A number of observations on this interesting point might be appropriately made, which can only be indicated to the reader. (1) This pre-eminency among the nations of the earth shows that the position assumed by us concerning the wall of partition being broken down only between believers in Christ and not between the Jewish and Gentile nations, is well taken. (2) This work is of God, and will be witnessed by the nations as a confirmation of His power, etc., Ezek. 17:22–24, Isa. 52:1–10, etc. (3) Jerusalem and Palestine (as the latter shall be extended according to promise) are most admirably situated (geographically) for the exercise of such supremacy. See Townsend’s Arrangement, Introd. p. 68–9. (4) The promise to Abraham is only then literally verified, “I will

make of thee a great nation.” For David and Solomon’s reign (aside from its Theocratic arrangement), plays but a small part at the side of the great empires of history. God’s Promise unerringly points to the future; and as His promises, long delayed, are sure, the greatness of the nation, as the prophets predict, will be more commensurate with the greatness of the Being who has promised. (5) The promise made to Abraham of being “heir of the world” is then realized, in the acknowledged pre-eminence of his seed. (6) How wonderful will then the history of this people appear, and how astonishing that the Divine Purpose so plainly revealed should have been, by lack of faith and with the notion of exalting the meaning of Scripture itself, so persistently overlooked by the multitude. (7) To occupy this position of supremacy, it is necessary that the division into two kingdoms, once existing, should be perpetually abolished. This is fully predicted, as e.g. Ezek. 37:21, 22, etc. (8) The folly of being indifferent to, or totally ignoring, the predictions on this subject, just as if they were not given. (9) That if, as many advocate, the phrase “Times of the Gentiles,” is indicative of “Gentile domination,” then the cessation of these times would of itself indicate that such dominion would come to a close.*

Obs. 6. This supremacy of the Jewish nation is a stumbling-block to many (who misapprehend its connection with the saints, etc.), and the most bitter and sarcastic remarks are levelled against it. We might content ourselves with the simple and positive statements of the Word of God, which have been presented, but, desirous to vindicate that blessed Word, we distinctly trace the fundamental reasons for the same, showing conclusively (1) that their covenanted, elect, Theocratic relationship to God, as their King (earthly Ruler), in their national capacity, imperatively demands just such a supremacy; (2) that this supremacy is fully required when the King and the saints are the rulers—the King being by inheritance the king of the nation and the saints being engrafted into the same Commonwealth, and regarded as part of Abraham’s seed—over the nation, from whence “a world-dominion” is to be exerted”; (3) that in the estimate of this supremacy it is impossible to separate the glorified (the king and co-rulers) from the unglorified, for they are united, the one as authoritative head and the other as specially exalted in view of this union (hence numerous prophecies make no distinction between the two, but speak of the nation as it shall be when restored and associated with the glorified seed of Abraham—which gives the key to the magnificent language employed); (4) that the nation as it shall hereafter be composed, viz., with its Mighty King and with its resurrected and glorified patriarchs and descendants, and with its adopted Gentiles resurrected, translated, and glorified, and with its twelve tribes repentant and converted, forms collectively “the rod of strength” (Ps. 110:2) which shall be exerted in a sway over the nations of the earth; (5) that a Theocracy with a rule over the world, embracing a union of Church and State, has its foundation in the nation specially selected, in which its rudimentary form was set up but which was withdrawn on account of wickedness and rebellion, and yet which Covenant and prophecy declare shall again be restored under David’s Son (hence unity, God’s oath, Jesus’s inheritance, etc., demand it); (6) the union of the Divine with Civil power over the nations, to accord with a pure Theocratic ordering, necessitates, in order to preserve unity, just such a supremacy as is predicted; (7) that to prepare this nation for its supremacy it is (Ex. 19:6) to be made “a Kingdom of priests and a holy nation,” which is done (a) by the Incorporated glorified “Kings and Priests,” and (6) by the pre-eminent holiness of the nation, “all” being righteous, and brought into special nearness and service to the king; and (8) that the promise “in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed,” indicates, as Hengstenberg remarked, “the re-establishment of the lost unity, and in the gathering again of the scattered human race around Abraham as their centre,” which to be realized, according to Covenant and prophecy, demands a visible, outward exhibition of civil and religious power according with the Divine Purpose as contained in the grammatical sense of the Word and advocated by us. Hence Ebrard (Ch. Dog., vol. 2, p. 749) justly observes, both in view of the elect, covenanted relationship, the incorporation of the Divine, and this supremacy: “And then (in the Mill. age) shall the Old Test. prophecies of the re-creation of the kingdom of Israel attain their fulfilment, for, within the unglorified humanity upon earth, converted Israel shall form the middle point of the Kingdom of Christ.” The nation, with its attached glorified rulers, forms the basis for that wide, extended, and ultimate universal dominion.*

Obs. 7. Milman (His. of the Jews), Wines (Com. on Laws), and others, have shown that past history records the fact that science, art, philosophy, history, jurisprudence, politics, statesmanship, finance, education, etc., are adorned with splendid Jewish names—names suggestive of vigorous intellect, large attainments, great skill, profound wisdom, and vast knowledge. If the Hebrew race in its dispersion, under its disabilities and humiliation among nations, has exhibited such talent, genius, energy, learning, enterprise, and power, what will they not become when restored to their own land under the peculiar and elevating guidance of their long expected, and at length arrived, Messiah? What brilliant names will not the future develop, when specially ruled over by the glorified and powerful Apostles, when in close and intimate connection with glorified saints, when the Mighty King and the splendid New Jerusalem are in their midst? The position that they will then occupy geographically and theocratically, together with the elements of individual and national greatness bought together, fostered, and developed under the all-wise and all-powerful Messiah, will bring forth a list of greater names to adorn the annals of the reign of Jesus and His saints—the evidence of a reign rich in all that pertains to the elevation of individual or national greatness.*

PROPOSITION 115. The Kingdom is not established without a period of violence or war.

In the nature of the case, if at any time God intends to re-establish such a Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, which is designed to extend its sway over the world, all, or nearly all, earthly Kingdoms will oppose it. This is precisely what the prophets, one and all, uniformly

predict.

Obs. 1. This is a terrible subject, and the writer was under strong temptation to suppress, in great part, this Proposition, lest to some it would prove "a dead fly in the ointment" (Eccles. 10:1), causing a rejection of the whole. But consideration urged that, as God proclaimed it, and frequently adverted to it, duty and faithfulness demanded its insertion as a testimony and warning to others. Reflection also will show that, fearful as it is, yet owing to its temporary nature it is not near so dreadful as the perpetual destruction, the everlasting cutting off of the wicked from the happiness and glory of the Kingdom. If any one objects to the war, slaughter, plagues, etc., that, as predicted, shall be meted out to the enemies of God when this Kingdom is to be inaugurated, on the ground that it is derogatory to God's character and to Christ's mission of love, etc., such are invited to consider, in addition, the following particulars. (1) What are we then to do with these predictions? Are they given merely as threats, God never intending to fulfil them? Or, are they conditional? That God intends their ample fulfilment is evident from the connection which they sustain, (a) to the Divine Plan; (b) to the chain of predictions in course of fulfilment, the literal accomplishment of which thus far forbids the notion of a change in the future; (c) and to the Sec. Advent of Christ; (d) to the future condition of saints; (e) and to the restoration of the Jewish nation. (2) The identical reasons which would impeach God in allowing this war and awful destruction of life can be urged against Him for allowing past war, the Jewish tribulation, the destiny of the wicked in the future. Take e.g. the wars carried on under this same Theocratic, and Theocratic-Davidic arrangement, under the Rulership of God Himself and by His direct sanction. Ponder it well, and then dare to judge God. If the Jewish nation was then justifiable, if God was then right in the destruction of His enemies, is it not equally so in the future? (3) This war, etc., in the future as expressly asserted, is not carried on because God delights in it, but because it will be waged against Him, His people and His Purpose by wicked, ambitious men, and the Almighty condescends to meet them in the same way to give them, through appointed agencies, a signal and deserved punishment and overthrow. The rise, progress, aims, slaughter, etc., of the confederation of wickedness arrayed against Him (Props. 160, 161, 162, 163) will fully vindicate the propriety and consistency of the means used in its downfall; which, as prophecy declares, will be freely and universally acknowledged the world over after its occurrence. (4) It is also not inconsistent with Christ's mission of mercy and love for the following reasons. (a) During this very period of mercy, heavy judgments of God have been constantly poured out, on the city and nation of the Jews; (b) if this were purely a dispensation of mercy, how account for the wars, sufferings, terrible Providences, etc., pertaining to nations, individuals, and the Church. There evidently is a limit to be fixed somewhere. Mercy is indeed extended, but it is not all mercy; judgment, justice, etc., are also to be regarded in forming our estimate, or it will prove to be one-sided, opposed to experience, fact, and Divine representation. The same Jesus, so desirous to save and bless, orders events according to His righteous will in blessing or in judgment as best suits the circumstances of the case. (c) This is a time of offered mercy, but even this will give place to a time of wrath and vengeance on the nations and persons that persistently reject Him. And we may well pause to ask that, if in a period so disposed to be gracious He allowed His just anger to burn toward a nation still "beloved for the Father's sake," what will He not do when His wrath is kindled against the nations of the earth who are not thus protected by Covenant relationship? (d) This is a heavy judgment on the wicked only, who are directly arrayed against Him at His Coming. (5) The simple record ought to suffice; for it is not becoming in us to sit in judgment on the propriety of God's dealings, either past or future. If God has revealed that thus it shall be, that He has ordered it, and will surely bring it to pass, that ought to satisfy the believer, especially since many of the adverse Providences of God can only now be received by faith. (6) If it is terrible, it is so to those who are properly warned. Let the nations, let the wicked open God's Word, and if they will receive His Record, not spiritualized away, but as it is written, there they find repeated solemn warnings against joining the confederation of evildoers in the last days; against arraying themselves in hostility to Christ and His interests; against any treacherous connivance against Jerusalem or the Jewish nation. If Jerusalem becomes "a cup of trembling" and "a burdensome stone" to them; if the wrath of the Lamb burns with consuming fury against them; it is because they have rejected the most solemnly given warnings.

Obs. 2. To appreciate this subject several things must be observed. (1) At the period of the Sec. Advent, as various prophecies show, Christ will find a mighty array of nations who will be hostile to believers, hostile to His ancient people and land. Rev. 19:2; Thess. 2; Isa. 63, etc. He is represented, not as converting, but as destroying them; and the most terrific figures and representations are heaped one on the other to describe the catastrophe, "Making war, treading the wine-press, treading the wine-press of the wrath of God, smiting the nations, ruling with a rod of iron, treading the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, treading the people in anger, trampling on them in fury, staining His garments with the blood of His enemies," etc., are a few of them, and under and in them is couched a dire reality against which it is worse than folly to close the eyes, viz., a most fearful period of vengeance on God's enemies. (2) That the ushering in of the Millennial era is immediately preceded by this period of vengeance. The context of numerous Millennial descriptions portray it as God then coming in anger, wrath, vengeance, etc., pouring out His indignation upon the nations of the earth, as e.g. Isa. 24, 25, 26, etc. (3) An antichristian confederation is represented as existing at that time which has slaughtered the saints, and is in open war with the Jewish nation, as e.g. 2 Thess. 2; Rev. 20; Zech. 14, etc. (4) The same is declared to exist just previous to the resurrection and deliverance of the saints, as e.g. Dan. 12:1, 2; Isa. 26:19. (5) The same is almost invariably linked with the restoration of the Jewish nation, as e.g. Joel 3; Dan. 12, etc. (6) The saints are also described as with Christ and participating in inflicting the judgments of God, ruling with a rod of iron, as e.g. Rev. 2:27-28, etc. (7) The Jewish nation is likewise an agency in this last overthrow of enemies, as e.g. Zech. 14, etc. It is scarcely possible in every

instance to show in what way Christ, or the saints, or the Jews participate in it. The testimony of prophecy is this: that Christ as the Mighty King directly interferes in behalf of His people, that His saints aid in this work, and that the Jews are supernaturally sustained in the same. Christ as the Master Spirit and Supporter of all this, is sometimes mentioned alone (as e.g. Isa. 63), the rest being implied; again Christ and the saints in view of their associated capacity are spoken of as together (as e.g. Rev. 19), in the accomplishment of it; then again, when details are given, the Jews are described (as e.g. Zech. 12) as largely participating. The fearful picture is only completely surveyed, when the several parts are brought together and viewed as one whole. Converging and irresistible proof is also established, because under several aspects the same tremendous scene is located at precisely the same period of time introductory to the Mill. age.

Obs. 3. Therefore, the Kingdom is introduced by violence and conflict. This is seen by referring to the Scriptures (which sustain the previous Observation), and to what was stated under former Propositions Passing by for the present the numerous allusions to the objects designed by Christ's Coming, such as to destroy the power of His enemies (Ps. 2:1–9; Dan. 7:9–26, etc.), and bestow retribution (2 Thess. 1:8; Ps. 10:15–18, etc.), it is sufficient for our purpose to direct attention to one single feature of the last times, which, aside from others vindicates the Divine interference and frightful drama that will be enacted. Notwithstanding the tenders of Gospel mercy, the gracious call given to Gentiles, it is predicted that not only wickedness shall abound down to the Advent (Matt. 24:6–15, 37; Mark 13:6–13; Luke 17:26–31; 1 Thess. 5:2, 3; 2 Tim. 3:1–13; 2 Pet. 3:3, 4, 10; Jude 18, 19, etc.), that not only antichristian powers shall exist down to that period (2 Thess. 2; Dan. 7, etc.), but that at the time of the Advent and ushering in of the Mill. age, wickedness shall increase (Matt. 24:37–39; Luke 17:26–30; 1 Thess. 5:1–3; 2 Tim. 3:13, etc.) to a fearful extent until it culminates into a mighty confederation against the truth. Without entering into details respecting this antichristian power (Props. 160–168), its existence is most prominently set forth so that it is impossible to ignore it. Through seducing influences (2 Tim. 4:1–3, etc.) and corrupting passion of nations (Ps. 2; Joel 3, etc.), there will result an organized effort to crush Christianity by persecution, and even to destroy the Jewish nation. Leaving the names, character, blasphemy, claims, etc., of this Antichrist, we again narrow our discussion to a single point, viz., that of his efforts to crush the Jews at Jerusalem. In comparing prophecy it is distinctly announced that he shall unite nations and armies into an expedition into Palestine and a siege against Jerusalem, Dan. 11, last part and 12:1; Isa. 14:24–27; Joel 3; Zech. 14; Rev. 14:20; Rev. 16:16; Ezek. 38:8–19, and that he is to be destroyed by a revelation of Christ in Palestine, Ezek. 38:21–23; 2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 19:11–20, etc., compared with the positive order laid down in Zech. 14. So plain are these predictions that not only the entire early Church looked for such an invasion of Palestine and overthrow of the Antichrist, but many who are not friendly to Millenarian views have adopted and advocated them. The reader then will observe that such a confederation is predicted as in open hostility against Jerusalem, etc.

Obs. 4. This, in the nature of the conflict described, and the results that follow, indicates a prior, partial restoration of Jews to Jerusalem, as many writers have observed. This is not the restoration under Christ, but one that will be effected under the auspices of some nation. At least one thing is certain, that the nation, as such, is at this very time represented at Jerusalem in such numerical force that prophets predict a gathering of the nations against the Jews. With one voice nearly all of them allude to this gathering, and describe the condition of the Jews as one of great trouble and misery. This gathering, too, is purposely allowed by God. In some predictions the nations are said to do this; in others that God, "He shall gather them." In Rev. 16:14, "the spirits of devils shall gather them;" in another place (Rev. 13:5–18), the last head of the beast and the false prophet shall assemble them; and then again God will do it, as in Zeph. 3:8, "Therefore wait ye upon me saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey, for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them my indignation, even all my fierce anger," etc. This is reconcilable with the permissive Providence of God, and with the fact that the results of the free agency of these nations falls in with the contemplated design of God to employ the very period of their gathering and anticipated triumph for their terrible punishment. By wilfully closing their eyes to "the counsel" of God, to His plain Word, they are led into the position of unbelief, etc., and God orders all things in such a manner that their purpose of gathering shall be fully carried out. Nothing shall intervene to frustrate the daring plans laid by them until the decisive moment arrives. They shall agree among themselves, and be prospered until God is ready to pour out His vengeance; and the gathering itself on a gigantic scale with the eyes of the world fixed on it, will make the punishment the more signal and overwhelming. God employs their design as a vehicle for the accomplishment of His own; and therefore, with the power to prevent it at any time, it is correctly, although the direct result of creature agencies, attributed to Him.

Obs. 5. Jerusalem will be taken by this last enemy, and great cruelties will be perpetrated. The Jews will be driven to despair, such as we can well imagine their blasted hopes, after long centuries of tribulation then excited by fondly anticipated prosperity, would produce. In a partial restoration attempted by themselves in reliance upon others, instead of waiting for the one to be gained through the power of their King, they suffer the last outpouring of God's anger. This causes a cry of agony, which is mercifully heard, and in such a way that sorrow and despair are turned into joy and happiness. Zech. ch. 14, delineates the extremity and the deliverance, which is corroborated by Zech. 12; Dan. 13; Jer. 30:4–24. The Lord will fight for them; and among the agencies employed is this very Jewish nation, as specified. Zech. 14:14, "Judah also shall fight at Jerusalem," etc.*

Obs. 6. The active part taken by this Jewish nation in the punishment of the nations who opposed Jerusalem, etc., is given in Zech. 12:1–9; Zech. 10:3–12; Micah 4:11–13; Isa. 41:15–16; Micah 5:8–10; Jer. 51:19–20, etc., verifying Dan. 2 and 7 and 12; Ps. 2, etc.

The nation, by virtue of Divine Support, is invincible, so that “they that strive with thee shall perish,” and “they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of naught,” becoming like “chaff,” etc. The nations will be confounded at their valor and might, Micah 7:16, 17; Zech. 9:13–16, etc. The slaughter will be terrific, represented under the most impressive figures that language can employ, as e.g. Ezek. 38 and 39 the awful supper “upon the mountains of Israel” to which the birds and beasts are invited, Rev. 19:17–20, same supper, Rev. 14:19, 20; Jer. 25:29–33, etc. It is impossible to explain away these passages; it is absurd to spiritualize them into something else, and we must receive them. That they relate to the future is so apparent that it needs no discussion; for such a Coming of the Lord and of His saints, such a display of valor, etc., by the Jews, such an overthrow of enemies after a siege of Jerusalem has never yet been witnessed. The hesitancy of many writers, who receive it, to dwell upon it arises not from disbelief or disregard, but from the fear that others not appreciating its relationship to the judgments of God preparatory to the establishment of His own Theocratic government, may become prejudiced against the truth in general. But let human opinion be what it may, one thing cannot be done, viz., to blot out these predictions, or to prevent their fulfilment.*

Obs. 7. In the face of all this array of Scripture, it will not answer for the objector to quote the language (John 18:36) of Jesus: “If my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But now is my Kingdom not from hence.” Will the Saviour contradict the predictions of the prophets? No, for He qualifies His language, guarding it, by the “but now,” i.e. at the present time, my Kingdom is not of this world and my servants do not fight, leaving the plain inference that at some future time, just as prophesied, His servants would fight. The time of wrath on the nations and of the Kingdom will also come, Rev. 11:15–18. Now, during the gathering out of the elect, vengeance is God’s; we are forbidden to exercise it; but God’s forbearance with Gentiles will also end as it did with Jerusalem, as it now does with individuals, and then He employs what agencies He pleases to cause their destruction.*

Obs. 8. This future overthrow of the nations is the key to the warlike spirit noticed in many of the Psalms, and which has been the fruitful subject of derision to unbelievers. Even many believers, not recognizing the period and the design God has in view, turn with unbelief from Ps. 58:10; 68:23, etc., as if it were inconsistent for the righteous to see and engage in the specific, appointed work of Jesus, the Divine Master. Look at the Sec. Advent of the august Jesus and see the bloodshed, slaughter, fearful supper, vintage, etc., connected with it, and if the blood of His enemies shall flow so abundantly, shall stain His garments, etc., in the day devoted to wrath, is it wrong or inconsistent for His people in that day to see and engage in the same work? If we dare not censure the blessed Saviour, who will engage in this work, made necessary by the enmity of His enemies, made requisite by His determination to set up His delayed Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, which these nations will determinately oppose, can we blame the righteous if they do as stated in Ps. 149:6, 7, 8, 9? And can this be regarded as in opposition to the Christian spirit, when it is even added that the righteous shall rejoice when he beholds and participates in it? He certainly does not rejoice in the necessity that exists for such a manifestation of power and vengeance—the whole tenor of the Bible forbids it; but he rejoices in it because incorrigible enemies, enemies who long violated God’s law and shed the blood of saints, are removed; that the righteous are at length rewarded; that Christ obtains His inheritance; that Covenant promises are realized, including even that the seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; that wickedness is utterly rooted out of the earth; and that now the whole world shall realize in Millennial blessedness and glory, that there is a God that judgeth in the earth, that God, His Son, and His people shall be sanctified, etc. A large number of reasons are given why this should cause exultation in the saints, arising from its being a removal of enemies and the introduction of promised blessings that could not possibly be realized on earth without such a previous and complete subjugation and expulsion of these enemies. The employment, too, of just such agencies may be part of that “snare” and “net” which God plants, in which to take those nations. The perversion of those predictions springs from not locating their fulfilment properly. One party, not observing that the Holy Christ is the Leader in these things, the Introducer of this day of vengeance and resultant year of the Redeemed, either persistently closes its eyes to the existence of such passages in the Scriptures, or declares them inconsistent with the Spirit, etc., of Jesus Christ. Another party takes a more dangerous position, for finding these prophecies and not noticing that they are identified with the Sec. Advent of Jesus, with His own appointed day of vengeance, presume rashly, without warrant, against even prohibition, to take up the sword and establish a Kingdom or maintain the truth. Both extremes are to be avoided, leaving God to take care of the ultimate fulfilment of His own Word, resting assured that such a terrible resource can only be taken under the directed auspices of Christ Himself, who as the designated “Lion of the tribe of Judah,” etc., will make this “war in righteousness.”*

Obs. 9. This subject in one of its features, ought to serve as a warning to Jews, not to allow themselves to be persuaded by any nation or party to establish themselves in Jerusalem and Palestine. The prophets plainly predict their sad fate; that they shall fall under the persecuting power of this last confederation and experience its fearful effects. The restoration that God predicts for them, and which they should await, is under the Messiah, Jesus Christ, David’s Son. If they run before they are called, or if they accept of a restoration under the auspices of some nation relying upon their own efforts, etc., they shall certainly realize in their own unhappy experience what will befall Jerusalem and its inhabitants at this last great siege by the gathered nations.*

Obs. 10. This also should serve as a warning to the nations, not to allow themselves by any arguments or inducements to enter into a league against Jerusalem. It is predicted that this will be done, and that all such nations shall be severely punished (as e.g. Zech. 12; 2, 3, 9) and destroyed. Wisdom, prudence, ought to urge an acceptance of God’s Word. It is true, that the establishment of such

a Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom may not prove very palatable to the nations, the governments of the earth, for it is destined to interfere materially with governments as now organized and conducted, and will not tolerate in any of them that sinfulness, etc., which, more or less, attaches to rulers, people, manner of conducting government, etc. But considering the Divine Purpose and the blessed results that will flow from it to the world; regarding the Almighty Power that will enforce the successful accomplishment of it although all nations resist it—surely true wisdom ought to indicate a persistent refusal to all solicitations to engage against the ancient city and people of God, and to suggest a ready compliance with all the demands that in that day may be made by the Mighty One who is to rule as the Father's beloved Theocratic King. It is no idle caution or impertinent request which says, Ps. 2: "Be wise now therefore, O ye Kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way when His wrath is kindled but a little." This period will be the crisis of nations.*

Obs. 11. This again reminds us of the extreme position adopted by peace congresses, etc. A portion of the Scripture, isolated or torn from its connection, is alone presented in their pleas, while lengthy predictions, which show that war exists down and at this period, are ignored as if they did not exist. The general analogy of the Word tells us that it is only after (not before) this terrible conflict of, and with, the nations, that war shall be banished under the then peaceful and triumphant reign of David's Son. To locate this era at any other period previously, or to declare that it can be brought to pass without Divine interposition, is to indulge in dreams that will never be realized. To diminish war, suffering, etc., is a Christian duty, but this is very different from that of misinterpreting and misapplying the Word of God, and predicting "peace and safety," which God warns us against. It virtually closes the eyes of many to the predictions of the future, and prevents them from seeing that they should so live that they "may be accounted worthy to escape the things that are coming on the earth," for the principle recorded by Ezek. 14:16, 18, 20, will be fully carried out.*

Obs. 12. When this war is concluded, then, and then only, will Ps. 76 be fulfilled in the manner we have presented. Then and then only shall the force of Ps. 110 be realized, as verified in the fate of the kings and heads over countries. Then, too, will men find that the confederation and its defeat are described in Ps. 83. Then Ps. 68 will stand forth with a significance that will astonish, and Ps. 60 will present a clearness in the light of fulfilment that must surprise. The rejoicing then prevailing is well foretold in Ps. 47. The struggle and glorious result is eloquently portrayed in Ps. 46, and it then will be a matter of amazement that it could be applied to any other era. How impressive, viewed in this connection, becomes Ps. 48, delineating the judgment inflicted on the kings that were assembled, and the glory that results. Indeed, in that day, many a prediction now imperfectly understood, shall stand forth with a distinctness that will reproach the weakness of our faith in God's Word, when the last prayer of Moses, the benedictions of Jacob, the covenanted relationship of the people, etc., are vindicated by this tremendous overthrow of enemies—then truly prophecy itself, now the sport of scientific unbelief and the butt of unscholarly ridicule, will secure the profound esteem and praise of all nations.*

Obs. 13. This war, with the prominence, valor, success, etc., of the Jewish nation in it, corroborates the supremacy of that people presented in the preceding Proposition. Thus verifying 2 Saml. 7:23, 24; Deut. 33:29; Isa. 43:1–7; Isa. 60; Zech. 9:16; Jer. 3:17–19; Ps. 144; Jer. 33; 9–16, the "war," Ps. 110, etc.

Obs. 14. The reader, who has closely followed our entire argument, will not fail to see that it is highly appropriate for the Jewish nation to be thus employed as instruments in the execution of the Divine Judgment of the King. The propriety springs from the fact that, as the Davidic throne and Kingdom embrace this nation, and as the judgments are to be poured out in consequence of the process of re-establishing this Kingdom in its Theocratic-Davidic form, the nation itself must, in the nature of the case, be used as an instrument in overwhelming His enemies. All pertaining to the Kingdom is thus engaged. Compare Jer. 51:19–20.*

Obs. 15. One peculiarity in this conflict is the statement that every Jew is specially under Divine protection, and endowed with supernatural strength, so that none of them are overcome by their enemies. The Spirit foreseeing this already foreshadows it in Deut. 32:30, and gives it plainly in Zech. 12:6, 8; thus also fulfilling Ps. 140:7. Being under the supervision of their King, and acting by His direct command, it will happen to them as in the battle with the Midianites (Num. 31:49), there lacketh not one man of us." For, God says to them, Deut. 33:27; Lev. 26:7, 8.*

Obs. 16. Owing to the fearful slaughter and the multitude of dead, we have described by Ezekiel and others the cleansing of the land. This gives us a direct clew to "the cleansing of the sanctuary," for the land of Palestine is called the sanctuary (Ex. 15:17, etc.), and, it being defiled, with the dead, is carefully purified by their removal.*

Obs. 17. The reader is reminded that these terrific scenes are connected with the closing period of Dan. 2 and 7, i.e. during the divided period of the last empire, the last beast; while powers arising from it are still existing, this confederation, this tribulation, these results will also be witnessed. These kingdoms and beasts, with their outgrowths, describe, as Mede and others have well characterized it, "the Gentile domination" beginning with Jewish captivity and extending down during a long period of, more or less, oppressive Gentilism, until the mystery of God is finished. Even Jews have observed and commented on this peculiarity, Thus e.g. Mede quotes Rabbi Saadiah Gaon on Dan. 7:18 as saying: "Because Israel have rebelled against the Lord, their Kingdom shall be taken from, them, and shall be given to these four Monarchies, which shall possess the Kingdom in this age, and shall lead captive and subdue Israel to themselves in this age until the age to come, until Messiah shall reign." History corroborates this Gentile

dominion, and it will continue until God shall determine that “the Times of the Gentiles” have run their allotted, predetermined course, and then and then only under the restoration of this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom will this domination come to a perpetual end (Prop. 164).

Obs. 18. Rejecting this prophetic war-spirit, commentators are greatly perplexed over the statement of Luke 22:36–38 and render corresponding singular interpretations. Jesus exhorts to the purchase of the sword, and when “they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, it is enough.” And in v. 49 the question was asked, “Lord, shall we smite with the sword?” Jesus permitted, v. 50, so that “one of them smote the servant of the high priest and cut off his right ear. And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far.” Even Olshausen makes the allusion to be that they should purchase or obtain the sword of the Spirit! He spiritualizes the whole matter to get rid of the idea that Jesus ordered material swords, because they are regarded as inconsistent with Christ’s character as “Prince of Peace.” So Barnes, Bloomfield, and others, who try to make out a proverbial expression or prediction, indicative of future trials and a proper provision to be made for them. But against all such one-sided interpretations, they forget (1) that material swords were shown; (2) the two material swords shown were esteemed sufficient; (3) that one of the swords was actually used in inflicting a wound; and (4) that this was done with the connivance of Jesus is self-evident, seeing that He ordered them foreseeing the intended use. To make “It is enough” to mean, “you do not understand me” is absurd, and, in view of what occurred in the use of the sword, would place Jesus in a false position. The expression in v. 51, “Suffer ye thus far,” gives the clew to the whole transaction. It is simply indicative that He can and will resort to arms and violence when (as all analogy proves) the proper time has arrived, but not then at that crisis (the time of obedience and humiliation, and suffering to perfect Himself as Redeemer), for to carry out the Divine Will, the resistance then offered—a sign that the sword also belonged to Him—was amply sufficient.*

PROPOSITION 116. This Kingdom is a visible, external one, here on the earth, taking the place of earthly kingdoms (comp. Props. 122, 111, 123, etc.).

Covenant promises, prophecies, all produce the impression that as soon as it is set up, such will be the result. To deny this, is to pass over the plainest feature of this Kingdom; and, therefore, no one but admits either that now it thus exists, or that at some time in the future the Church will assume this (thus making a change), or else that it is fulfilled (against prophecy) in the third heaven. The admission is favorable to our argument, for precisely such a visible Kingdom is demanded.

Obs. 1. The Kingdom embraces not merely visibility but a divine-political dominion (Prop. 117) superseding all other Kingdoms, as e.g., Dan. 2:44; Rev. 11:15; Dan. 7:13, 14, 18–27; Zech. 14:9, etc. This, too, is, admitted by a host of our opponents; and we are assured by many of them that, by some additions or transpositions, this will in the course of time be effected. But if this is a characteristic of the Kingdom and at its setting up, as prophecy indicates, then, if the Church is such a Kingdom, the Church should have presented this very appearance. On the other hand, the Kingdom of God at one time was visible, then it was overthrown, but its restoration under David’s Son foretold. Now, if ever restored, as covenant requires and as promise declares, then, as a matter of course, a divine political rule or dominion must be restored. Hence, the prophecies run in the current of the Divine Purpose in making these portrayals of the future Kingdom.*

Obs. 2. The concession, that such a Kingdom is still in the future, is all that at present our argument needs. The manner in which it is made may be referred to as a matter of curiosity and confirmation. Whatever mystical or spiritualistic interpretations Neander, Fairbairn and others, give, yet they are forced, against their theory, to find in an ultimate outward, visible manifestation in the Church, in a real political dominion, in a subjection of all Kingdoms under a Theocratic government, the conditions of prophecy. Having already quoted Neander largely, who contends for this feature, we pass to others. Pressense, who spiritualizes the prophecies in extenso, still unable to entirely rid himself of what he calls “the materialistic” tendencies of them, says (The Redeemer, p. 101): “Let us add that this spirituality of interpretation prevents us in no respect from admitting that the Kingdom of God will be triumphantly established in the outer world also; the new heavens and the new earth are a reality to our minds.” Fairbairn (On Proph., p. 297), gives to the Church “the real universality and the absolute right of governing upon earth;” alluding (p. 447) to the language of Daniel respecting the Kingdom, he says, it is such as “to indicate an actual remodelling of the state of things among men, and a fresh organization of the social fabric such as would formally commit the administration of affairs into the hands of the Lord’s people,” etc.; and he admits (p. 465) that this includes “the formal elevation of the pious and God-fearing portion of mankind to the place of influence and authority.” Lange (Bremen Lec. No. 8) advocates a future union of Church and State, asserting “that State and Church are to become one in the Kingdom of God,” and in his Com. (Matt. 3, p. 73) he declares that “the Christian Church and the Christian State may be regarded as the twofold manifestation of the Kingdom of God.” Even those who are the most non-committal admit even on Isa. 2:1–5 (as e.g. Alexander, Com. loci), that the description denotes something of authority, etc., “permanently visible.” Dr. Arnold held that a development of the Church in its perfect form includes a blending or union of Church and State, thus constituting a properly developed Kingdom of God, saying (Hurst’s His. Rational.), “there can be no perfect Church or State without their

blending into one,” etc. Such references might be endlessly multiplied, but these are amply sufficient to show, (1) that the Word of God demands such an outward dominion; (2) that it will be supreme over the earth; (3) that the want is felt and acknowledged; (4) the hope is expressed that it will finally, in some way, be realized.

Obs. 3. It is strange, however, that in such a delineation of prophetic language, fully admitting a divine political world-dominion, they forget the objections alleged against our view. In their case the very passages presented to teach an exclusively spiritual and invisible Kingdom as against us, are now no longer of force. But we may well pause, and ask the consistency of this; for, if they forbid an outward universal Kingdom such as the early Church advocated, why should they not also prevent them from entertaining a similar view? Again, in such admissions they also overlook what so many writers among themselves learnedly argue when writing in opposition to us, viz. that those predictions are typical of something else. Thus, e.g. Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 270) frankly admits that the prophetic language describes a literal Kingdom, but that this must be understood as typical, etc. Afterward he himself sets up a Kingdom corresponding with this literal description, and neglects applying to the plain grammatical sense his Origenistic derived typical one. If the predictions have been typical thus far in the history of the Church, and no change of nature is noted in the predictions themselves, how does it come that this typical application does not continue—that it suddenly changes, more or less, into literalness? Does not this prove that the principles of interpretation underlying the Church-Kingdom theory are not entirely satisfactory to their own advocates.

Obs. 4. The very concession of a visible “world-dominion” by the Church-Kingdom theorists is hampered by other difficulties, irreconcilable with the uniform tenor of prophecy. Thus, e.g. they concede that this Kingdom possesses an outward authoritative dominion, but, (1) they must, if they take the descriptions of wickedness, war, etc., preceding the Sec. Advent, have the saints or Church yield up such dominion against positive assertions by the prophets to the contrary; (2) with their theory of the ending of this dispensation, general judgment, winding up of the world, changes in the Church, they allow no such permanency, everlasting duration (see Prop. 159) ascribed to it by the prophets. The only effort made to obviate this difficulty is to say that the Church is everlasting, and hence will ever endure. This we admit, but that is not the point at issue between us; the point is, that a certain position or station is assigned to the Church, viz., that of exerting power, authority, dominion here on the earth, and the question is whether that will be retained as the prophets predict or not. Our doctrine gives this authority to the elect people—the seed of Abraham—but at a designated time, and retains it as a permanent possession; the prevailing view gives such dominion, but finally brings it to a close to make way for an alleged “Kingdom of Glory,” somewhere in God’s universe.

Obs. 5. If the popular definition of the Kingdom of God, viz., that it is “God’s reign in the heart” (thus confounding God’s Sovereignty with a special Kingdom of promise) is correct, how comes it that the prophets assign it specified time and place in the future? How comes it that it is spoken of as established at a certain period, and as pertaining to the humanity of Jesus Christ? Surely something very different from the absolute eternal Sovereignty of God is denoted; it may be, and is indeed attached to, and grows out of, that Sovereignty, but linked as it is with the elect Jewish nation, the Davidic throne and Kingdom, the human nature of Christ as David’s Son, the outward visibility and dominion, the ending of the times of the Gentiles, the restoration of the Jewish nation, etc., it cannot be referred to any other Kingdom but the Theocratic-Davidic as believed in, and preached by the early churches. Admit this, and the significance and unity of covenant and prophecy are apparent; deny it, and diversity and antagonism follow.*

Obs. 6. The Herald of the Morning (June 15, 1878, August 1, 1877, etc.) makes the future Kingdom “spiritual,” and denounces us in our belief as “materialists.” All that we need to say in reply is this: without discarding the spiritual aspects of the Kingdom (comp. Prop. 197), we are satisfied to receive the visible and materialistic view in connection with that which covenant and prophecy embraces. The reasons assigned for this purely spiritual Kingdom are too subtle and far-fetched for us, seeing that it is taken for granted that a glorification must necessarily result in an invisible and wholly spiritual state against the general analogy and specific teaching of the Scriptures. (Comp. next observation and Prop.)*

Obs. 7. Barbour (*Three Worlds*) employs the same reasoning as given in the previous Observation, and insists that this Kingdom of “the Christ” is spiritual and invisible, being something separate and distinct from “the Kingdoms” given to Jesus in Rev. 11:15, laying special stress on the plural “Kingdoms.” Now a reference to Rev. 11:15 shows, even in our version by the italics that in the latter clause the plural is assumed. The MSS. S. & A. (Tischendorf’s N. T.) have even “the Kingdom of this world is become the Kingdom of,” etc., and hence many critics, making the correspondence with Dan. 7 the more striking, translate, “The Sovereignty of this world is become the Sovereignty of,” etc. Now that this is the meaning, and that it is visible on the earth, including the nations, is abundantly evident from Dan. 2 and 7, as comp. e.g. with Isa. 2, Micah 4 etc. The prophecy not only takes it for granted that it takes the place of preceding Kingdoms, but expressly asserts that it is a Kingdom under heaven, here on earth, which embraces the rulership of the saints and the subjection of the nations. It requires the grossest perversion of language to make a purely spiritual and invisible Kingdom out of the one delineated, and thus corresponding with the covenanted one. The Kingdom promised to David’s Son by oath, and which is His inheritance is not an invisible one—far from it. Barbour reaches his conclusions by pressing a few sentences of 1 Cor. 15, relating to the future glorified condition of the saints—a condition which only qualifies them for a visible and glorious reign—a condition, which, in Jesus and the saints, brings the Divine and Supernatural in visible relationship to humanity. It is by spiritualizing some predictions, making others conditional, applying the typical to some, and overlooking others,

that this spiritual system, Gnostic in tendency, is produced.*

PROPOSITION 117. The Kingdom of God re-established will form a divinely appointed and visibly manifested Theocracy.

It is not a political body of human institution, for its divine origin is found in its covenanted relationship, and in its history. Its visibility we have seen in its ancient establishment; and when re-established, it must, as the case absolutely requires, again thus appear. It cannot exist without this external appearance in view of its direct connection with the Jewish nation, etc. Its Theocratic element is seen in God again condescending to act as an earthly Ruler in and through and by David's Son (comp. Prop. 110).*

Obs. 1. This is a Theocracy in deed and in truth, for in this reorganized Kingdom we find the Theocratic idea—God's idea of a perfect government—fully consummated. The Rulership is safely and powerfully lodged in one Person, who in Himself unites the human and the Divine, who becomes, according to "the everlasting covenant" and "the sure mercies of David" (Isa. 55:3, 4, Alexander's version), "the Chief and Commander of nations." See Prop. on Humanity, etc.

Obs. 2. The restoration of the Jewish nation, the supremacy of the nation, the reign of the Messiah as David's Son in connection with it, in brief, all the details given by the prophets of this era, are only reconcilable and in harmony with a re-establishment of the Theocratic government. This insures divinity and visibility.

Obs. 3. As already intimated, the highest possible position that we can place the Kingdom of God in, is that of regarding it such a Theocratic State or Empire, universal over the earth, founded, governed and developed under Divine authority personally manifested. This, as admitted by nearly all, was foreshadowed by the ancient Jewish Theocracy. Something like it has been the desire of nations, as can be seen even in the Utopian theories of philanthropists, philosophers, statesmen, and more recently in the expressed wishes of spiritualists to attain to it through the medium of spirits, etc. But originally founded by Divine power, it can only be restored by the same power; it can never be realized through human instrumentality, requiring, as we have all along shown, a higher agency to introduce it.*

Obs. 4. The inconsistency of some able writers on the subject of a Theocracy is remarkable. Some who admit that the fundamental idea of a Theocracy is something very different from that of the Divine Sovereignty, embracing, as it does, God condescending to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler, a union of Church and State under direct Divine rule, etc., yet apply this Theocratic idea, stripped of that which gives it its peculiar vital force, by the wholesale to the Church and world. Numerous excellent writers who do this will occur to the student. The most surprising part is that, in the application of this theory, they contradict themselves without apparently being conscious of the impropriety. Thus, e.g. to illustrate: Neander, *Life of Christ*, B. 4, ch. 1, S. 51, says: "The form of a State cannot be thought of in connection with this Kingdom; a State pre-supposes a relation to transgression; an outward law, the forms of judicature, the administration of justice, are essential to its organization. But all these can have no place in the perfect Kingdom of Christ; a community whose whole principle of life is love." The first sentence has force only as it applies to the Church (and it was Neander's church view that led to it), but is erroneous when thus applied to the Kingdom, for he himself in his theory of progressive development loses sight of the principle thus laid down and expressly anticipates a period when the Kingdom of God shall (in the same section) "exhibit an external stately fabric" and "regenerate all things and thus appropriate them to itself;" while in other places, previously quoted, he advocates this future perfect union of Church and State as the highest development of Christ's Kingdom on earth. The fundamental error in this theory is, that it attributes to the Church, its development, etc., what the Bible only represents as performed under the direct auspices of David's Son, at and after a time of vengeance, etc. If God Himself in the establishment of a Theocracy did not regard the union of Church and State an inconsistency; if He through the Spirit sounds forth its praises and portrays vividly the blessings that can flow from it, it surely does not become us virtually to impeach His wisdom in such an organization. Besides, love, exceedingly precious and cementing, is not government, but is most admirably adapted to preserve and perpetuate it when established. The highest exhibition of love will be that which is manifested, not in individual life, but in associated life in its greatest of worldly relations, the civil.

Obs. 5. Surely no one should object to this consistent Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, so precious to the pious Jews and early Church, when many, who reject Millenarian views, still are forced by the peculiarity of predictions to concede that there will be a Theocratic reign, a union of Church and State, a universal, visible, external government. In addition to the illustrations given under previous Propositions, another may be presented. Ralston (*On Apoc.*, p. 162, etc.) when describing the Millennium of Rev. 20, says: "we find a reference to thrones which represent the dominion of the saints in a Theocratic form of government," and adds, that prophecy teaches not only a destruction of earthly governments, but "also the erection of a government founded in righteousness and guarded by heavenly influences;" that a new form of government will be established when the Jews are reorganized as a nation, clearly Theocratic, having its seat in Judea, so that "Judea may be most distinguished in that day as the Redeemer's Kingdom on earth," and all other nations will render homage, etc. Why—when thus making out a Kingdom distinguished by political power, etc., exerting the same over the earth from the central seat in Judea—not admit all that the prophets declare, and accept of the Theocratic-Davidic

Kingdom fully restored in David's Son? Why leave out the Divine chain which binds the whole together? Why shrink from the divine throne and Kingdom of David, claimed by God as His own, specifically covenanted to Jesus, now in ruins but promised to be rebuilt, and, turning away from this divine, etc., still in some way attach Origenistic derived ideas to this Kingdom, constituting it a progressive development of the Church?

Obs. 6. If such a Theocratic Kingdom, as God Himself instituted, is not permanently and gloriously re-established here upon earth, then it follows that God's efforts at the establishment of government and the interest which He manifests in it are fruitless of abiding results. Or, in other words, His own Kingdom has proven a failure. If the rebellion, etc., of the Jews is urged as a reason why it was not carried out, the reply is plain: why then, with His foreknowledge institute it at first, and then when overthrown predict its restoration, etc.? Besides, why adopt it in the sacred covenant relationship? Such questions might be multiplied, showing that God's honor, majesty, etc., are immediately concerned in its restoration, or otherwise it will be said that the Almighty undertook a work which, owing to man, He could not accomplish. If the general opinion is to be received, as expressed by numerous theologians, that it would be foolishness to expect such a restoration; that it has given place to a much higher, refined, spiritual Theocratic order, etc., then it leaves God's direct attempt at exercising the functions of an earthly Ruler an inscrutable riddle. If the original Theocratic idea is lost, if God Himself is not at some period of the world's history to be its actual, earthly Sovereign, then certainly the earth will lack in its history the completion of a form of government indorsed and adopted as the most desirable by the Omniscient Himself. Recent writers, as Wines and others, insist that the Theocracy was entered into by God to teach man the true science of government. This is true, but not the whole truth, for we would add: to teach man that perfect government can only come directly through God. But take this half-truth, that God teaches man how true government cannot be justly separated from the relations that man sustains to God, etc., and does it not directly lead to the conclusion, that if God's own teachings are to be realized, then a government must at some time exist here on earth, in which He is the recognized Lawgiver and Sovereign, to whom all can apply? Shall these teachings be defeated by depraved human nature, or by the combinations of Gentile domination? Or, shall they be spiritualized away to mean something else? Shall the now "Prince of this World" gain the victory in the most dignified and exalted of man's relations, viz., in that of organized society in its national, governmental, and monarchical arrangements; or, shall the victory be given, as the Bible does, to the Son of Man, David's Son, in this very direction? The glory of God, in virtue of His beginning, is deeply concerned in the completion of His own system of government; and we may rest assured, from a multitude of concurrent predictions, that He will sanctify Himself in this particular, exalting in the eyes of all people the identical form, now the scoff of unbelievers and even so difficult of acceptance by many believers (comp. Prop. 201).*

Obs. 7. The delay in this Theocracy is no reason for refusing credence to it, seeing that God so plainly foretells the reason for its delay, viz., in punishment of the nation with which it is connected; and seeing that He also reveals to us a long period of Gentile dominion during which it cannot exist. God, having, for the sake of man only, shown by the experiment of its previous establishment (designed also as a covenant basis, to secure the heir, etc.), that human nature as now constituted is utterly inadequate to bear and perpetuate such a Kingdom, during this season of delay is gathering out the material, i.e. the saints, who, as co-heirs, joint-rulers with "the man ordained," shall form such an illustrious, all powerful body identified and incorporated with this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, that re-erected it will be sustained with purity, dignity and stability. God's ways are marvellous in preparing for His own government, overruling the freedom of man and his bias for sin, and constantly, slowly but surely, advancing toward His intended goal. Having repeatedly shown this gathering of elect destined to co-operate with David's Son when their number is completed, we may add: that the Jewish nation and the race itself will after so long a trial of Gentile domination and its historical results, especially as witnessed at the time of the end in its confederated wickedness, be the better prepared to acknowledge the incomparable superiority of God's form of government.*

Obs. 8. The eulogistic phraseology of the prophets which some critics ascribe to Oriental usage, respecting this Theocracy is well deserved. For, if we consider the King, David's immortal Son, with the Divine inseparable with Him; the redeemed saints, also immortal, inheriting with Christ, and qualified by their trial, experience, etc., to act as rulers with Him; the Jewish nation restored to favor, and its coveted position after an education that never will be lost; the Gentile nations receiving the blessings accruing from a government which ever has been the need of the world; the glorious results ever flowing in free and abundant streams from God's own fountain of order—all this ought to lead us to feel that language is too feeble to express what will be realized.

Obs. 9. This Theocracy will realize the idea of universal Empire, the darling wish of mighty monarchs. David's Son, King Jesus will, with His own power, His associated rulers, His restored and exalted nation, in the Davidic throne and Kingdom by its grandeur cause all nations to become tributary and joyful supporters of its authority. The throne of David will become the great, recognized throne of the world, all others being subordinate to it. The prophecies relating to this need not be repeated, for the reader in our argument must have observed that one design God has in re-establishing this Kingdom is, to advance through it, and perfect by it, His own universal rule, so that finally all people without reserve shall fully and freely acknowledge the supremacy of God as manifested in and through the Ruler of this Kingdom.

Obs. 10. This Theocracy, as frequently intimated and implied, is designed to create blessings. Fruitful as it may be at the beginning

in vengeance to nations who interfere with God's purposes, yet its main object is to procure blessings. It is not to gratify the ambition of the Jewish nation that it enjoys such supremacy, but that, as Paul in Rom. 11; Zech. 8:13, etc., it may dispense richness to others; it is not to gratify pride that saints reign with Christ, but that they may be instrumental in promoting the welfare of others, etc. Of David's Son itself it is said that His reign shall bring showers of blessing upon all, so that all families of the earth shall be blessed in Him. The Millennial descriptions abound with things productive of happiness. It is only necessary, as our subject suggests it, to point to one, the fruitful parent of many others, viz., a perfectly safe, reliable, stable righteous government, with King, rulers and subjects bound together by the interests arising from manifested Redemption.

Obs. 11. This Theocracy embraces not only perfected salvation as in the Rulers, i.e. those who reign with Jesus Christ, who are crowned as the inheritors of the Kingdom, but it includes the contemplated salvation of others, and the redemption of the race as a race. Leaving the classes that are to be found in this Kingdom for separate consideration and proof, it may now be said that it will be fully proven, at the time this Kingdom is set up by the mighty confederation then existing which is to be overcome, and by the continued sinfulness of the world down to that era, that owing to the corrupt nature of man, notwithstanding the provision made for salvation, the appeals, truth, etc., the tendency of man, against light, is toward evil. Evil will in a most fearful aspect be in the ascendancy when the King comes, and it is positive folly for any professed believer in the Word to deny the record on this point. This conclusively establishes the proof, that to bring the world under subjection to God, to bring it even to accept of the blessings tendered to it, something more is needed than present instrumentalities. What will God introduce to break down, and keep down, this spirit of wickedness and rebellion? The prophets all declare that it will be the pouring out of His heavy judgments, and the setting up of this Kingdom. This Kingdom thus introduced is the bulwark erected by God against the enemies of God, by which they are either overthrown, destroyed or brought into subjection; by which all evil shall be rooted out, and the race itself be perpetuated in a state of purity and happiness just as predicted. It is the Divine means by which all are brought to feel and recognize the relations sustained to a Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Benefactor; removing all causes of war, national jealousies, civil disturbances, diversity of church government and worship, and bestowing peace, rejoicing and happiness.

Obs. 12. The reader's attention is briefly called to consider, what, in such a Theocratic arrangement, must be the honor and dignity of the Rulers associated with the Mighty Son of Man. The position of the twelve apostles ruling over the twelve tribes, and that of the saints in their various stations of kingship and priesthood, all linked with the glory of this Kingdom. (See Props. 154, 156.)

Obs. 13. How vain is the boast of statesman or king, that this or that nation and land will become the greatest that earth shall ever behold. If wise, they would see that this is reserved for the now despised people that stand in covenanted Theocratic relationship with Jesus.

Obs. 14. In every aspect that we view the subject, it seems suitable and necessary to have such a Theocracy as predicted. Besides the reasons adduced derived from covenant, the faithfulness of God, the redemption of the earth, etc., it does appear eminently proper that the theatre of King Jesus' humiliation, sufferings, and death should witness also His exaltation and glory. The Bible, in addition to the pleas presented by us, points to the time coming when Christ shall be openly and visibly recognized as the glorious One, who, as the Second Adam, having substituted Himself through love, is the efficacious Head of Humanity in its newly begun destiny; who, as Redeemer, having offered expiation to and honored the justice of God, now practically manifests the fruits of salvation; who, as Prophet, having taught restitution, now exhibits Himself as the Truth evidenced by the work performed before Him; who, as Priest, having made an acceptable sacrifice, now presents before the world the fruit resulting from it; who, as King, in virtue even of His Divine union and showing it by guidance, supporting, etc., now manifests it in the special ordained manner as Sovereign Ruler. In brief, this Theocracy is the restoration of a God again dwelling with man, accessible, and constituting in Jesus an infallible Head, just such as the world needs, just such as man for ages has longed for, and just such as will place David's Son in honor and glory in a world where He suffered and died. The past treatment and brief stay of the Son of God and David's Son insures a triumphant return, and a sojourn in power among men whom He will save, verifying the name Immanuel, God with us, in the Theocratical sense.

PROPOSITION 118. This view of the Kingdom is most forcibly sustained by the figure of the Barren Woman.

Turning to Isa. 54:1-17, the exact order of events advocated by us is distinctly announced as follows: (1) the elect condition of the Jewish nation and union with God in Theocratic relationship; (2) the rebellion of this nation and temporary rejection of the nation; (3) during this period of rejection another people is to be gathered out to which God will be specially united in the same relationship; (4) that when this gathered people enter into this relationship God will again restore the Jewish nation to its original position in virtue of His former union with it; (5) and the results of such a restoration to favor shall be of the highest importance, etc., to that nation.

Obs. 1. Because this passage is not regarded in the light of the solemnly covenanted relationship of the Jewish nation, which God's faithfulness and oath can never alter or break, however it may be held in abeyance on account of sinfulness, men have attached to

it the most inconsistent and contradictory interpretations. Leaving the logical application given to this passage by the early Church, the majority of commentators, etc., involve themselves in absurdities, gross difficulties, and unnecessary perplexities. It is sad to find able and learned men who make “the barren woman” and “the married wife,” although the one is contrasted with the other, the same; or, who make both to be the Church in different aspects; or, who make it simply a figure of Jewish prosperity exceeding that of other nations who then exist; or, who even make it out to be a kind of proverbial expression indicative of increase; or, who make “the barren” the Christian Church largely increased by Gentile nations which are supposed to be “the married wife,” etc. Surely, if mere fancy or imagination has had full play in exegesis, it has been on this Scripture. Instead, however, of dwelling on the looseness of exposition on this passage, let us, following step by step the teachings of the Word, endeavor to ascertain the meaning which accords with the general tenor of prophecy, and with historical fact.

Obs. 2. Who is this “barren woman”? The definite answer is given by the entire scope and order of the prediction. For the present, we reply: It is the Jewish nation as the covenanted elect nation, or, if the reader chooses, Jerusalem as the type of the nation, its chief representative, the nation itself being thus designated. For, (1) This nation is represented as married to God, being His wife. The marriage relation being thus used as a figure to denote the intimate, Theocratic relation that God sustained as earthly Head or Ruler over it. Many passages teach this, in which the nation, under the same figure, is declared to be treacherous as a wife, guilty of whoredoms, etc. In this same chapter she is therefore called “a wife of youth,” a woman that was married when but young, etc. Compare Ezek. 16; Jer. 3:20, etc. (2) She is a “barren woman.” Because, (a) she forsook the Lord and followed her own devices, so that God said, Hos. 2:4, “And I will not have mercy on her children, for they be the children of whoredoms;” Hos. 4:6, (b) she persecuted and destroyed her children; Ezek. 16:20, 21, “Moreover thou hast taken thy sons and daughters whom thou hast borne unto me, and these hast thou sacrificed unto them to be devoured. Is this of thy whoredoms a small matter, that thou hast slain my children,” etc.; (c) hence the increase that would have resulted had she proven faithful, was, owing to her wickedness, not realized, Hos. 9:14–17; (d) by her sinfulness she defeated the gracious purposes of God respecting her. This is apparent from numerous declarations in which God promises to her to perform such and such things if she only prove faithful. The lamentation of Jesus over her is sufficient evidence. The nation, persistent in its evil course, instead of blessings receives the curse which is productive of barrenness; (e) she brings forth fruit unto herself and not of God, Hos. 10:1, “begotten strange children,” Hos. 5:7. (3) She is not only a “barren” but “a desolate woman.” In view of the wickedness of the nation God forsook her and in wrath hid His face from her (vs. 7, 8), so that in verse 6 she is called “a woman forsaken;” and, owing to this forsaken condition, in verse 4 it is designated by way of reproach a “widowhood” (a condition, notwithstanding the assertions of some, that can never be applied to the Church). How amply this has been fulfilled is evident from Scripture (Ezek. 16:36, etc., Hos. 2, etc.), and from history. Down to the present day she is yet in her “widowhood,” yet “a woman forsaken,” yet “judged as a woman that breaketh wedlock.” Right here the reader may pause and ask, if all this has been so minutely fulfilled that it is a matter of record in the languages of the earth, will not the remainder, also asserted of this very “forsaken woman,” be verified? Certainly!

Obs. 3. Who is this “married wife” that is contrasted with the other? For two women are spoken of, “the barren woman” and “the married wife,” and some things are asserted of the one that do not pertain to the other. If our line of argument has been noticed, there will be no difficulty in recognizing this “married wife.” After “the barren woman,” i.e. Jewish nation, had forsaken her husband, and God had, owing to her sinfulness, forsaken her, God takes to Himself another wife, here called “the married wife” to distinguish her from “the desolate” one. If we open the Bible and read what follows the rejection of the Jewish nation and its miserable fall, we find that God during this period of abandonment proceeds to raise up a seed unto Abraham of those, out of all nations, who fear and obey God. (See Prop. on election and continued election.) It is this seed, this nation thus gathered to whom the Kingdom in a high, special sense is to be given—i.e. they also will be married, i.e., enter into this Theocratical relationship with God. This seed is said in the New Test. in its aggregate (not before) to form “the chaste virgin,” “the Bride” that is to be married just previous to the ushering in of the Millennial age at the Sec. Advent of Christ, 2 Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:27; Rev. 19:7, 9. This too, of course, as intimated in the text, and as necessarily included in our argument, occurs here on earth previous to the restoration of the Jews. It is a matter of profound admiration to see how harmoniously the spirit speaks, even in the most delicate of figures, through inspired men separated by intervening centuries. There is a marriage, i.e., such a Theocratic affinity, consummated at the coming of the Bridegroom, which gives the saints the inexpressible privilege and honor of reigning with Christ. In Gal. 4 the apostle contrasts these two women. Those gathered out of this dispensation are “the children of promise,” i.e. inherit with Abraham, and they are the children of the New Jerusalem, she being “our mother,” i.e. when the New Jerusalem comes down from God out of heaven, they are identified with her, etc. But, on the other hand, the earthly Jerusalem is the mother of those in bondage, i.e. of those who are now “forsaken.” The earthly Jerusalem is the central figure of the power and glory of the Jewish nation, and this runs its allotted course now in bondage and in cruel subjection, now grievously “desolate,” etc. (But will she remain thus?) The New Jerusalem is the central figure of the power and glory of this gathered seed, who in this married state inherit the promises that “the barren woman,” owing to her unfaithfulness, has forfeited, viz., that of being specially associated with Christ as Rulers, etc., in this Theocratic Kingdom. The reader’s indulgence for proof is asked until we come to the Propositions pertaining to the reign, etc., of these saints, showing that, although identified with it, yet they are a separate distinguished body in point of honor and privileges from the restored Jewish nation. The apostle’s quotation from Isa. (Gal. 4:27), and immediate reference to inheriting, indicates that his eye of faith was

directed to this "married wife." What follows in Isaiah's prediction is evidence of the correctness of our deductions, preserving a connected series in the order of events.*

Obs. 4. For, this "barren," "forsaken," "desolate," and "widowed" one is again reconciled. In the fourth and fifth verses it is said, that she shall forget her shame and her widowhood because "thy Maker is thy Husband," and a mighty increase of children is to result from God thus again receiving her back. Therefore, most impressively it is stated: "For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer." This reception and subsequent union, under the figure of marriage, is delineated in many places. To keep within the shadow of the same, men may argue that God will utterly forget His marriage vows most solemnly given when He took to wife this nation, but, however unfaithful she has been, God, as the prophets testify, is faithful to His own. Hence the intense beauty and force of Hos. 2, where, after describing the desolation and sorrows of this "barren woman;" after declaring "she is not my wife, neither am I her husband," the prophet goes on to predict that the day is coming when God shall again "speak comfortably unto her" and "she shall sing as in the days of her youth," and she shall "call me Ishi," i.e. My Husband (marg. reading), for "I will betroth thee unto me forever," etc. So Isa. 49:13–17 declares how the Lord will comfort this afflicted one, although she, "Zion said: The Lord hath forsaken me and my Lord hath forgotten me." The reply comes: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me. Thy children shall make haste; thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee." God cannot, will not forsake this woman, but intends, such is His purpose, to restore her to favor. A thousand predictions proclaim it. As if purposely to meet the objection that some urge, viz., that this woman is put away forever (Isa. 50:1), God asks of the Jews at Babylon: "Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement whom I have put away, or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you? Behold for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away." Keeping in view that the mother is Jerusalem (Gal. 4, etc.), we may ask to-day, where is that bill of perpetual divorcement? It has no existence; it never was given; the estrangement that God Himself asserts arose not from such a divorcement, but was owing to their transgressions. The bond is indissoluble, although a temporary separation intervenes. If man desires to see in this matter the most amazing condescension and unalterable love in God, let him ponder well Jer. 3:1–22, and notice that "the bill of divorce" in the case of Israel is only a temporary one, and is the fruit of her own doings, verse 20, and that a blessed reconciliation will yet be effected.

Obs. 5. Notice the increase of this "barren woman." The most astounding assertion is made which those not conversant with Scripture will regard as contrary to fact, viz., that the children of "the barren woman" shall be more than the children of "the married wife." This is the Divine purpose. (1) In reference to "the married wife," i.e. the elect, royal, chosen body of kings and priests, gathered out and associated with Christ, no such increase as is attributed to "the barren woman" can be ascribed, seeing that they are glorified saints of whom Jesus Himself tells us that they "neither marry nor are given in marriage." They compose a definite, determined number to which none are to be added and from which none are to be taken. Their peculiar relationship to Jesus as co-heirs, their identity with Him in acts of judgeship, etc., is well represented under the figure of marriage, the most intimate and endearing of earthly relations. But of this marriage relation no increase of children can be predicated, seeing that its number is fixed. This wife is the inheritor of the Kingdom, i.e. exalted to actual possession of its governmental power, etc., with her Bridegroom Jesus Christ, and "flesh and blood" cannot inherit or attain to this power. (Prop. on Reign, etc.) Besides this, the idea of the original may be that "the married wife" with all the increase which such an elect body has attained to, although in the aggregate large, is comparatively small when contrasted with that which shall characterize the Jewish nation when restored. That is, "the married wife" are "the few" saved when compared with "the many" that shall experience God's favor in, and through, this "barren woman." (2) "The Barren Woman" being restored, as we have seen, shall have a wonderful increase of children, so that she is called on to enlarge her habitation to receive them. There is a remarkable contrast given by the Spirit for the wise, who compare Scripture, through David in Ps. 113. For, at the very time that God's poor and needy are remembered "to set them with princes even with the princes of His people" (which only occurs when this Kingdom and Mill. era is ushered in), it is added: "He making the barren woman (Jewish nation) to keep house (marg. reading: to dwell in a house, i.e. the Theocratic-Davidic house, as covenant calls it the 'house') and to be a joyful mother of children." The same idea of increase is conveyed under another form in Isa. 49. After describing the restoration of this nation, calling on heaven and earth to sing for the comfort and mercy extended to "the forsaken" one, the prophet predicts: "Thy waste and thy desolate places and the land of thy destruction shall even now be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed thee up shall be far away. The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me; give place to me that I may dwell. Then shalt thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children and am desolate, a captive and removing to and fro," etc. Many and precious are the predictions relating to this increase, and if the reader will peruse such as are contained in Isa. chs. 60, 61, 62, etc., he may then form a faint idea how unexampled, vast, and glorious it will be. Notwithstanding those plain predictions, such is the unbelief of many, that it almost seems necessary to send again the angel to say, Zech. 2:3–5, "Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls for the multitude of men and cattle therein," and as if to check such lack of faith, "for I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her." Well may infidels smile and laugh, when professed believers, learned men, not

seeing that the restoration always connected with it looks beyond the first one from Babylon, narrow such magnificent promises of the Almighty God down into a dwarfed, enfeebled fulfilment in the past. No! the early Church, the pious Jews, regarded by many as very “weak” and possessing only “the germ” of truth in “a materialistic husk,” had at least nobler conceptions of God’s promises and a higher estimate of His faithfulness than to emasculate the Word in this manner.

Obs. 6. Let the foundation of the promise of this increase be especially noticed. After describing this increase, and that He shall again be her husband, we have the unalterable determination of God to bring it to pass: “For this is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee.” This fully accords with Ezek. 16, where, after being informed how God married Jerusalem (i.e. established His Theocratic relationship there), how she became barren, how she was forsaken and punished for her sins, it is finally added: “Nevertheless (i.e. notwithstanding the past) I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant,” i.e. He will make manifest that “the sure mercies of David” are, as David calls it, “an everlasting covenant”—i.e. one that cannot be broken or altered. Then the prophet continues, filled with the Spirit to meet objections: “And I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord. That thou mayest remember and be confounded and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord.” Now, if we turn to the basis of this promise in the covenant made with Abraham, we read of an increase which has never yet been realized in the history of God’s people. Thus, Gen. 22:16, 17, “By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is upon the sea shore, and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.” So Gen. 15:5; 13:16; 26:4; 28:14; 32:12. These are not proverbial sayings, as some imagine, indicating simply a multitude, etc., for occurring in a covenant sworn to by God they become intensified. They have not been fulfilled in the Jewish nation thus far, for (1) this increase is to take place when the seed Christ inherits the land; (2) it is connected with a period after a certain restoration to their land; (3) after the Jewish nation had passed through its brief period of prosperity, etc., and it had begun to enter upon its desolate condition, the increase founded on this covenant is still predicted by the prophets as future. Thus, e.g. Hos. 1:10, “Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea which cannot be measured nor numbered, and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God.” (4) Isa. 49:17, 18 says that if the nation had hearkened to the commandments of God, “thy seed also had been as the sand and the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof,” showing that disobedience deferred its fulfilment. (5) That it is future, notwithstanding the partial fulfilment under the Mosaic and present dispensations appears from what Jer. 33:22 mentions. For, giving a Millennial description, vividly portraying the glory of the coming Davidic Kingdom, and testifying that “the covenant” which God made cannot be broken, he appends: “As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the seas measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant and the Levites that minister unto me.” (6) In the Mill. delineations we have repeated assurances that after the restoration of this “barren woman” this increase shall be so great that, Ezek. 36:10, 11, 37, 38, “I will multiply men upon you, all the house of Israel, even all of it; and the cities shall be inhabited and the wastes shall be builded. And I will multiply upon you man and beast; and they shall increase and bring fruit; and I will settle you after your old estates and will do better unto you than at your beginnings; and ye shall know that I am the Lord,” etc. Jer. 31:27, “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man and with the seed of beast. And it shall come to pass that like as I have watched over them to pluck up and to break down and to throw down and to destroy and to afflict, so will I watch over them to build and to plant, saith the Lord.” Who can resist such evidence as this, when the folly of spiritualizing away such promises is properly, and perhaps designedly, checkmated by the direct allusions to the multiplication of beasts—creation itself participating in these times of restoration? Who can resist the declaration made by God in Isa. 49:3–8, or in Isa. 27:6, etc., unless he is regardless of what specially belongs to the nation as such, and appropriates to Gentile nations what is not promised to them.

Obs. 7. The stability of this promise to “the Barren Woman” of increase is worthy of attention. (1) Her Husband is no ordinary one; He is (v. 5) “the Lord of Hosts” and her “Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall He be called.” He will verify His own promises. (2) The assurance given (v. 8) that the long period of Jewish tribulation and desolation, embracing century after century of “widowhood,” is only “for a moment,” i.e. a brief space of time, when compared with “the everlasting kindness” that she shall experience when again reconciled to her Husband. Thus we have again indicated the abiding covenanted relationship of this nation. (3) His covenant, as firm and immovable as that contracted with Noah, v. 9, is thus made with this “barren woman.” (4) His covenant with her more enduring than the mountains and hills, v. 10. (5) He is not merely bound to her by a promise, which in itself is sure, but by an oath, v. 9. This oath is found originally in the Abrahamic covenant, commencing (Gen. 22:16), “By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord,” etc. It is adverted to in Luke 1:73; Heb. 6:13, 14, etc. This marriage relation is confirmed by what Paul calls an “immutable thing.” The same oath was made to David, Psalms. 89, 132, etc. Therefore, we may well say with Micah 7:20, who, after stating the restoration of this “barren woman,” remarks: “Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob and the mercy to Abraham, which Thou hast sworn unto our Fathers from the days of old.” (6) All things are under the control of this husband, vs. 16 and 17, and no

adverse events can prevent this reconciliation. His power is superior to the performance of the promise, and therefore this “barren woman” is exhorted, v. 4, “Fear not,” etc. She has no cause for apprehension, “For the Lord of Hosts has purposed, and who shall disannul it? and His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?” Therefore God says so emphatically by Jer. 31:35–37.

Obs. 8. The period when this reconciliation with “the barren,” “desolate,” and “forsaken woman” is effected. (1) It is after the nation is gathered, v. 7, restored nationally to Jerusalem and the Holy Land; for the Theocratic relationship, the marriage is restored, and then, as shown, the increase will be witnessed. (2) It is after “the married wife” is elevated to the New Jerusalem state, after the New Jerusalem (the one Mother) has completed the elect number of her children, that “the barren woman” is reinstated and has her promised abundance of children. This most accurately corresponds—showing the Divine Spirit revealing these precious things—with the condition of things in Rev., when the nations that are saved, after the erection, etc., of the New Jerusalem state, walk in the light of it and kings of the earth bring their honor and glory to it. This “barren woman” is to rejoice in the blessings added by this New Jerusalem state as appears from vs. 11, 12, 13, etc., compared with Rev. 21 and 22, and Isa. 60, etc. (3) It is when the Mill. age is ushered in; which is already confirmed by the passages quoted. (4) The extraordinary versatility of the Spirit in exhibiting this matter is seen in Hos. 3. A remarkable command is given to the prophet. He is ordered to take a woman, an adulteress, forsaken but still loved. This was a type of the Jewish nation, forsaken but still “beloved,” “according to the love of the Lord toward the children of Israel;” and the action of the prophet is symbolic, indicating that God also is waiting to receive “an adulteress,” forsaken woman. Then the direct application of the symbolic representation follows: viz., that Israel shall thus be forsaken “many days” having no Theocratic relationship with her God, but that “afterward” they shall again return and fully realize it in “the Lord their God and David their King.” That is, the woman, i.e. nation, guilty of sin, and long punished for the same, shall be reinstated in the old relationship that she sustained to her Husband. And this, as parallel passages prove, is when the Jews are restored, and Mill. blessedness is introduced by the setting up of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom. (5) This is done at the time, as we have previously shown, when a confederation is gathered against this “barren woman.” For, in verse 15, it is said: “Behold they shall surely gather together, but not by me; whosoever shall gather together against thee shall fall for thy sake.” Just such a confederation arises and endeavors to prevent the Jewish nation from reoccupying their city and land, and, as here intimated, meets with a complete overthrow. This sufficiently identifies the period of reinstation to Divine favor. Prov. 15:25 will yet be fulfilled (comp. Props. 161 and 163).

Obs. 9. Briefly, as it also serves to fill out the identification of this “barren woman,” we may regard the altered condition of this woman when thus reconciled. She was forsaken, desolate, in reproachful widowhood, but now again in intimate relationship with her former husband clad as He will clothe her; fed as He will feed her; dwelling as He will place her; she is to sing and break forth into singing (so also Zeph. 3:14; Isa. 49:13; Isa. 12:6; Zech. 2:10, etc). She shall also inherit (v. 3) the Gentiles, thus indicating her national supremacy over all other nations. (Prop. 114). She shall be “far from oppression,” she “shall not fear,” etc., as she once endured and suffered. “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment shalt thou condemn.” All her children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be their peace, etc.

Obs. 10. If we take all these particulars, and see how minutely they are given; how all the prophets, separated by ages, so accurately preserve the shading of the most delicate figures to teach who this woman is, what her present and then her future condition, how distinguished, etc., it seems almost incredible that the wisdom of man, so freely exercised over these things, should, as in multitudes of instances, cast them aside as “Jewish,” etc., just as if God was not the Husband of a Jewish wife; just as if God was like unto man and could and would forever, against His protestations solemnly given to the contrary, break His marital relations.

Obs. 11. With the Spirit insisting upon the unalterable covenant relationship that this “barren woman” sustains to her Husband, what folly it is for churches, religious organizations, fanatical bodies, and Gentile nations to assume that they compose this Barren Woman, and are to exhibit this increase, etc. It would be, if not so fearful a perversion of Scripture, simply ridiculous. Need we wonder that the Spirit complains of the lack of faith that men shall manifest, when such unwarranted pretensions are seriously set forth, upheld, and defended?*

Obs. 12. The observant student will not fail to notice the Oneness that exists between the Father and the Son in this marriage relation (i.e. Theocratical) with this woman. What is said of God is directly asserted of His Son; and when the Holy One of Israel occupies the Theocratic-Davidic throne, restoring the ancient relationship, it is positively asserted that God does this for the Divine Ruler, the God who formerly condescended to act as Israel’s earthly Ruler is again favoring the nation in and through David’s Son. This might easily be developed into a strong argument for the divinity of Jesus Christ.

Obs. 13. If the two women thus married, i.e. received in Theocratic connection, are thus properly distinguished the one from the other, and their mutual standing is observed and discriminated in the Coming Kingdom, new light is thrown on many of the more obscure allusions to the same in the Word. Thus, e.g. in Ps. 45, where the heart of the Psalmist (marg. reading) “boils or bubbles up a good matter” “things touching the King,” he describes the beauty of this King’s appearance, the dreadful overthrow of His enemies, the establishment of His throne, and then we have a distinction made between several women. For we have (1) “the Queen in gold of Ophir (Justin, in garments of gold, variegated,) standing upon thy right hand;” (2) “King’s daughters (i.e. other nations) were among thy honorable women;” (3) the King’s daughter, her clothing of wrought gold; (4) the virgins that accompany her; (5) the

daughter of Tyre. This corresponds with what has been said, viz., that one, “the married wife,” sustains a peculiar relation to this King, and that the Jewish nation is also restored, glorified through her, and that other nations will acknowledge the same and minister to her, and this is after this King’s hand has performed the “terrible things” upon His “enemies.”*

Obs. 14. When this marriage relation is renewed with “the barren” one, the King Himself will be present, and tender Himself, too, in a way that will prove irresistibly attractive, as David and others represent. Comp. Zeph. 3; Isa. 12:6, etc. The happiness and glory of the once desolate woman are invariably connected with an abiding, accessible King dwelling with her.

Obs. 15. Will the reader pause and reflect to what special privilege and honor we are invited in this dispensation, viz., to an identification with and participation in the blessings of “the married wife.” She, indeed, will number less than that of the other one when God’s purposes are all carried out, but her lot is the more exalted and ennobling, as her “Mother” is the greater and nobler.*

Obs. 16. If it is our happy lot to be identified with this “married wife,” then we shall see with our own eyes the fulfilment of this prophecy respecting “the barren woman.” Now we behold her forsaken; then we shall see this same desolate woman restored to favor, re-entering her married state, bringing forth her increase, revelling in happiness and glory. But we shall not only see it, but even be employed with Christ as instruments in promoting and extending the “great mercies,” “the everlasting kindness” showed unto her. May God indeed grant that our eyes may see her “fair colored stones,” her “sapphire foundations,” her “agate windows,” her “gates of carbuncles,” her “borders of pleasant stones,” and the unspeakable “peace” of “her children.” The student must never forget that the New Jerusalem state and that of this woman are inseparable at the period of her restoration; the former adding to the glory of the latter, being virtually the outgrowth, the first-fruits, of her covenanted relationship.

PROPOSITION 119. The Kingdom of God in the Millennial descriptions is represented in restoring all the forfeited blessings.

Attention is only called to the fact, that, explain it as we may, when this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom is represented in the portrayal of the Millennial era as existing, it embraces a restoration of blessings forfeited by sin. The prophets instead of separating that age from this restitution, making the latter, as many suppose, a result to follow afterward, distinctly unite them. Now, this, as the argument thus far demands, is requisite to preserve the Divine order in the re-establishment of the Kingdom, seeing that it involves a resurrected, immortal David’s Son, resurrected and immortal Ruler, and the fulfilment of covenant promises designed when accomplished to remove evil, sorrow, suffering, etc.

Obs. 1. Three cautions are in place here: (1) Not to disconnect what the prophets have linked together as belonging to the same period of time here on earth. (2) Not to imagine that everything mentioned is to be instantaneously or quickly performed—time being required for the full realization of what may be commenced at the beginning of this age. The exceeding brevity and sometimes obscure allusions admonish us to be guarded in our deductions. (3) Not to force an interpretation which is directly opposed by other Scriptures, and then leave the same without the least attempt at reconciliation. Thus e.g. in Isa. 2:1–4, we read: “Neither shall they learn war any more,” etc., upon which Alexander (so Barnes and others) comments: “War ceases, the very knowledge of the art is lost,” etc. But as these commentators apply Isa. 2:1–4 to the Church before the Sec. Advent of Christ, they fail to inform us what to do with the passages which teach, positively, that wars exist, more or less, down to the very Advent itself, thus leaving no room for such a period of time as Isaiah describes. Such interpretation is not only misleading, but it darkens precious truth, and inspires hopes that misguide, and is the result of not regarding the general scope of prophecy.*

Obs. 2. As it is our purpose merely to show how the Spirit locates the performance of these things (preparatory to following Propositions), a brief summary of some of them must suffice. 1. Salvation is repeatedly predicated of this period. Indeed, the burden of prophecy concerning this era is Salvation, abundant and most glorious. God then is the Saviour—the Holy One of Israel is the Saviour, and Salvation comes to His people. And such is the significance of it, that it stands forth as the Salvation, the predicted, pre-eminent Salvation. Great is the number of passages bearing this impression, only a few of which we cite, sufficient to convey our idea, viz., such as Isa. 12:2; Isa. 49:26; Isa. 26:1; Isa. 35:4; Jer. 23:6; Jer. 30:7; Ezek. 37:23, etc. When this Mill. day comes, then, Isa. 25:9, “it shall be said in that day, Lo this is our God; we have waited for Him and He will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation.” Salvation is likewise ascribed to the Sec. Advent, as e.g. Heb. 9:28, etc. 2. Then is verified the promise (Gen. 3:15) that “the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head” (comp. Rom. 16:20 and Rev. 20:2, 3), Satan being bound, and the victory gained over him, all evil capable of injuring God’s people is removed, and this freedom from Satanic power is an exultant portion of these Mill. descriptions. So complete, too, is the same that no sorrow, crying, etc., is to be experienced. 3. The world beholds a change of Princes. Compare e.g. John 14:30 with Rev. 11:15, when the sovereignty of this world is taken from “the Prince of this world” and given to Christ in open manifestation. 4. The original sovereign dominion over all given to Adam at Creation (Gen. 1:28) and forfeited by sin, is restored by the Second Adam (Ps. 8:6, comp. with Heb. 2:8; Dan. 7, etc.). 5. The judges and counsellors shall be restored as at first, Isa. 1:26; and they will be righteous, Isa. 32:1; Isa.

60:17; Jer. 30:21. 6. The righteous dead will be raised up, so that death is swallowed up in victory, Isa. 25, etc. 7. The saints shall participate in the dominion over the earth, Dan. 7:21, 22; Rev. 20:4; Isa. 32:1, etc. 8. This divine rule so entirely subjects the world that all enemies are destroyed, Zech. 14; Dan. 7, etc. 9. Christ is the King, Micah 4:1–7; Zech. 9:10, etc. 10. War will cease and universal peace be experienced, Isa. 2; Micah 4, etc. 11. There will be a general diffusion of revealed truth, Isa. 11:9; Isa. 25:7, etc. 12. Universal intelligence will characterize the people, Isa. 54:13; Jer. 31:34. 13. Holiness is remarkably exhibited in all, Isa. 60:21; Isa. 52:1; Zech. 14:20, 21. 14. The Jews are to be gathered from all places of their dispersion and enjoy their land of old, Isa. 11; Zech. 8, etc. 15. The Jews will be aided and joined by the Gentiles, Isa. 49:22; Ezek. 48:22, 23; Zech. 8:20–23, etc. 16. The Jewish nation sustains a pre-eminency, Micah 4:8; Zech. 12:6–9, etc. 17. The Jewish nation a great blessing to other nations, Zech. 8:13; Rom. 11:26, 27, etc. 18. Jerusalem shall be the metropolis, Zech. 14:17–21; Isa. 24:23, etc. 19. The Spirit is marvellously poured out, Ezek. 11:19; Joel 2:28–32, etc. 20. All things shall be used as consecrated to God, Zech. 14:20; Isa. 23:18, etc. 21. The Jewish nation no longer divided, Isa. 11:13, 14; Jer. 50:4, etc. 22. There will be an increase of revelation, Joel 2:28; Isa. 2:3, etc. 23. A mighty increase of population will be witnessed, Isa. 49:19, 20; Jer. 30:18–20, etc. 24. Great rejoicing and praise owing to restoration, Jer. 33:11; Isa. 51:3, etc. 25. Great prosperity evidencing increased progress in all that tends to promote the welfare and happiness of man, Zech. 8:12; Isa. 60, etc. 26. Jerusalem, rebuilt and the metropolis, shall never be destroyed, etc., Jer. 31:38–40; Joel 3:17, etc. 27. A renewal of earth will be experienced, Isa. 65:17; Isa. 66:22, etc. 28. Perfect union will exist, Isa. 52:8; Isa. 49:23, etc. 29. Riches will abound, Isa. 60:5, 9, 17, etc. 30. There will be no famine, Ezek. 36:29–35, etc. 31. Sickness will be removed, Isa. 33:24, etc. 32. Happy old age, bride and bridegroom rejoicing, boys and girls playing, deaf, blind, lame, etc., restored, fear absent—in brief, all the blessings that mortal man can properly desire are embraced in these portrayals, Zech. 8; Isa. 35; Isa. 33, etc. All these things are directly, by the Prophets, assigned to this very period of time.

Obs. 3. But several particulars are owing to their being so generally overlooked, worthy of more extended mention. 1. The fruitfulness of the land, Amos 9:13; Isa. 29:17; Ezek. 34:26, 27; Joel 3:18; Isa. 35:1–9; Hos. 2:21; Isa. 54:12, 13; Jer. 31:5, 6; Isa. 60:13–17; Zech. 8:12; Isa. 65:25; Ezek. 36:8, 29, 30, 35, etc. This has been the object of ridicule by some (and we might quote very unjust things ascribed to our view), just as if the earth in this respect was not now placed under a curse (Gen. 3:18, 19), as if such a deliverance from the curse were not desirable to man, and as if God had not by direct promises of renewal determined to bring back the land to the Eden-like state (Isa. 51:3) forfeited by sin. If this curse is not removed, then, as many theologians have well observed, one of the blessings forfeited is not restored, and Redemption in so far would be incomplete. The Bible, however, presents no such imperfect deliverance, and hence all reliable systems of theology have our feature, more or less prominently, in some way incorporated. The unfairness toward us is manifested by refusal in some to accept of the discrimination which we make, viz., that this fruitfulness, planting, etc., is designed for the nations in the flesh (which all Millenarians expressly teach), and persistently ascribing to our view, what we deny, viz., that all relating to this fruitfulness, culture of the earth, etc., is purposed for the glorified saints. 2. Great miracles will be performed at that time, Isa. 11:15, 16; Zech. 14:4; Isa. 27:12; Micah 7:15; Isa. 19:20; Micah 2:12, 13, etc. Indeed, the entire current of prediction impresses the idea that the most astounding, marvellous events shall be then witnessed—in the removal of enemies; in the restoration of the Jews; in the resurrection and glorification of saints; in the uniting, as declared to Nathanael (John 1:51), of the heavenly with the earthly, so that the angels of God shall be seen ascending and descending; in the fulfilment of the promise (John 14:12) that the believers of Christ shall perform the miraculous works of Jesus. Having shown that this Kingdom, in the nature of the case, demanded miraculous interference (Prop. 6), that the miracles of Christ are an earnest (Prop. 7) that these things are predicted, it can be readily seen that the persons engaged in this work, Jesus Christ and His associated glorified brethren, with the mighty angels, are abundantly able to verify all these predictions. Therefore, mighty and supernatural as the work is, our faith is constantly urged to steadfastness by the appeal that God will perform it, either directly or by imparting the ability. 3. The original grant of land to the Jews will then also be confirmed, Gen. 15:13–21; Ex. 23:31; Deut. 11:22, and extended. The boundaries given are the Mediterranean, the Nile and the Euphrates; thus including places not before possessed. Some indeed (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 12) think that in David's and Solomon's reign this was the extent, but others more accurately narrow their dominion in actual possession. Whatever may be the fact in reference to past fulfilment, three things are very evident, (a) that a portion was not held by the Jews, excepting by a precarious tributary arrangement; (b) that it was only thus possessed for a short time, and hence is no ways commensurate with the promise; (c) that the predictions relating to the future take it as a matter of course that at the future restoration this will be effected, seeing that all the covenant promises are then to be realized. 4. In connection with the outward manifestation of the Kingdom, the Millennial predictions indicate the greatest outpouring and cultivation of the graces of the Spirit. Indeed, all spiritual blessings are included; none that is desirable is excluded, for while not only an abundance of joy, peace, etc., in the Holy Ghost is given, others are added, by faith giving place to sight, hope to realization. All Millenarian writers of the early Church, as well as modern, have held to the spirituality connected with this Kingdom, and freely expressed their hopes of "communion and unity of spiritual things with the holy angels" (Irenæus), etc.* 5. The New Jerusalem blessings, the blessings of the restoration, etc., are inseparably connected in the Millennial descriptions. This is readily seen by comparing e.g. Isa., chs. 25, or 54, or 60, with Rev. 21 and 22. God has thus joined them together, and we cannot, without violence, separate them. But this will be explained hereafter. 6. The Kingdom itself will be a great blessing over the earth, being designed for this very purpose. There is a beautiful representation of this in Ps. 65, where, after declaring that God will answer the prayer of His people "by terrible things in righteousness," He will then enrich the earth "with the river of God which is full of water" (river being

representative of Kingdom—thus used) so that “the year” (viz., “the year of the redeemed,” Isa. 63:4, i.e. the Sabbatical year) is “crowned with goodness” and the earth with “fatness.” 7. Language itself has been corrupted by sin, for the confusion of tongues and consequent dispersion of mankind followed (Gen. 11) an exhibition of pride and arrogance; it is therefore reasonable to suppose that an era which is again to bind the nations together and to bring them, through representatives, etc., to a central point of union and worship, should restore the forfeited unity of language. This seems to be intimated in Zeph. 3:9; Isa. 32:4, etc. At least, we have a significant instance given (Acts 2:4) which shows, that as the Spirit is also marvellously poured out in this period, He can impart what power He pleases over the use of language. 8. Taking the language in its literal aspect, there appears to be described the intervention of miraculous power in behalf of diseases, as e.g. even so obscure an allusion as Isa. 53:4, 5, is quoted Matt. 8:17 as applicable to the removal of bodily infirmities. Having such a warrant, the plainer predictions can scarcely be applied in any other manner. 9. Christ “shall be a priest upon His throne,” Zech. 6:13, being a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (Ps. 110:4). This is essential to our faith in order to preserve the consistency of the design of this Kingdom over the nations of the earth. Hence all Millenarians accept of it as a cardinal point in their system over against the Popish view, which makes this priesthood to cease at the end of this age. 10. A materialistic element pervades the Millennial descriptions, chiefly confined to the Jewish and Gentile nations, and the earth. This is the rock upon which so many strike, regarding it inconsistent with the future state of the righteous, etc. Aside from, what we have stated concerning the humanity of Jesus, how the Kingdom is promised to David’s Son, evincing His continued humanity, although glorified—aside from the continued humanity of the saints (although also glorified), and their reign here on earth, it is sufficient for the present to say, that if the Millennial predictions lacked this materialistic feature, a very important and essential one would be missing in Redemption. Is it not true, that the materialistic Eden was forfeited by sin, that man, composed of soul, spirit, and body, is fallen under the curse, that a material creation groans under the same; and is it not also true that if there is no deliverance of this material portion, Redemption in so far is incomplete? Extremes are here to be avoided; gross materialism on the one hand, and a general or universal spiritualism on the other. If God pronounced a material Eden very good; if it is linked with the most glorious period of Christ’s reign; if it is united with the highest spiritual good; if it has been assumed by God Himself to bring Himself condescendingly in contact with humanity, then surely we ought to be guarded, lest in ultra-spiritualism or in ultra-materialism we mar the truth of God, bring reproach upon His work, and diminish the perfection of Redemption.

Obs. 4. Take all these particulars (others will hereafter be mentioned in detail), and see how they are identified with the Kingdom of God as it shall exist in the future. Receiving the Divine utterances and placing them together, it is found that a glorious Redemption is to be experienced at that time. Before this era is entered into, these blessings cannot be realized; and therefore we find in the predictions relating to this present age or dispensation no such forfeited blessings are restored. This is seen in numerous instances. Thus e.g. the parables of the tares and net indicate it; the prophecy of Jesus in Matt. 24, which gives an epitome of Jewish history to the ending of the times of the Gentiles, and to the Advent, has no such Millennium introduced; in the reply of Paul to the Thessalonians respecting the nearness of the Advent of Jesus he gives, as a distinctive intervening mark, the spirit and continued progress of the Apostasy and Antichrist, but no Millennial era; the prophet Daniel delineates Gentile domination as existing down to the Coming of the Son of Man followed by Millennial dominion, etc., which was not verified at the First Advent, seeing that the same domination continued after that Advent and still continues. So carefully does the Spirit corroborate our position, that in no case, chronologically or in any other way, is the least encouragement given to anticipate the re-bestowal of forfeited blessings anterior to the ushering in of this Kingdom, and accompanying Millennial bliss, by the Advent of Jesus Christ.

Obs. 5. The folly of making the Millennial era one that is past. The theory of Grotius, Prideaux, Vint, Bush, etc., which dates the beginning of this age from the overthrow of Paganism under Constantine (A.D. 323); that of Hengstenberg and others, dating it from Charlemagne (A.D. 800), that of Popish doctors ascribing its rise to the preaching or death of Christ, to the destruction of Jerusalem, etc.; in brief, all theories that locate this period in the past do so by a palpable violation of the order laid down in Scripture, and of facts in history, which cannot by any fair interpretation be made to accord with a fulfilment of prediction.* Therefore it happens, that the ablest writers in opposition to our views frankly concede that the Millennial era is still future. Thus e.g. Fairbairn (On Prophecy, p. 432) unhesitatingly places it in the future, and regards “as utterly futile all the attempts that have been made to accommodate the terms of the description to any period in the past.” This is emphatically true, for during the past no such blessings as the Millennial descriptions portray have been realized; persecution, trial, suffering, etc., have, more or less, characterized the Church’s history. Even if we confine ourselves to the statement in Rev. 20:1–7 (which is only a very small portion of the whole), the world has never yet witnessed such a binding of Satan, such a restraintment of his influences and power, such an exemption of nations from his deception, such a resurrection and reigning with Christ, such a resurrection of the rest of the dead, etc., as is therein described. Simple truth requires us to say, that any one who can ascribe to an era of time swarming with heresies, outrages against truth, superstitions the most vile, etc., the characteristics of predicted Millennial blessedness, whatever his ability and learning, must certainly be fettered and prejudiced by some system which makes such a revolting transposition necessary. And the application of prophecy in this direction is sufficient evidence that the system of interpretation which fosters it is radically wrong.

Obs. 6. The same is true of the theory which ascribes this Millennial period to the present dispensation. For it only requires a survey of the blessings connected with this era, and two things follow: (1) that they cannot possibly be realized in this dispensation by the use of present instrumentalities, seeing that to produce them demands superadded power, etc.; (2) that such Millennial happiness is

inconsistent with the predicted state of the Church and of the world during the existence of this period down to the ending of it. How can we reconcile e.g. the mixed condition, state of suffering, war, etc., expressly affirmed to be characteristics of this dispensation to its very close, with the purity, freedom from evil, peace, etc., of the promised Millennium?

Obs. 7. This also teaches the absurdity of totally ignoring the subject, as if it were a species of exaggerated human prediction. It is true, that such an era, "a golden age," has been desired by man in various ages. Writers quote Plato, Plutarch, Virgil, Seneca, Chinese ancient books, Persian Magi, Mexicans, etc., even including rude and uncultivated nations, Indians and barbarians, who either locate such an era in the past or in the future, and from this argue that it is a sentiment common to man, and that the Bible falls into the same general current of uninspired desire. But they forget the great and unmeasurable difference between these heathen utterances and that of the Word of God. The former are disconnected, incoherent, individual expressions, often obscure, etc., while the latter forms part of a regular system, maintains a consistent and regular connection in it, is necessary to the Divine Plan of Redemption, and is given in an unbroken prediction from the earliest to the latest prophets. The Bible would be incomplete without it. For, beginning with the fall of man and revealing the manner of man's recovery from the results of such a fall, it ends appropriately with a restoration of the forfeited blessings. Besides this, the truthfulness of its Millennial predictions is abundantly verified by ten thousand incidentals, which have been, and are, experienced in the unfolding of the Divine Purpose tending toward the ultimate fulfilment. Thus e.g. the history and present condition of the Jewish nation; the times of the Gentiles; the rise, progress, etc., of other nations, as Persian, Grecian, Roman, Turkish, etc.; the calling of the Gentiles; the Christian Church in its conflicts; the personal experience of believers, etc.—all these, and more, are so many corroborating evidences and testimonies that distinguish the Bible Millennium from all others, seeing that the same prophets also have predicted all these. God has not left Himself without witness; and it is only by persistently closing our eyes to existing facts, prophesied thousands of years ago, that we can escape God's manifested interest in sustaining our faith. To deny all this requires about as much assurance and love of singularity as it did in the philosophers who, against their senses and laws of being, denied the existence of an external world.

Obs. 8. Now let the reader consider: 1. What would this earth have become if Adam had not fallen? The answer, as given by Scripture and repeated in various theological systems, is this: it would have had no curse entailed, bringing in its train unfruitfulness, evils, sorrow, and death. It would have had the world under a Theocratic ordering, by which man would have been elevated and blessed, having direct nearness to his beneficent Ruler, etc. 2. Now look at the Millennial blessings enumerated, to be realized here on earth during the Messianic reign in the restored Theocratic Kingdom, and is there a single blessing that we can conceive of as intended for man unfallen, and which was forfeited by sin, that is not mentioned to be then realized? If the Millennium embraces "Redemption," "Salvation," and the Messiah is One that can perform His work perfectly, this is precisely the condition that we ought reasonably to anticipate. The very fact that the Millennium itself contains such inestimable blessings, honor, and glory, such a revelation of Divine majesty and goodness, such an ample deliverance from all evil and even death, such a restoration to God's favor and nearness in Theocratic ordering, is sufficient evidence that our doctrinal position is impregnable. The unity of the Word, running from the fall to the Sec. Advent, demands, prompted by covenants and promise, impelled by the plain grammatical and God-given sense, this belief, so dear to the hearts of the martyrs of the early Church.

PROPOSITION 120. This Kingdom with its Millennial blessings can only be introduced through the power of God in Christ Jesus.

This is evinced by the Propositions preceding; for the blessings are of such a nature that to produce them requires supernatural aid. Hence the introduction of this Kingdom with its attendant felicity, etc., is directly ascribed by the sacred writers to God or to His Son, Jesus Christ.*

Obs. 1. That Christ is the Introducer of the Millennial era is so abundantly asserted by the Prophets that a large number of writers, opposed to our view, still admit that Christ must come at this period spiritually in extraordinary power. Later writers finding the older spiritualistic opinions untenable, now (as e.g. Fairbairn, On Proph., pp. 469–471) frankly declare that the glory, etc., is so great and universal that extraordinary adjuncts and manifestations and gifts must be bestowed to affect it, thus confessing that the present means and instrumentalities are ineffective to produce it; and acknowledging that, by such additions, a dispensation, to all intent and purpose, in some respects different from the present one will be inaugurated. This is done too after spiritualizing the resurrection and many other blessings; how then must the matter be regarded if we allow a literal resurrection, reign, etc.—in brief, the blessings enumerated, to ensue at this time? It is utterly impossible to ascribe their reception to any other power than the direct intervention of King Jesus. It is a matter of surprise that one class of our opponents, such as Prof. Stuart, do not see that the confession that Rev. 20:1–7 teaches a literal resurrection, in the very nature of the case demands, in order to effect it, the personal Coming of Christ, or, at least, His direct intervention. Indeed, there is scarcely a blessing described but such is the amplitude of it, that we know from other Scripture that it cannot be realized until the Advent of Jesus. Thus to illustrate: take the order, peace, subjection of nations portrayed, and it is found that no such order, peace, etc., is to be found on earth until the Coming of Christ, for even preceding it,

and at the Advent, nations shall be arrayed against the truth. In the "Prize Peace Essays and Congress of Nations," Micah 4:3, is quoted and the assertion made that "the Gospel of peace" will accomplish the removal of war, restore peace, etc. But that is opposed to the spirit of the same chapter, for in the verse quoted we find that instead of the Gospel affecting this result it is done in the following manner: "He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off," and this when (v. 7) "the Lord shall reign in Mt. Zion"—when the Jews (v. 6) are restored—when the nations that are to be judged are gathered (v. 11) against Zion—and when "many people (v. 13) are to be beaten in pieces" Against such testimony in the context, which becomes overwhelming when compared with parallel passages, it is in vain to protest; it must be reverently received as of God's ordering. Hence, although materially differing in our view from Maurice, yet we can cordially accept of the title which he gives to one of his sermons: "Christ, not Christianity, the deliverance of mankind." How can the Covenant with David be possibly realized without David's Son personally comes to fulfil it? How can the Kingdom be manifested before the Coming of the King and the exertion of His power and will? How can the associated rulers with Him exercise the honorable prerogative of reigning with Him unless they are raised from the dead according to promise? In brief, all depends on that Second Advent and its resultant accompaniments.*

Obs. 2. The multitude of writers, who so persistently proclaim that the Kingdom and Millennial blessedness shall be introduced by present existing instrumentalities, are in direct opposition to Scripture. This theory will receive attention in another place (Prop. 175), and requires no special refutation here, seeing that our entire argument, as well as detached portions of it, refute its pretentious claims. It is simply amazing how pious, devoted, and able men have fallen under the influence of a theory, which causes even a very recent writer, Talmage (quoted by the Wittenberger of Nov., 1873), to say: "The way to the Millennium is through the fit and full education of woman. Social, political, and religious progress is conditioned upon her advancement," etc. This may be regarded as an extreme opinion, but the truth is, that any view that ascribes the realization of those precious predictions to any other power than that delineated so faithfully and minutely by the Prophets, is extreme and equally repulsive to the truth.*

Obs. 3. It is saddening to find how far this denial of the necessity of Christ's Second Coming for purposes of Salvation is carried in our Theological literature. Men who would shrink from any impeachment of orthodoxy, or denial of truth, array themselves against Covenant promise under the misguiding influence of supposed developed truth. Thus to illustrate: In the excellent Quarterly Review for Jan., 1874, in a one-sided Art., which totally ignores the expressed views of the confessors, the following bold assertion is made: "Christ's power to bless and save His people and protect them against the devil and sin is not in His Coming again on earth, but in His session at the right hand of God and His power there in their behalf," etc. How such language can be employed in the face of scriptural authority, is a matter of surprise. The reader can readily test the trustworthiness of the declaration by referring to these facts: (1) that His Coming is for Salvation, to complete Redemption, Heb. 9:28; Luke 21:27, 28; Rom. 8:19–23; Eph. 4:30, etc.; (2) to raise the dead, 1 Thess. 4:14, 16, etc.; (3) to change the living, 1 Cor. 15:42–44, 51–54, etc.; (4) to invest with dominion (Prop. 154); (5) to remove the wicked, His enemies, 2 Thess. 2:8–11, etc.; (6) to deliver the Jewish nation (Prop. 111, etc.); (7) to relieve creation, Rom. 8:19–21, etc.; (8) in brief, to introduce the numerous blessings which our argument evolves. It is certainly sufficient, in order to prevent our accepting such contradictory utterances, to know that He comes for Salvation; and that that Coming is represented to be the most efficacious in removing sin and overcoming Satan.*

Obs. 4. On the other hand, it is refreshing to see even some of our most unrelenting opponents acknowledge the force of Scripture representation to the extent that they also make the Sec. Advent the most desirable object of hope, ascribing to it, as the Spirit does, divine purposes of Salvation. Thus e.g. Brown (Christ's Sec. Com., chs. 1 and 2) frankly admits that Christ's Sec. Coming is "the blessed hope" of the Church—that it is "the polar star" of faith—strenuously opposing the view so prevalent that Christ comes at death, by showing, (1) that the death of the believer is grievous; (2) that the salvation without Sec. Advent is incomplete; (3) and that we otherwise dislocate Scripture, etc. Thus also let the reader refer to Barnes (Com., Phil. 3:20), and he will find this Coming again eulogized as "a glorious truth," necessary unto salvation, "identified with all our hopes," exerting blessed influences as in the early Church, etc. And, what is even hostile to their own system, seeing that they put off this Advent to the distant future, to a period after the Millennium, they exhort believers to look for it, pray for it, etc. In looking over commentaries, many of them express, under passages relating to the Advent, the duty of regarding the amelioration of the world, etc., as dependent on Christ's Coming, and not on earthly systems, existing means, etc., and yet when turning to Scripture portraying the restitution of forfeited blessings not a word is said concerning Christ's Coming to perform the work, but much is stated respecting the Church's power to accomplish the same. If it were a pleasant task, hundreds of contradictions, some the most flagrant, could be produced. Surely a system of interpretation that so freely fosters the same must be unreliable.

Obs. 5. It is objected by unbelievers that the notion that some great Saviour is to come to restore all things, is found in other religions beside the Christian. Thus e.g. Clarke (Ten Religions, p. 204, Alger's Doc. of Fut. Life, Kurtz, Sac. His., p. 273, etc.) shows that in the system of Zoroaster mention is made of a future Restorer or Saviour, who is expected to come at the end of the age, restore the dead by a resurrection, and introduce a Kingdom of untroubled happiness, etc. It is of little consequence how this idea was suggested and introduced (some contending that it sprung from original communications made by God, others that it originated with man himself, etc.), for it evidences, what was observed previously, that man feels the utter inability of existing causes to produce such a restitution, and therefore, owing to the inadequacy of present means and instrumentalities, falls back upon the supernatural.

This feeling, as we have seen, is general, and naturally arises from reflection, and a desire to secure deliverance.*

Obs. 6. The most intelligent and profound thinkers of every age declare, that the removal of the self-evident curse (explain its introduction as they may) entailed upon the earth and its inhabitants, demands higher power and greater manifestations of Deity than now are exhibited. It is admitted that physical science, however it may in some instances mitigate, cannot remove the evils; mental agencies cannot affect it, for knowledge itself may give new weapons into the hands of evil; moral agencies cannot do it, the Church cannot do it, since the most moral and pious fall beneath the curse, experiencing disease, sorrow, death, the grave, and corruption. This Kingdom—this Millennial prediction—embraces the removal of the curse. This is fully proven by the descriptions of the same. The question, by what agencies its removal is accomplished, is also satisfactorily answered. The scope of the Word asserts, that man is under the curse through his fallen condition, and that the evils arising therefrom are the work of Satan. The fact that the evils do exist is painfully evident on all sides; the manner of introduction, whatever may be said pro and con, is also sadly corroborated by the tendency to sin in man. We are only concerned with present facts, and to show how they will be changed for desired and glorious realities. The Bible points to One alone who is to produce this change, viz., to “the Christ” who is revealed expressly “to destroy the works of the devil.” The power over evil which He exhibited in His life, death, resurrection, and ascension affords the assurance, if we will only receive it, that His ability is commensurate, yea, infinitely superior to this removal of Satan’s work. Those “works of the devil” have not yet been destroyed; they exist in vast proportions over the whole earth; and so universal and far-reaching are they that not one escapes from feeling their fatal effects. Creation continues to groan and travail in pain; man, even the most devoted, continues to reap the bitter fruits of the fall, and thus we are told it will go on until the time appointed by God, when He shall send this Son of His, and through Him “destroy the works of the devil.” When the King comes to whom all power is committed in virtue of His Theocratical relationship, sustained by His covenanted descent, divine nature, sacrificial death, etc., then primarily through Him, and subordinately through His associates (deriving their power from Him), this most blessed removal of the curse will at last be experienced. Supernatural intervention, divine outpourings of judgments, the introduction of an overwhelming mass of righteousness in glorified humanity, the erection of a magnificent Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom supported by this majestic David’s Son with a corporate body of immortal, intelligent, holy rulers endued with angelic power, etc.—these things, and these alone, can bring about, as inspiration testifies, the long-hoped-for deliverance. If we were to bring together the absurd language used by many in reference to the curse and its removal, it would be deemed a caricature of the sacred promise. Indeed, so little regard is paid to the tenor of Scripture by some, that the old monkish notion is reiterated, that the removal of the curse is confined to the third heaven, thus overlooking the plain implication that the third heaven itself must then also have fallen under the curse, and thus making Redemption, so far as the earth, race, Kingdom, etc., is concerned, incomplete. The “no more curse,” as all inspired men unitedly agree, refers to this earth, and to man upon it; and hence the singular beauty and consistency of the Bible beginning with the curse and forfeited blessings and ending with happy restitution.*

Obs. 7. The Bible attributes the curse, or introduction of evil, to the fall of the first Adam, and the removal of it to the second Adam, that is “the Christ”. To this, as adverted to before, some object on cosmological and geological grounds, viz., that facts seem to establish the truth that death and natural evil existed, taking the biblical chronology, long before the fall of Adam. This would of course conflict with the view of Basil, Luther, and many of the Fathers, that the poison of the serpent, the thorn of the rose, the disease and death of man and animals, etc., were added to poisonless, thornless, diseaseless objects, as a direct result of the curse—in brief, that all evil resulted from thence, the calamitous effect of the fall. Dr. Bushnell (as in “Nature and the Supernatural,” ch. 6, 7) and others advocate “anticipative consequences,” i.e. that the introduction of evil anticipated the results which actually transpired. Others (Meth. Quart. Review., Ap., 1862, Art. 6, Dr. Clarke, Gen. 1:24) that it resulted from divine caprice, or a desire “merely to show what he could do,” making it inexplicable. Others again, as Keerl (Origen at first), Boehmen, etc., that the evil originated not from the fall of Adam, but from the fall of Satan, which may have occurred long before. Other theories, modifications of the preceding, are advanced—all evincing, however, that it is a deep and mysterious subject? But is it requisite to adopt any theory, seeing that the objection is forcible only against theological theories which have really no basis in Scripture? For, if we come to the Bible unhampered by theories respecting the fall, we find that, being only a Book designed for fallen man, and to indicate his redemption, it commences with man and incidentally introduces a sufficiency to show what relation he sustained to creation in point of time, and what was his original condition. The record itself does not say that no evil previously existed in the earth, but positively asserts that evil did exist in Satan; and it was by this evil already present, and which came in contact with man, that the Fall was induced. Death itself was in existence, seeing that it is implied by the bestowal of the tree of life in Eden by which immortality could be obtained. By the creation of Adam and Eve and the withdrawal of them in a separate, distinctive place (i.e. the Garden of Eden, thus indicative that the rest of the earth was as yet unprepared for their reception), God was designing a provision for the emancipation of the earth under the holy dominion of man, i.e. to subjugate the evil already existing and to triumph over Satan. But the unfilial conduct of our first parents made the gracious purpose of God, without preliminary training, a dangerous procedure, so that man was driven from the tree of life. Being mortal, he fell under the penalty of a law of death then in existence, and which he might have avoided by obedience; and when the Bible says that death came by man and passed upon all men, it simply refers us to the plain fact that immortality, in the tree of life, was tendered to man, and he rendering himself unfit for its reception, fell under the power of death, and with him, of course, all his descendants. The Bible and science here accord, for Eden was not the whole earth,

but only a limited space, specially fitted for man; for evil was here present before man came; the simple withdrawal of the tree of life exhibited the already existing laws of mortality; the curse itself was (1) a removal from an Eden state, (2) the sad experience and confirmation of evil into which man was driven outside of Eden. Here is no conflict. Besides this, the Bible language is so guarded, that it is also correct to insist as it does, that through the fall of Adam the race was placed under the curse, inasmuch as Adam entailed his fallen condition upon all his offspring; for, as intimated, immortality being withdrawn from fallen man, as too dangerous and exalted to be allowed, Adam and his descendants must obtain it now in some other way, viz., through the power of a Redeemer, while they all suffer the loss of Eden. The Word is consistent in its utterances, but just so soon as we press them, as Basil, etc., did, or seek for apologies, as Clarke, Bushnell, and others do, we not only depreciate the Bible account, but call into question its accuracy. It needs no apology from us, dealing as it does with stubborn facts, patent to all, viz., that we are fallen into the embraces of evil, that we have no Eden state here, etc. If the Bible had asserted that all the earth was an Eden, and that no evil and death had any previous existence, then science might find some leverage for its objection, but depending on opinions of men engrafted on the Word, it becomes futile and very unscientific.*

Obs. 8. This leads us to consider that a restoration to an Eden state involves the reproduction of an Eden immensely greater than the original. That we find was limited—abundantly large for the trial through which man passed. But when we consider that this Eden restored must be of a sufficient capacity to hold not merely the first parents, but that numerous progeny who have laid hold on life through a divine faith, etc., it will be seen at once that the Millennial descriptions do not exceed what is required, when they represent the whole earth as finally embraced in such a state. And not only so, but in the new creative energy manifested at this period, there are intimations which seem to point to an enlargement of the earth itself. In this reproduction we have no specific detail, for these are wisely omitted, because (1) if given they would lead men to object to the Word on the ground of impossibilities, which is even now done with the general affirmations of renewal; (2) with our present knowledge and the state of science we could not comprehend the changes and altered conditions. The Word is not given to extravagances of expression, such as we find in the conjectures of men (astronomers, philosophers, etc.) concerning the sun, planets, and universe, which could be seized upon as purely hypothetical, but this restitution is based on a regular divine Plan of Redemption; is presented in guarded general terms, and ascribed to a Being in whom we now that the power to accomplish it is to be found. Therefore, we rest satisfied that the Eden will be fully commensurate to the number who shall be entitled to admission to it.

Obs. 9. This Kingdom designed to carry out and display the Redemptive process in its realization will exhibit in the highest degree the love of God through re-creative power and activity. No one doubts but that such love was strongly shown in creation, in the Incarnation, in Providential movements, etc., but all these, if we are to credit the Prophets, are only forerunners of a higher manifestation of His goodness when the consummation arrives. God revealed directly through humanity as the Theocratic God, acts of restoration and renewal, the complete union of Church and State, the subordination of the human to the divine Will, the rule of righteousness and righteous submission harmoniously blended, the abrogation of all divergence between religion and science, the world and heaven, the heart and God, life and holiness—all this calls forth exhibitions of love in Father, Son, and Spirit, to which all previously given ones are only earnest of the ultimate feast.

Obs. 10. May we not again remind the reader, how logically consistent the early Church was to attribute to Christ at His Sec. Advent this work of restoring all things through the power of His rule and Kingdom? In addition to the numerous allusions already made to their belief on the subject, the candid admission of Neander (His. Ch. Church, vol. 1, p. 182), that Paul looked for the Advent of Christ, and that it was to be regarded, by believers as “fitted to be, not an object of dread, but of joyful, longing hope,” because neither Paul nor the other Apostles believed in a conversion of the world, but rather in its growing worse until the personal Advent of Christ brought deliverance. This very posture and belief our argument demands, and hence these concessions of such historians form an important corroborating element in the chain of evidence which the student should not overlook.

PROPOSITION 121. This Kingdom, of necessity, requires a Pre-Millennial Personal Advent of Jesus Christ.

The covenant promises, the Millennial descriptions which predict the fulfilment of these promises, the entire tenor and analogy of Scripture demand such an Advent. To establish the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom as given by the prophets requires such a personal Coming; and as inspiration indicates the restoration of the Davidic throne in that period and David's seed occupying that throne and Kingdom of David's, it also invariably speaks of the return and presence of David's Son. The proof is cumulative and overwhelming, and in the aggregate establishes the remarkable unity of the Word, the consistency of Jewish expectation, apostolic preaching, and early Church doctrine.*

Obs. 1. Before presenting our arguments in favor of a Pre-Millennial Advent, it is best to notice a few particulars. And first, seeing that the Covenant, promises and prophecies in their literal import do teach a literal personal Advent, why is it, if the same is only to be understood spiritually or providentially, that so many of our opponents (as Neander, Bush, Billroth, Jowett, etc.) admit that the

Apostles—inspired men to be guided into all truth—themselves held to such a literal construction? How comes it, that instead of looking for a Millennium to precede the Advent as men now confidently teach, these inspired men, having the same prophets, and it being part of their mission to interpret and explain these prophets, taught the Advent without an intervening Millennium? Why do they employ the explicit language, the strongest possible expressions, confirmatory of a literal personal Coming, if something else is denoted? If we reject their teaching, and the results of the same as manifested in the Churches established by them, we degrade them to the position of uninspired, and hence unreliable, guides; and infidelity in its inferences drawn from this point may well laugh with scorn at the foolish apologies offered by learned men in extenuation of such an unapostolic posture then so fruitful in error and deception. Secondly, if the Apostles were to lead their hearers to the truth as given by holy men of old, and if the varied interpretations long afterward bestowed upon the predictions of this Advent are correct, why is it that we do not find the language now so prevalent on the subject in the epistles? Why e.g. do we not find the interpretations of “a spiritual Coming,” “a providential Coming,” “a Coming with the Roman army,” “a Coming in death,” etc.? The fact is, that not one of the phrases now so current in theological literature on this point is to be found in the Bible. The absence of them, to say the least, indicates their human origin. Thirdly, the words themselves used by the apostles to designate the Second Advent (Parousia and Epiphaneia) are conceded by all critics to be, owing to their primary meaning and usage, eminently calculated to teach a literal, personal Advent. The very selection of such words ought to have weight with the student in such a discussion.* Fourthly, the hope as expressed by pious Jews, was in the personal Advent of the Messiah. After the rejection and death of Jesus by the nation, the Apostles transfer this hope to the Second Advent, and in doing this adopt the very phraseology employed by the pious Jews, thus unmistakably exhibiting faith in the ultimate realization of the hope in a personal Sec. Advent. “He that Cometh” or “the Coming One,” “the One waited for,” “the expected One” (taken e.g. from Ps. 118:26, so Olshausen; or Ps. 40:8, 80, Lange; or Mal. 3:1, so Hengstenberg, etc.), is transferred to the still future Advent with the idea attached that then will the Covenant promises be verified. The proof is found in the acknowledged fact that all their hearers, so far as we have any record, were impressed with this belief. It is also seen in constantly holding up the Sec. Coming as “the blessed hope,” etc., in exhorting to patient waiting, earnest expectation, eager looking, ardent love for the appearing of “the Chief Shepherd,” just as the godly Jews previously waited, longed, and looked for the “Shepherd” described by the Prophets.*

Obs. 2. Attention is again called to the early Church doctrine, in view of the importance of this subject. If a fundamental mistake was made in the teaching of so significant and consequential a doctrine as that pertaining to the Pre-Millennial personal Advent of Jesus, then we may well pause and ask, whether similar errors were not committed in the reception of other doctrines. The denial of the early Church belief on so weighty a point involves their entire faith in obscurity and credulity. But our argument produces no such dilemma, but accepts of their faith in this matter as legitimate, consistent, and indispensable to the truth. Indeed, if it were missing in the early history of the Church, then a powerful objection would arise against our view, but existing as it does, it becomes, on the other hand, evidence in our favor. It is gratifying to us that so many passages relied on to prove a Pre-Mill. Advent were thus quoted by the immediate followers of the Apostles and their disciples. As previously shown, all the Apostolic Fathers, and all the earliest Christian Fathers, taught our doctrine (see Prop. 73–78). The very persons who had access to the Apostles; who received their instruction, public and private; who were deeply interested in the Advent, and made it a prominent feature in their system of faith; who were intimately acquainted with the language in which the doctrine was promulgated, etc.—these were the men who adopted and taught it. Even after a spiritualizing theory was broached, yet such was the force of the passages which speak of the personal Coming of Jesus, that even Origen, Jerome, and others, were unable to rid themselves entirely of them, but admitted—as their works evidence—however contradictory to their own system that a personal Coming was intended, as e.g. 2 Thess. 2, etc. And what is remarkable to the student, both Millenarians and their opposers located the personal Advent about the same time. For, as scholars have noticed, the ancients universally (or nearly so) understood the Advent to follow the closing of 6000 years. And following (Bush, etc.) the Septuagint Chronology, they supposed the Advent near, owing to its lengthening the world’s duration beyond that of the Hebrew. Millenarians held the 1000 years, the Sabbatism, as future, and located the personal Advent at its commencement. The others identifying the 1000 years as in some way connected with this dispensation and included in the 6000 years, looked for the Personal Advent at its close, preparative to the eternal Sabbath. Hence in reference to many of the passages relating to the Advent there was but little difference of interpretation, saving in the one point of Pre-Millennial. It required many centuries before men could arise and destructively interpret away the plainest statements of Scripture. And it was after the comparative modern Whitbyan theory of a Millennium still future, to be introduced through the Gospel and Church, that the most unwarranted liberties were taken with the sacred text in order to accommodate it to such a theory. However painful this may be to contemplate, the student of prophecy is not surprised at its existence; for in that Word he finds that as the period arrives for the Advent, unbelief in it shall characterize the Church and world. Hence, he expects its Pre-Mill. nature to be opposed and rejected; the passages which teach it to be glossed over with other meanings; the objects intended by it to be denied; the early Church doctrine to be derided as suited for children, and a soporific, worldly-wise interpretation to become generally prevalent. Indeed, to place the Church and world in the posture assigned to it just previous to the Advent, requires a display of learning, theology, philosophy, spiritual improvement, etc., in order to beat down the warnings of the Word and of a long line of faithful witnesses to the truth. Therefore, the simple fact that so much hostility is manifested against what was once the orthodox faith of the Church, regarded in the light of the predicted faithlessness of the Church on this point, ought to excite suspicion that something is wrong in the popular

view. The best of men, innocently and with the purest of motives, desirous even to promote what they regard as truth, are engaged in this work of changing and corrupting the divine testimony. Their piety, usefulness, ability, etc., enlarge the power to mislead in this direction, and materially aids in forming that "snare" and "net" in which both Church and world will be entangled at the Advent. Love for such brethren, and a desire to be faithful to the testimony of the Spirit in the Word, cause us to use such plainness of speech, even if it should result (God forbid) in giving offence to some.

Obs. 3. A mere mention of some of the opinions entertained will be sufficient. Thus e.g. Westminster Review for Oct., 1873, in an Art. calls this Sec. Advent of Christ an "exploded superstition." Renan (*Life of Jesus* p. 107) says: "The material conception of the divine Advent was only a cloud, a passing error which death consigned to oblivion." Such statements could be multiplied, together with those which urge such a doctrine, as taught by the Apostles, to be subversive of the inspiration of the Word. Besides these, the reader must have noticed that in leading reviews, etc., articles are constantly appearing which assert that everything of importance refers to the present time with which we alone are concerned; the whole tenor and spirit of which is hostile to faith and hope in a coming personal Redeemer. Now and then, these are accompanied by remarks designed to be witticisms, making sport of our hope, and endeavoring to cover it with ridicule, just as if a Pre-Mill. Advent were some fair target for scorn and burlesque. If this were always done by infidels, it would be something to be expected in view of their principles (although some of them have treated our faith more fairly and courteously than many believers), but it happens that believers, for the moment forgetting the preciousness of that Coming and the gracious designs connected with it, indulge in such witticisms, etc., thus placing themselves in the posture delineated, Matt. 24:48, which, Lange (*Com. loci*) aptly expresses, is indicative of "an internal mocking frivolity." The claim that Noble, Barrett, and others make, viz., that through E. Swedenborg there has been "the revelation of the spiritual sense of the Word through the obscurity or cloud of the letter, which is the predicted and glorious appearing of the Son of Man upon the clouds of heaven"—is little short of blasphemous, because it applies to mortal man, or to the work that he performs, terms that belong pre-eminently and exclusively to Jesus Christ. And to take that "appearing" which belongs peculiarly and distinctively to the Saviour, and which pertains to His glory, and to apply this to erring man is the highest presumption. The opposite extreme is found in Colani (quoted by Van Oosterzee), who is so hostile to the idea of Christ's personal return that he would expunge all expressions relating to it as spurious. Between these extremes, a variety of arbitrary interpretations exist. Thus e.g. Fowle (*Contemp. Review*, May, 1872, p. 729) makes the Coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven and the gathering of the elect "metaphorical language, descriptive of the growth of the Church." This is regarded as a decided improvement on that interpretation which makes the Advent of Christ "the Advent of the Roman army," etc. To get rid of a Sec. personal Advent, Nisbett (*Coming of the Messiah*) confines the description of Christ's Coming and the destruction of His enemies to His first Coming. The apostasy in 2 Thess. 2 is conveniently confined to the rebellions of the Jews. These specimens will suffice to show the variations caused by a departure from the grammatical sense; but we turn to others advocated by earnest and able men equally untenable. Prest. Edwards (*His. of Redemp.*, p. 269) has four Comings or Advents, viz., His First extending to destruction of Jerusalem, and the proof alleged is Matt. 16:28 (which we will examine under Prop. 150, relating to the transfiguration); the Second, "in Constantine's time, in the destruction of the heathen Roman Empire, and the proof is Rev. 6:13–17; the third is at the destruction of Antichrist, and the proof is Dan. 7; the fourth is at the last judgment. Other writers, not satisfied with such a perversion, have these Comings extended into many more by the aid of the phrases "providential," "spiritual," "figurative," etc., so that there is scarcely a notable event in Church history, or in a man's life, but what this "Coming" is enlisted as accessory, etc. The spiritual interpretation brings forth an abundant crop in this field of investigation. Turning away from those who are so fanciful in interpretation, let us briefly present those who are more sober and systematic in their efforts. Barnes, Fairbairn, Brown, and others take the passages which we refer to a Pre-Mill. Advent, and ascribe to them a spiritual or providential Coming. Admitting that God is always in Providence, that He is ever spiritually present with His people (*comp. Lange, Com.*, p. 564), our answer to their mode of dealing with these predictions follows.

Obs. 4. The attempt to make out a spiritual or providential Coming from the occurrences in the Old Test., such as the destruction of Sodom, the deliverance of Israel from the host of Pharaoh, etc., fails for the simple reason that this Coming is asserted in reference to the humanity of Christ, pertains to David's Son. He comes not as the invisible God, who may be present unseen and unknown, but as Man, the Son of Man, the Man ordained, and one too, as will be shown hereafter, to be seen and recognized. While fully indorsing a divine sovereignty (Props. 79 and 80), a constant pervading superintending presence, which we might see if our eyes were opened like the servant's of Elisha, or like Stephen's or Saul's, yet this is very diverse from a Coming or presence of "the Son of Man." Our opponents, when not directly arguing against us, frankly concede this point to us in their explanations of the phrase "Son of Man." Thus e.g. Dr. Neander (*Life of Christ*, pp. 99, 100) says respecting this phrase: "We conclude that as Christ used the one (viz., Son of Man) to designate His human personality, so He employed the other to point out His divine." Now admit that it refers to "human personality," why should the meaning thus given be changed for the divine or spiritual, when the phrase is employed in reference to a Pre-Mill. Advent? Where, we ask, is the consistency of altering this explanation of the term, when all of them confess that in some passages (as e.g. Matt. 16:27) it undoubtedly refers to His personal future Advent? If such an arbitrary change is to be made, what uniformity and consonance is there in Scriptural exposition?

Obs. 5. Our opposers (as Barnes, Fairbairn, Edwards, etc.) contend that the symbolical representation of the latter part of Rev. 20 denotes the personal, visible presence of Christ. But how can they make it such, when they deny the same to the Advent of Rev.

19? The principle on which the two visions is constructed is identical: agents represent agents, acts represent acts, conditions and events represent conditions and events. Now if in the one vision the agents represent personal agents, how comes it that in the other they do not? Is there not abundant ground for suspicion that such an interpretation is adapted to a preconceived theory? This very indication of weakness is seized by rationalistic writers and drawn out to its legitimate end, viz., taking the interpretation given by our opponents to Rev. 19, they apply the same to Rev. 20, and deny both the personal Coming and literal resurrection. And from this there is no appeal to the application of grammatical rules, seeing that the additional sense foisted on the symbols is something unknown to the rules of language. It is singular, taking the views arrayed against us, that in the descriptions of this Pre-Mill. Advent everything is conceded visible and literally present excepting Christ Himself. Thus in Rev. 19, alluded to, the beast, false prophet, etc., represent real personal agents—everything is visible and recognizable—but the Coming and agency of Christ seen by the inspired writer as real, personal, and visible, as that of the beast, prophet, nations, etc., is to be discarded as invisible, and is stripped of its recognizable personality. By what rule of interpretation is this done? If such a rule were penned down and consistently applied, would it not make all the agents, acts, etc., invisible also? Take e.g. Dan. 7; and the four beasts, horns, destruction, even the saints, Kingdom, dominion, all in fact, saving the Advent of “the Son of Man,” is to be received as representing visible personal agents, etc., here on the earth. Why make this one exception, simply on the authority of uninspired man, and against the direct testimony of the whole early Church? If it be admitted that the Advent in Dan. 7 alludes to His personal First Advent, then it only confirms our argument under Prop. 104, where we conclusively show that it only occurs after the divided form of the Roman Empire, and the rise and progress of the little horn, etc. The truth is, that a denial of the Pre-Mill. Advent involves an arbitrary handling of prophecy. It is a matter of regret that distinguished theologians fall into this illogical and unfounded method of dealing with predictions relating to this Coming. Thus e.g. Kurtz (Sac. His., sec. 198) says: “Every interposition of the Omnipotent Ruler and Judge of the world who sits on the right hand of Omnipotence, every progressive movement of His Kingdom, every victory which He gains over His enemies, and every judgment which overtakes them, is a Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” The only proof assigned for so sweeping a declaration and such a wide departure from primitive doctrine is 1 Cor. 1:7 and 2 Pet. 1:16, which passages, as the reader can see for himself, refer to a literal, personal Coming; the one to His future revelation, the other to His First Advent and manifestation in the transfiguration.*

Obs. 6. If we were to adopt this principle of spiritualizing the Coming and the language employed in its usage, then, if consistently applied to the whole Bible, it would ignore the literal, personal First Advent. This is no caricature, but sober argument. Suppose our opponents are correct in their interpretation; let us then transplant ourselves to a period before the First Advent and apply their system to prophecies relating to that Advent and see the result. Let us, taking such an imaginative position, select e.g. Isa. 40:3, “the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness,” etc., and according to the system just adopted, this would denote that divine truth would be heard in the earth even in the most abandoned parts of it, etc. Or, select e.g. Isa. 53, and we would have a representation of truth, its treatment, rejection, and final triumph. But what are the facts as evidenced by fulfilment? Have we not a literal voice, literal wilderness, literal address to Jews, a literal Coming, humiliation, sufferings, and death of Jesus Christ, etc.? According to the system of our opponents no such literal, personal fulfilment was intended, for if the predictions relating to the Sec. Advent, which are far clearer, distinctive, and decisive than those referring to the First, are to be understood as portraying a spiritual or providential Coming, then surely, if this measurer of prophecy is applied to the less distinct ones of the First Advent, they too only mean a spiritual or providential Coming. If the rule of interpretation holds good now, it ought to cover all time; for we know of no rules that were applicable to one age and not to another. If it be answered, that fulfilment shows that such and such language must be literally understood, then our reply is ready: the fulfilment is evidence that the spiritualistic interpretation on this point is utterly untrustworthy, while it gives decisive proof of the consistency of that adopted by the early Church.*

Obs. 7. Having briefly glanced at the inconsistency of our opposers, in interpreting the Pre-Mill. Advent predictions, the reader may be confirmed in our statements, if his attention is more particularly directed to the glaring contradictions that it produces. A few examples will suffice by way of illustration: (1) Barnes (Com.) and others freely contend that the Coming in 2 Thess. 2 is a literal, personal one, and which results in the destruction of the Antichrist. They acknowledge that this antichristian power is in this dispensation, exists some time before the Advent, and that previous to his removal there can be no Millennial blessedness, etc. And yet when the same power is stated to be removed and destroyed by the Advent of the same Jesus previous to the ushering in of Mill. happiness, as e.g. Dan. 7 and Rev. 19, they refuse to accept of this identification of the period, and thus have in one place a personal, and then in other places a spiritual Advent to destroy the last great enemy of the truth. (2) Again, many commentators on various passages declare that a personal Advent is prerequisite to the resurrection of the saints according to the promises given. They admit that Rev. 11:18 teaches a literal resurrection under the last trumpet, but refuse to bring in the personal Coming of Jesus at that period as necessary to secure it, although laid down as something inseparably connected with a resurrection of the dead. (3) Many writers commenting on certain Scriptures relating to the watching, looking, longing, and waiting for the Advent, as e.g. Matt. 25:13; 1 Thess. 5:6, etc., inform us that it is (Barnes) “an event which is certainly to occur and which may occur at any moment,” and, therefore, we should be prepared for it, etc.; and yet when they come to where the order is given and a Pre-Mill. Advent indicated (which alone meets their admissions of suddenness, unexpectedness, its occurrence at almost any time, etc.), then we are told that it cannot and will not take place until the Millennial era has first transpired. They feel themselves qualified to definitely locate

the Advent to a period at least ten centuries in the future, thus making it a matter of mere folly, to look, etc., for the Sec. Coming before the expiration of the allotted time. (4) A large number of authors when interpreting passages relating to death, as 1 Cor. 15:54, 55, etc., correctly represent death as an enemy that will finally be conquered, etc.; they have much to say about death being the result of sin, etc.; but they forget in their eagerness to interpret Scripture as against us what they said concerning death, and actually declare that Christ comes in and through death. The blessed Saviour is transformed into our enemy! We glory in the fact that we can be strengthened and supported by Jesus in meeting this enemy; we rejoice that our Saviour has the power finally to overcome and destroy this foe, but we utterly deny that Jesus comes to us in the shape of this enemy. What! Jesus coming in death, when death even came to Him and obtained a brief triumph! This remnant of Popish theology, originated by a perversion of plain Bible statements, is, alas! deeply rooted in the minds of many. It would seem that a little reflection over the existence of death from the expulsion from Eden and the fearful result, even corruption, following it, ought to lead men of judgment to discard so foolish and unscriptural a doctrine which serves with many to obscure a Pre-Mill. Advent. Even the naive remark of Sir Thomas Browne (Relig. Medici,) is sufficient answer to its use: "I am not so much afraid of death as ashamed thereof; 'tis the very disgrace and ignominy of our natures, that in a moment can so disfigure us, that our nearest friends, wife and children, stand afraid, and start at us," etc. Christ does not come in this way; He is our deliverer from such a disgraceful state, and He will yet save us from this enemy, who holds in his prison house His brethren. (5) Again, many explain the parable of the tares and wheat to indicate a mixed condition of the Church, and that the harvest is at the end of the age, but in the delineations of Mill. descriptions this mixed condition insisted on in one place is forgotten and removed; and to avoid making a Pre-Mill. Advent, the personal Advent, admitted in connection with the harvest in the parable, is denied to the harvests of Revelation and Joel. (6) Again, multitudes give us the most eulogistic and congratulatory expositions of the marriage announced in Rev. 19:7, 9, and on the phrase "the marriage of the Lamb is come" positively assert (the truth) that the marriage is then (at that period) consummated (so Barnes, etc.), and yet seeing that this involves a Pre-Mill. Advent of the bridegroom, they gravely inform us (as Fairbairn, etc.) that this very marriage of the Lamb is postponed until after the thousand years are expired, although announced previously, etc. (7) Thus might be adduced admissions made respecting "restitution," "regeneration," "world to come," etc., and then can be shown how these again are contradicted when we come to the "restitution," etc., of the Mill. era, on the sole ground to avoid a Pre-Mill. Advent. The illustrations given are ample enough to indicate, that with all the boasted enlightenment above that of the early Church, the early Christians, alleged "babes" in knowledge, were incapable of perpetrating such opposite and contradictory expositions of Scripture. Their system of belief had, at least, unity of utterance and design.

Obs. 8. Leaving the objections to be answered by the proof that shall be adduced, attention is invited to this feature, viz., that as the covenant promises and the Millennial descriptions demand a Pre-Millennial personal Advent, we find this very phase of doctrine presented to us in a variety of aspects, as if purposely to meet and answer the objections that are alleged against it. And the Spirit, to confirm our hopes excited by the Covenant, presents it in forms so as to leave no doubt of a real, personal Coming being intended. We give the evidence as briefly as is consistent with a clear understanding of the same, keeping in view the demands of various classes of our readers.

1. In the portraiture of the Mill. era, it is repeatedly promised that all suffering, sorrow, shedding of tears—in short, all evil shall be removed by a certain Coming. Now such a deliverance, we know from many positive declarations, will never be witnessed until the Second personal Advent; for down to that period, the Church itself—all saints—shall be subject to suffering, sorrow, tears, and trial. The freedom from evil united with the promises of the personal Advent, are precisely the same specified with the Pre-Mill. Coming and Mill. glory to be seen on the earth. And, therefore, as we dare not separate what God has joined together, these Comings must be the same and relate to the same period of time.

2. The Millennial descriptions of the Prophets, it must be admitted, are not yet realized. They are preceded by and connected with a Coming of the Lord; and if that era is still future (as a comparison of them with history unmistakably proves), it follows that the Coming linked with it is also in the future. Now the personality of the Coming is admitted as it relates to some of the predictions, as e.g. Jer. 23:5; Jer. 30:9; Ezek. 37:22–25; Ezek. 34:23, etc., under the impression that they relate to the First Advent. But if it can be shown that the prophecies were not realized at that Coming, the admissions of the personality still remain and must refer to the future. To illustrate: Take Jer. 23:5, and if we allow the context to have its due force, then it follows that it is not yet fulfilled, because (1) the gathering of the Jews was not then witnessed; (2) the Jews were not delivered from fear, dismay, and want; (3) Judah and Israel did not dwell safely; (4) instead of dwelling in their own land they were driven out, etc. Or, select Jer. 30:9, and it was not verified, because (1) there was no return of the nation to the land of their fathers; (2) the yoke upon the nation was not broken; (3) Jacob was not saved out of his trouble; (4) the blessings enumerated as connected with the restoration were not experienced. Thus passage after passage might be taken, and the same deductions made from the context, all showing that the Advent referred to is yet to come.

3. The doctrine of a literal first resurrection (Props. 125–129) establishes a literal Pre-Mill. Advent, seeing that that resurrection precedes the Millennium. Lange (Com., p. 421; Matt. 24) tersely says: "It is baseless to regard the Coming of Christ to the first resurrection as altogether spiritual." Even our opponents unite the resurrection of the dead with a personal Coming, and argue,

scripturally, that the former is a result of the latter. The admissions of Prof. Stuart and others, as to the literalness of the resurrection, involves this personal Coming.

4. "The Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints," 1 Thess. 3:13 (comp. ch. 4:14; Jude 14), is admitted to be a literal one. But the same thing is asserted to take place, viz., the Coming of the Lord and all the saints with Him, as Pre-Millennial in Zech. 14:5.

5. The Advent of Rev. 19:11–21, is a Pre-Mill. one, and is a personal Coming, being parallel with Rev. 14:14–20. A large number of our opponents, overlooking consistency in their own system, yet forced by the scene described, frankly declare that the latter passage (Rev. 14:14) denotes the literal Advent of the Son of Man. Thus e.g. Barnes, *Com. loci*, informs us that it applies to the end, consummation, etc., at which time he locates the Sec. Advent. But in both places the design in Coming and the acts performed by "the Coming One" are the same, to save His people and overthrow His enemies. In both places the beast and abettors are destroyed, for they shall not exist in the Millennium; and both places are located under the last trumpet, indicating the precise time when we are to look for it, viz., before the Millennium commences.

6. In His Second Advent it is asserted that He shall "come in the clouds of heaven" Angels, Christ Himself, and the Apostles declare this to be a concomitant of the Advent. Daniel (7:13) expressly describes this, that "the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven," and on thus coming the Kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven is given to Him. In Rev. 14:14, commentators, etc., as Barnes, *loci*, admit "a designed reference to Daniel," but if, as they also admit that, Rev. 14:14, refers to the personal Advent, then Daniel must predict the same. We are not, however, left to human conjecture on the application of Daniel's prediction of the Advent. Jesus directly applies it to His future Advent. When before Caiaphas, well knowing how the Jews regarded this prophecy, He boldly (Matt. 26:64) says: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven," thus not only locating this Coming in the future, reaffirming its personality by the "shall ye see;" but even, under the grave charge of blasphemy, establishing the Jewish view, that they made a correct application of the prophecy to a personally manifested Messiah.

7. To that class of interpreters who confess the personal Advent to be designated by Daniel, but refer it to His First Advent, we reply: Notice, that the reference made by Christ to it as delineating His Coming at some future time confirms the order given by us under Prop. 104. The Coming is witnessed, not as at the First Advent when the fourth Empire was undivided, long before the horns arose, etc., but in its divided state, and after the horns had arisen and progressed, etc. The unity of the prophecy demands the location of the Advent where Jesus places it.

8. The personal Advent, its uncertainty, suddenness, and stealthy approach is likened, by Matthew, Luke, Paul, and others to that of a thief. Commentators, etc., abundantly connect the idea of a personal Coming with the phrase. It has also been said that a thief does not come figuratively but personally; and the likening of the one to the other embraces the notion of a personal Coming as well as that of the manner of His Coming. But mark, under the sixth vial, just before the fearful gathering of nations, the outpouring of awful judgments, and the Millennium, the Apostle John, giving the testimony of Jesus, Rev. 16:15, says: "Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth," etc. Why does the Spirit thus employ expressions identical in spirit and design, if not to teach us that this Coming in a thief-like manner is a personal Pre-Millennial one?

9. The Apocalypse begins with "Behold, He comes with clouds and every eye shall see Him," etc., and ends with "Surely, I come quickly." The concessions made by opponents on these phrases are numerous, and contradictory to their spiritual interpretations. But they are not needed, for the great vital topic of the Book, viz., the Coming of Jesus, is self-evident; for all the predictions are given to testify to the same, and to events preceding, connected with, and following it. So apparent is this, that some reject the book solely on this ground as teaching a "Jewish" Coming and reign of a personal Messiah. We, however, joyfully accept of this feature as blessed evidence of its inspiration, making it confirmatory of covenanted promises. Now is it reasonable to suppose, that in a Revelation designed to give special information respecting this personal Advent announced in its opening and close as a source of faith, hope, and warning, that an Advent should be specified as preceding the Millennium which is to be understood differently from a personal one, when the language describing it is similar to that employed in other places to designate a personal one? The Spirit, we contend, purposely uses the same phraseology in order to prevent us, if wise, from perverting this doctrine of His Coming.

10. When Christ comes personally, the holy angels or messengers come with Him, 2 Thess. 1:7; Matt. 13:39, 41; 16:21; 24:31, etc. This is also said in reference to the Pre-Mill. Coming; for in Rev. 14:10 (perhaps Eng. version of Joel 3:11); Rev. 19:17; Rev. 20:1, etc., we find angels participate in it, and perform the same things ascribed to them in the preceding passages.

11. When He comes personally we (2 Thess. 1:7, 8) read: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels in flaming fire," etc. Other passages teach that then "the tares," "the chaff," shall be "cast into a furnace of fire," shall be "burned with fire unquenchable," etc. Fire, as descriptive of God's vengeance, etc., is an element intimately connected with it. The very same is frequently stated in relation to this Pre-Mill. Advent. Thus e.g. Isa. 66:15, 16, "Behold the Lord will come with fire and with His chariots like a whirlwind, to render His anger with fury and His rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by His sword will the Lord plead with all flesh" etc., which is almost the phraseology of Paul. Then follows the Millennial glory. Daniel, Joel, Malachi, Isaiah, and others speak of a fire that shall consume and destroy in connection with the Lord's Coming, to be followed by a glorious Kingdom.

This confirmatory fact may be added: in Matt. 25:31; Matt. 13:40–42, etc., it is declared that the wicked are cast into “everlasting fire.” This is done at the personal Sec. Advent, as theologians, of all classes, proclaim. If we turn to the events immediately preceding the Millennium and related to the Coming then manifested, we read, Rev. 19:20, and Rev. 14:9, 10, that certain wicked are cast into a “lake of fire” at this very period. The Spirit again identifies them.

12. In His Sec. Advent, He is represented as coming as (e.g. Matt. 25:34) a King. This is also the characteristic attributed to the Pre-Millennial Coming that He is revealed as “the King” (Zech. 14), even “King of Kings” (Rev. 19), etc. Our entire argument makes this a prerequisite.

13. In the Sec. Advent, Christ comes as Judge, engaged in judging. If there is one feature that specially appertains to the Pre-Mill. Advent it certainly is this, that in numerous places His Coming as Judge and judging is blended with it. See Props. 132, 133, 134.

14. At the Sec. Advent a Kingdom is said to be revealed, as 2 Tim. 4:1, “at His appearing and His Kingdom.” This is frequently, as we have abundantly shown, described as following the Pre-Mill. Advent.

15. At the personal Coming of Jesus, the Scriptures locate a gathering of saints from all quarters, 2 Thess. 2:1, etc. This is precisely what is said to be done at the Advent before the Millennium in numerous places, as has already been indicated. This gathering is described, more or less, by the Prophets, so that even Augustine (City of God, B. 20, c. 23) makes Ps. 50:3–5, denote the personal Coming of Christ.

16. At the Sec. Advent Jesus shall “sit upon the throne of His glory,” Matt. 25:31. This is also stated to follow the Pre-Mill. Coming. Both the throne and the glory, or “the glorious throne” are mentioned, as will be seen in the Prop. on the reign. In comparing such passages as Col. 3:4, Ps. 102, etc., with the Mill. glory, the identity is established. Besides the specific mention of Christ’s throne—a throne even David’s (Acts 2:30, etc.) belonging specially to Him—upon which He personally sits, Rev. 3:21, we find the same throne particularly mentioned in the Pre-Mill. Coming, as in Ps. 89; Isa. 9:7; Jer. 33; Ezek. 37, etc.

17. Into this Kingdom of Christ’s, linked with His “appearing,” believers enter, 1 Pet. 1:7, 13; Matt. 25:34; comp. 2 Pet. 1:11, etc. The personal presence of Jesus, as all believe, is then enjoyed. But the Scriptures unite in locating this entrance, inheriting, reigning, etc., in the Kingdom with the Millennium itself; and hence it implies His personal presence. For, all the promises of future happiness and glory given to the saints to be hereafter enjoyed in Christ’s Kingdom and presence, are also found recorded and fully designated in the Mill. descriptions.

18. The period of Christ’s personal return is at the time of “regeneration” Matt. 19:28, that great glorious “new birth” (res.) of the sons of God and of Creation. But this “regeneration” is identified with the Mill. age (Prop. 145), and hence the Advent is personal.

19. So likewise the period of the “restitution of all things” is preceded by “sending Jesus Christ,” “whom the heavens must receive until the times” are ushered in. Barnes, loci, even admits: “until: this word implies that He would then return to the earth.” To effect this “restitution” Christ’s personal presence is promised. But this “restitution” is the grand theme of the Millennial predictions, the scope of its prophecy, the alleged design of the establishment of the Millennium. See Prop. 144:

20. The personal Advent of Christ is united, by nearly all, with the deliverance of suffering creation from the bondage of corruption, Rom. 8:19–21. The Millennial predictions portray this very deliverance and hence it includes that presence. See Prop. 146.

21. Commentators, etc., inform us that Christ is evidently present in the New Heavens and New Earth of 2 Pet. 3:10–13, etc. But the New Heavens and New Earth of promise (so stated by Peter) are found in the Millennial descriptions, Isa. 65:17–25, Isa. 66:22, and, in the nature of the case, must include the same presence. See Props. 148 and 151.

22. The Spirit, as if purposely to meet the anticipated unbelief, even condescends to tell us, that “His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mt. of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the East,” Zech. 14:4. In this Pre-Mill. Advent the exact locality is pointed out (the same from whence He ascended to heaven), and His personality indisputably demonstrated by “His feet shall stand,” etc. The language is alone applicable to a Pre-Mill. personal Coming, and distinctively refers us to the promise of the angels, Acts 1:11.

23. But, in addition, to indicate in the most striking manner the personality of this Pre-Mill. Coming, it is stated that He shall be seen at that time. Thus, in Micah 3:12, the mountain of the house is made desolate, but in Micah 4:1, etc., this same house is restored, and all agree that in the latter we have a Millennial description. Now, if we turn to Matt. 23:38, 39, and Luke 13:35, it is stated that Jesus at His First Advent did not restore this house which He found and left desolate, but will do so when He comes again: “Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall NOT SEE ME HENCEFORTH, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate, and verily I say unto you, YE SHALL NOT SEE ME until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.” This unequivocally teaches that the people saw Him there; that for a time He would be invisible to the nation, but that they should again see Him; and that seeing would be at the time when He would restore the house from its desolation. The Millennial prophecies show the removal of this desolation,

and, hence, that He shall be then seen. But we have more explicit passages: in Rev. 1:7, "Behold He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him; and they also which pierced Him, and all Kindreds of the earth (some read: all tribes of the land) shall wail because of Him." This at once recalls the parallel prediction of Zech. 12:10, which binds the whole in unity; for at the very time "the house of David" is restored the Millennial predictions are to be verified in the bestowal upon the Jewish nation of the long-promised (but long-delayed) blessings, then "they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him," etc. This is corroborated by the general tenor of the prophecies which speak of the presence of the Redeemer, their King, David, etc., at the restoration of the Jewish nation, and of His pleading with the Jews "face to face," etc.

24. This again is confirmed by James, Acts 15:16, 17, "after this I (Christ) will return," etc., i.e. after a people are gathered out, as predicted, Jesus will "return" to rebuild the tabernacle of David, etc. Those even who reject our views admit that this "return" is a personal Coming, but inconsistently and violently apply it to the First Advent. But the simple fact that it is a "return;" that it occurs after a certain event is accomplished (yet in course of fulfilment, viz., the gathering); that the tabernacle of David is yet in ruins; that it corresponds with the analogy of prophecy teaching a personal presence, then an absence, and finally a personal return, etc.—makes it alone applicable to the Pre-Mill. Advent.

25. Paul significantly points to the Pre-Mill. personal Advent in Rom. 11, when he connects with it the removal of the blindness of the Jewish nation, and says: "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer." For in thus representing Him as Coming in relation to this event, he accords with the portrayal of the Millennium, and, as we have previously intimated, with the Jewish doctrine that "the Coming One" is to perform a great work for the nation. He links his faith with that of the nation's, as expressed by John the Baptist ("art Thou the Coming One?"), by the people at the entry into Jerusalem ("the Coming One"), but transfers it, as Jesus did (see above 22, which some render "Blessed is the Coming One") to the still future Advent.

26. Rev. 11:15–18, with its "time of the dead that they should be judged," its "reward unto Thy servants the prophets," its removal and destruction of the wicked, etc., cannot possibly be reconciled with a postponement of these events until after the Millennial period has expired. The simple announcement of them under the seventh trumpet is sufficient to sustain our position. These things demand for their fulfilment a personal Pre-Mill. Advent.

27. Phrases are employed, in connection with this Pre-Mill. Coming, which can only be consistently explained as denoting a personal Coming. Thus e.g. in Rev. 14:10, the Image-worshippers, who are to be destroyed, Rev. 19, before the Mill. age, are to "be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb," i.e. they are to witness (Alford, "visible") their punishment—indeed, as we find in other places, inflict it. Again, in Isa. 26:21, "Behold the Lord cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity," etc., thus vacating the place that now holds Him in accordance with the promise of the angels, etc. This at once reminds the student of Hos. 5:15, Zech. 8:3, etc.

28. When Christ comes, He shall "rule with a rod of iron," etc. In Rev. 2:27, the saints are to be associated with Him in ruling with the same rod. Now, some of our most persistent opposers frankly admit that this participation of the saints in such ruling will only be witnessed "when the Son of God will come to judge the world." In Rev. 19:15, before the Mill. era, Jesus comes, and it is announced that "He shall rule them with a rod of iron."

29. Again, we may insist upon the personality contained in the phrase, "Son of Man." It is employed, as all concede, to designate the Sec. Advent, a Coming not merely as a divine personage, but as Son of Man, glorified it is true, but one united with humanity, a true descendant of David's. He is designated the same, as we have shown, in Pre-Mill. predictions (Dan. 7:13; Rev. 14:14), thus showing, if we will but receive it, that a personal Advent is intended.

30. In correspondence with this, Paul tells us, Acts 17:31, that when Christ comes to judge, He comes as the "Man ordained." The sacred writers designate Him as "the Man," the descendant of David's, the promised seed who comes before the Millennial era; therefore, we cannot mistake the Coming of this personage, who is appointed to be revealed as the appointed, ordained, and actual Son of David. In Zech. 6:8, "Behold the Man whose name is the Branch," etc., we have, as the Apostles corroborate, the work of salvation in its initial, execution, and completion carried on by the Lord Jesus not merely in His relation to God as His Son, but as "the Man" promised to David. Coming as "the Man," involves the personal Pre-Mill. Advent.

31. This personality and Pre-Mill. Coming can be derived, by comparing Scripture, in several ways from Phil. 2:10, 11, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things (beings) in heaven, and things in (beings on) earth, and things (beings) under the earth."

a. The time when this is to be fulfilled is seen from the parallel passage, Rom. 14:10, 11, "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For, it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." Christ is personally present on this judgment-seat. But according to Isa. 45:23; Isa. 65:16, 23; Ps. 63:11, etc., this will occur at the period when Mill. blessedness is bestowed. See Props. 132, 133, and 134, on Judgment and Judgment Day.

b. It is admitted even by our opponents, that the "things under the earth" that shall "bow" the "knee" are "beings," viz., the dead, the resurrected dead that shall appear. The application of the passage by Paul indicates a personal presence; the resurrection of the

dead requires the same. This resurrection, we have shown, is, so far as the saints, Pre-Millennial, and the passage quoted by Paul standing related to the Millennium (as shown by many commentators, see e.g. Barnes, On Isa. 45:23), it follows that, if verified, Christ is personally present to whom this homage is rendered.

c. The personal name that is to be thus acknowledged is indicative of the personal presence. The Jesus, Joshua, or Saviour is designated "the Christ," "the Messiah." By the latter name He is known as the covenanted seed of promise; the former is His personal name. The Apostle argues that not only the name Christ which both Jews and Gentiles acknowledge, but the personal name given by God to this one person, viz., that of Jesus as the Christ and consequently the Lord, the predicted and covenanted Ruler in the Davidic order, shall be openly acknowledged by all. Now, such an acknowledgment of the name, identifying the Lordship with the person called Jesus, seems to demand a personal presence, which, doubtless, led the angels to say so pointedly, Acts 1:11, "this same Jesus," etc. This contributes to the honor and glorification of the Father, that that which is now denied by so many should be openly manifested, especially before His covenanted nation. If we accept of the application and amplification of this Millennial description by Paul, then it follows that Christ is personally thus acknowledged at the Mill. era. The whole passage impresses us with distinctive personality.

32. In the description of His personal Advent, Matt. 25:31, informs us that "before Him shall be gathered all nations," etc. This is an adjunct of the Pre-Mill. Coming, for Isa., Jer., Ezek., Zeph., Joel, Zech., John, and others unite in declaring that a gathering of the nations shall take place immediately preceding and connected with such a Coming. Rev. 16:14–16, and Rev. 19:19, etc., are alone a complete confirmation of such a Pre-Mill. gathering linked with the Advent. The Spirit again identifies the Coming.

33. It is granted that, Matt. 13:30, 39, 41, Jesus personally comes at the harvest at the end of the age. Joel (3:13, etc.) informs us that the Lord will come when the harvest is ripe, before the Millennium. So Rev. 14:14, 15, tells us that "the Son of Man" shall come when "the harvest of the earth is ripe," and this also precedes the Millennial era. This connection of the Advents with the "harvest" by the Spirit is intentional so that we may identify them as one and the same.

34. The Coming of the Son of Man, Matt. 24 and Luke 21, is "after" "immediately after" a tribulation which runs down through the times of the Gentiles, and is accompanied by the gathering or harvest of the elect. With all the efforts made by our opponents to spiritualize this Coming into a Providential one, nearly all of them are forced to allow that it includes a future personal one. But if so (which we believe), then it follows that it must be one preceding the Mill. age, because it is to be witnessed at the closing period of this long-continued tribulation—a tribulation which, in the very nature of the case, cannot enter into or exist contemporaneously with the Millennium. This Advent then precedes it.

35. The Sec. Advent is designed for Salvation, Heb. 9:28, etc. This we have shown is a distinguishing characteristic of the Pre-Mill. Coming, and hence, as Barnes informs us (Com. loci), "Tholuck and the Germans generally" interpret Rom. 13:11 to apply "to the personal reign of Christ on earth." That such an application of the passage is correct is evident (1) from the contrast of night and day following (see Props. 138 and 139, on Day of Christ), and (2) in using the words "Salvation," "night," and "day," according to Jewish usage and expectations (comp. e.g. Isa. 25:9).

36. In the Sec. Advent four things are united, as e.g. in 2 Thess. 1:5–11, (1) the rest or Kingdom; (2) the triumphant, irresistible Coming of Jesus; (3) the overthrow of and vengeance upon the enemies; (4) the deliverance and blessedness of God's people. These four things are also united with the Pre-Mill. Coming, as can be seen by reference to numerous Mill. predictions, already frequently quoted.

37. The binding and confinement of Satan is Pre-Millennial. This is Christ's work, and the entire train of prediction from Gen. 3:15 down leaves the decided impression that this is done by a personal manifestation; for while provision was made at the First Advent to accomplish it, the victory itself is not seen until the time of the Second. Down to the Sec. Coming Satan is the avowed, loosened enemy, corrupting the Church and the world, exciting the nations to open hostility, to whose power the saints are exposed and the sleeping are held fast in his bonds. Such a deposing and binding of Satan, as the Millennium demands to secure a fulfilment of promise, the appointed Seed alone, in His own personal power, can perform.

38. We may urge even the eminent fitness of Christ, the Second Adam, manifesting Himself personally in the very place where Satan obtained his triumphs over the first Adam, at the very time that Satan is bound and his work of deception is stayed. Where man fell, there the triumph of man, the woman's seed, is also to be exhibited; and if so, it involves a personal Coming at the period of the Millennium.

39. Hence, this is confirmed by the announcement, that this Pre-Mill. Coming is for the purpose of "Redemption." It is granted that He comes personally in "the day of Redemption," Matt. 19:27, 28; Rom. 8:23; Eph. 4:30, etc. The Mill. descriptions are full of this Redemption; that Jesus then comes as "Redeemer," that He then "redeems" His people, and that they shall be called "the redeemed," "the redeemed of the Lord," etc. The accordance of phraseology, the identity of acts performed, etc., again teach us what Coming is intended.

40. The personal Coming shall occur when “the mystery of God is finished.” That the finishing of the mystery includes the open revelation of Christ, the vindication of God’s ways, the judgments of Christ, the overthrow of Satan and his deposition from being “the god of this world,” and the exaltation of the saints, is admitted by our opponents. In Rev. 10:7 it is asserted in the most express terms, that “in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as He hath declared to His servants the Prophets.” Under this seventh trumpet (and mark, too, at the beginning of the sounding and not at its close, or, as some even grossly have it, a thousand years after the sounding) then, which introduces the Millennium, this mystery relating to the Kingdom, the general theme of the Prophets, is finished. If the mystery is indeed finished, then the King has come and the Kingdom is established. If we notice the events occurring under this last trumpet, they are precisely such as include the Advent and Kingdom. Briefly, if the mystery of God as stated by the Prophets, the divine purpose of God in Christ, the consummation of covenanted promises, is then finished, completed, manifested, then it follows, of necessity, that the Pre-Mill. Coming of Jesus under this seventh trumpet is a personal one.

41. The Spirit locates the marriage of the Lamb as Pre-Millennial, and against the statements of the multitude who would postpone it until the close of the Millennium, expressly says, Rev. 19:7, 8, 9, that this “marriage of the Lamb is come,” etc. A marriage without the personal presence of the bridegroom is an incongruity. Such a presence is demanded by the blessings bestowed by the marriage, and is insured by the Advent predicted in its connection, and by the allusions to it, as in Matt. 25:1–13, and in the Prophets.

42. This is forcibly corroborated by the Scripture just referred to, viz., the parable (Matt. 25:1–13) of the ten virgins. For the preceding context and the word “then” indicate that a delineation of the Church is given as it will exist at the Sec. Advent. The Bridegroom comes, and those who are prepared “went in with Him to the marriage.” The Coming of the Bridegroom is represented as personal, for the wise “go out to meet Him,” and are “with Him.” This Coming must be Pre-Millennial, for such a mixture of wise and foolish does not exist in the Millennium. The parable which follows that of the virgins also teaches a personal Coming.

43. At the Sec. Advent when, Matt. 16:27, “the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, then He shall reward every man according to his works.” The same thing of rewarding is stated in connection with this Pre-Mill. Coming. Thus e.g. Isa. 40:10; Rev. 11:18, etc., distinctly announce it.

44. Heb. 1:6, “And when He bringeth in (marg. read when He bringeth again) the first begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him.” This verse which has perplexed many expositors is plain, if we but remember that Christ is called “the first begotten” with reference to His resurrection from the dead in Rev. 1:5, and Col. 1:18, and that the Apostle had just referred in preceding verse (comp. Acts 13:33 with verse 5) to the resurrection of Christ as a begetting. As taught distinctively in marg. reading, with which critics generally agree, this same resurrected, first begotten Jesus shall come “again.” This must be applied to His Second Coming, seeing that it is after He is constituted “the First Begotten.” If the personal Advent is intended, as expositors hold, it can be shown to be Pre-Millennial by the quotation appended by Paul, “let all the angels,” etc. If the quotation is derived (Barnes) from the Septuagint rendering of Deut. 32:43, then it is identified with “avenging the blood of His servants, and rendering vengeance to His adversaries,” thus agreeing with the acts assigned to Christ’s Pre-Mill. Coming. If, on the other hand, it is taken from Ps. 97:7, then it stands in immediate relation to the reigning and “presence of the Lord of the whole earth,” the destruction or “burning up” of His enemies, the overthrow of image-worshippers, the exaltation of Zion, all people seeing His glory, etc., thus again corresponding with events ascribed to Christ’s Advent before and at the Millennium.

45. There is a day of the Lord, of Jesus Christ, of the Son of Man to be revealed in the future. In Luke 17:24; Phil. 1:6, etc., it is allowed that Christ will be personally present in that day. It is easy to show by a comparison of Scripture that “the day of the Lord” mentioned in Millennial predictions is the same spoken of by the Apostles. This we will do hereafter (Props. 138 and 139), and for the present it is amply sufficient to say that the use of the phrase by the Apostles confirmed the Jewish idea of “the day of the Lord,” “the day of the Messiah,” as the predicted Millennial day. If the Jewish expectation was erroneous, as moderns now say, then it was wrong for inspired men to employ such confirmatory phraseology without appending a suitable correction or definition, etc.

46. The reader, if a careful student of the Word, must have noticed the peculiarity, that not one of the Prophets speak of an Advent to follow the Millennial age. It is something—although now so prevalent—utterly unknown to them. The Coming of the Lord, the predicted Seed, etc., is always represented as occurring previously, and that age is described as the result of such an Advent. It is in vain to look for any other order given by the holy men of old; and therefore, in the nature of the case, they denoted, as the Jews, disciples, and Apostles held, a personal Coming.

47. In addition to this, in the epitome of events running down from the establishment of the Christian Church to the Sec. Advent, such as Matt., chs. 24 and 26; 2 Thess. 2; Mark 13; Luke 21, in direct reference to this personal Coming, no mention is made of an intervening Millennium of blessedness, such as the Prophets describe, but tribulation, oppression, apostasy, etc., are to be experienced and witnessed. Hence that Sec. Advent attached to these epitomes, allowed by commentators, etc., to be personal, must precede that age.

48. Eminent writers on prophecy have well remarked, that the First and Second Advents are sometimes so linked together in prophecy that it requires discrimination to discern what belongs to the one or to the other. The same language is applied to both so far as Coming is concerned, only that the one (the First) refers more directly to humiliation, suffering, etc., the other (the Second) to the glory that shall be revealed. The Sec. Advent is an outgrowth or result of the First (Props. 34, 66, 75, etc.). The simple fact that they are thus spoken of together, without an effort at discrimination; that the Second is far more definitely and minutely described than the First; that they both (the First as preparative) stand related to the Millennium—this should influence us to believe that as one was literal, so the other will be the same.

49. This Pre-Mill. Coming is a personal one, on the ground that the objections alleged against its personality apply, if legitimately carried out, with equal force against the First Advent or a future personal Sec. Advent. If so many arguments, showing that it is personal, have no weight, if they can be so readily explained away as figurative, or spiritual, or providential, then it follows, if that principle of interpretation is logically applied, that there is no personal Coming of Christ in the future. Who that hath faith in the simple, sublime utterances of God will credit this? Alas! multitudes are doing this to-day; taking the weapons forged to their hand by reputed orthodox divines, influenced by the refining mystical process so generally adopted in these passages they spiritualize the Sec. Advent; churches, counting their thousands upon thousands, utterly reject a personal Sec. Advent, and the heaven is penetrating far and wide. Such an Advent as we contend for is personal, thus making our system of interpretation a consistent and uniform one, leaving no room, and affording no refuge, for the denial of a Second personal Advent.

50. But brevity demands a mere mention of other arguments, such as (1) the supernatural and miraculous events connected with the Kingdom (Props. 6 and 7). (2) The prophecies interpreted literally (Prop. 21) sustains it (3) The preaching of John, Jesus, disciples, and Apostles indorses it (Prop. 16, etc.). (4) The re-establishment of the Theocracy in the Davidic line demands it (Props. 31, 32, 33, 48, 49, etc.). (5) The postponement of the Kingdom indicates it (Props. 56, 57, 58, 59, etc.). (6) The preaching of the Apostles after the death and ascension of Christ (Props. 71–74). (7) The removal of the Kingdom to the close of the tribulation and times of the Gentiles (Prop. 66). (8) The doctrine of the election corroborates it (Props. 62–65). (9) This Kingdom a Jewish one in its foundation, etc. (Prop. 68). (10) Arguments can be derived from what has been said respecting the Church (Props. 88–104, etc.). (11) The specific mention and promise of the Kingdom to David's Son (Prop. 84). (12) Incidental arguments from the visibility, etc., of the Kingdom, the oneness of the Kingdom, the teaching of the parables, the inheriting of the land by David's Son and His brethren, the corroboration of passages supposed to teach the contrary, the restoration of the Jewish nation, etc. (see Props. on these). (13) Additional arguments will be found in following Propositions.

51. Millenarian writers have always insisted that a personal Pre-Mill. Advent is to be witnessed under the seventh or last trumpet. Now, Bengel in his Gnomon has shown, that by the authority of the earliest MSS. the phrases “and art to come” in Rev. 11:17, “and shalt be” in Rev. 16:5, are to be rejected. This criticism is fully sustained by the authoritative Sinaitic MSS. discovered by Prof. Tischendorf. The student may well ponder this omission thus given by the Spirit. Why should the title of “Who is to come,” or “the Coming One” given in Rev. 1:4, 8 and 4:8 be omitted in 11:17 and 16:5? The reason, so corroborative of our faith, was given long ago by Ansbert (as quoted by Bengel): “They do not here subjoin, as they are accustomed, ‘and Who art to come;’ they speak of Him as already present.” This omission, as the weightiest MSS. (admitted by Anti-Millenarians, as Prof. Stuart, Com.) prove, is not accidental but intentional, showing that the Coming One is no longer expected to come, but has already come. It is a beautiful, incidental, and most powerful proof confirmatory of our position, indicative of a Pre-Mill. arrival and presence.

52. The Jews (Prop. 160, Obs. 2, etc.) held that the Antichrist preceded the personal Coming of the Son of Man, which view was derived from Dan. 7, etc. Now (1) the Antichrist did not precede the first Advent; (2) Paul (2 Thess.), John (Apoc.), well knowing this Jewish doctrine, locate this Antichrist in the future; (3) they, employing language expressive of a personal Advent and without indicating the Jews to be in error, associate with this Antichrist (i.e. his destruction) the personal Coming of Jesus; (4) this Antichrist, the Coming of Christ, and the overthrow of the former, are witnessed before the ushering in of the Millennium. This is the plain order laid down by the Spirit.

53. It is admitted, as we have repeatedly shown (Prop. 75, etc.) from others, that the Apostles and those under their immediate instruction looked for a near Advent of the Saviour. The express language is so definite on this point that it is not susceptible of a different interpretation, so that commentators concede it, some with and others without any explanation. Having previously given (e.g. Prop. 74) the probable reasons for such a faith, we now refer to it as a decided proof of their belief in a personal Pre-Mill. Advent. For urging this nearness, an event that might at any time occur, after the rise and progress of an apostasy, indicates in the clearest manner that they at least did not entertain the modern Whitbyan “new hypothesis” of an intervening Millennium before the Advent. Taking it even for granted (which we do not) that they were “ignorant” or “mistaken” as to future events and the period of time to elapse before that Advent, it does not follow that they were also “ignorant,” etc., as to the nature of the Advent or its connection with continued suffering, etc., down to its occurrence. If the Advent itself that they looked for is personal, then the knowledge they had received from Christ respecting the Kingdom and the plain predictions of Millennial blessedness to be realized at a Coming of Christ's, if they were to be experienced in this dispensation, would most certainly have prevented such utterances in

men who were guided into truth by the same Spirit that gave the predictions. The unity is alone preserved by admitting that the Advent is Pre-Millennial. If in error on the one point, they were the same in making it Pre-Millennial. We are content to remain "ignorant" and "mistaken" in such company, for we recognize a propriety in such declarations utterly irreconcilable with current doctrines.

54. We hold to this Pre-Mill. Coming as personal, because we are plainly told that as the Millennial age draws nigh, the world, and even the professed Church, will be disinclined to believe in a personal Coming. The world shall reject the doctrine and ridicule it; the Church as a body shall slumber and sleep; professed servants shall say, "My Lord delayeth His Coming;" and many shall declare, "Where is the promise of His Coming?" "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" Surely He would find such, if the earth just emerged from Millennial glory, but in the darkness, etc., preceding that age, faith is almost extinct in His Coming. Nearly all prophetic writers agree that, owing to the limited nature of the chronological prophecies, the Mill. era cannot be far distant, and we find that the world and Church are rapidly drifting into this precise condition of unbelief. Such a position of unbelief in a personal Coming cannot exist in the Church in its present form after the Millennium; and, therefore, its extensive existence, advocated by all classes, is a strong presumptive proof, why we should insist on its being a literal Coming.

55. Christ will come personally to introduce Mill. glory just previous to a period—connected with this dispensation—of apostasy and unbelief, 2 Thess. 2:8; 2 Tim. 3:1–5; 2 Pet. 3:3, 4, etc., of great trouble and trial, Rev. 19; Ps. 2; Luke 21:25–28, etc., of scepticism and indifference, 1 Thess. 5:3; Jude 14, 15, 16, etc., so that it shall come "as a snare," Luke 21:35, etc. But while this is so, God, simply judging from the past, will never permit such an occurrence as this Pre-Mill. Advent, so tremendous in its effects both upon the world and the Church, to take place without suitable warning. It is reasonable to expect from the past dealings of God, that, in His providence, He will raise up men, who, amid sarcasm, ridicule, charges of error, heresy, folly, enthusiasm, fanaticism, etc., will, Noah-like, faithfully point to this personal Coming, and warn the Church and world of its approach by direct appeals. Amos 3:7, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets," compared with Ps. 25:14, "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him and He will show them His covenant" (marg. read. "and His covenant to make them know it"). Now, if this Coming is personal we ought to find (1) predictions that it would be recognized by some; and (2) that as the age is approaching, men will proclaim it. This we do, for (1) it is promised that some shall know it, and a cry of its nearness shall be raised, Luke 21:28; 1 Thess. 5:4; Matt. 25:6; Mal. 4:5, 6; Rev. 16:15; and (2) some men in nearly all denominations hold to and proclaim this warning, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh." Such a striking and predicted coincidence serves to confirm our faith in the Pre-Mill personal Coming. It is also one of the evidences given by the Spirit, and as such we accept of it. Thus we have the Spirit, in the most various and accommodating forms, shaping His revelations to sustain our weakness and preserve us from forsaking "the old paths" of belief.

Obs. 9. (1) An argument might be erected on the chronological prophecies which approximatively would indicate a Pre-Mill. Advent, but they are purposely passed by, because they would require extended notice. (2) So also the theory, so prevalent in the early Church, of the six thousand years before the Advent and Millennium, which is only susceptible of indirect corroboration. (3) Another class of arguments might, however, be advanced with advantage. Thus e.g. if the Millennium is experienced as predicted, then, owing to the state of universal righteousness and blessedness, much of the New Testament would be in a great degree inapplicable. To illustrate: how could "the friendship of the world" be "enmity against God" when all its Kingdoms do Him honor and service; how could those who "live godly in Christ Jesus suffer persecution" when all persecution had ceased; how could the way to life be "narrow" and the way to destruction "broad," etc., when to follow the multitude would be to follow the righteous, etc.?^{*} It appears necessary therefore, in consideration of the extraordinary changes that will then be wrought in the condition of God's people, in such a dispensation of affairs, that Christ should in some special manner manifest Himself and bestow, in such a revolution, a revelation of His will adapted to the actual circumstances of the saints, etc. (Prop. 167) That there will be a Coming and a special revelation suited to that state all believe, but, on reflection, what Coming is so suitable, so desirable, so applicable to the intended change as the personal? (4) Besides this, as we have shown, in the Millennium is to be secured an infallible, accessible head (of which Popery is a shabby imitation) to secure perfect government, union, etc. To secure such a needed visibly manifested source of knowledge and power, able to unite all nations, to give forth all law, to establish the true sense of Scripture beyond appeal, etc.—a want which the world sadly feels—the personal Advent alone gives satisfaction, meeting the demands. The current of prophecy teaches, that this want will be supplied, in the Coming of a Ruler, now absent, who shall be accessible to the nations—in the Advent of a King whose infallibility and divine attributes will secure the establishment of a government of indisputable authority, etc. (Props. 200–204). (5) Again, the Old Test. Scriptures hold up to the eye of faith as its chief prospect, and to the heart of hope as its great object, a glorious Millennial period in which Christ, the Messiah, the promised Seed, should manifest His glory and firmly establish the happiness and exaltation of His people. Now, if those who for many centuries read these descriptions and hoped that they themselves should experience this blessedness, are not raised up by a Pre-Mill. Coming and resurrection so that they can enter into the enjoyment of this predicted state of glory, then indeed the wisest and best (including, as our opponents admit, inspired men and their disciples) have indulged a faith that is vain, and a hope that is delusive. But God does not deal thus with His creatures, when His Word contains promises which in their simple grammatical construction involve His honor in performance. (6) Again, in order to fully exhibit a Pre-Mill. Advent, a number of adjuncts are indispensably necessary, such as a resurrection, a judgment, a Kingdom,

an inheriting, a new creation, etc., seeing that all these are united with the Sec. Advent. How comes it then that all these are either directly mentioned in connection with the Pre-Mill. Coming or with the age itself? No one who rejects our view has been able to give an explanation of this remarkable coincidence. We, on the other hand, rejoice in it, as being a matter of design to lead inquirers into the truth. One single flaw (omission) here in reference to any important event united with the Advent, would indeed be a serious defect in our system and render it, in so far, worthy of grave suspicion. Thus e.g. if no judgment was connected with this Pre-Mill. Coming, if we could not consistently show from the Scriptures that the judgment (for instance, in Matt. 25) was just previous to the Millennium, then, we admit, a most serious and inseparable objection would be raised up against us. But since not only the judgment but all the other events are distinctly linked with the Pre-Mill. Advent, we insist that all these concurrent facts, which do not occur by chance, but were purposely engrafted upon it, contain the evidence of so many separate witnesses to the truth of our doctrine. We can justly claim, that such a union of events is a powerful reason why we should receive so cheering a belief. Especially so, when we again remind the reader how the Jews believed in such a Pre-Mill. Advent, how Jesus and the Apostles employed the language of the prophets pertaining to it, and, without any intimation of a change in the meaning, transfer it over and apply it to the Sec. Advent, thus directing Jews and Gentiles to a future, glorious Pre-Mill. Coming.*

Obs. 10. The fact is, that arguments in favor of a personal Pre-Mill. Advent abound on all sides. That this is no empty boast, we select some more, in addition to those given, for the reader's consideration. (1) If we are allowed to take the application of Isa. 63, the Coming from Edom, to Christ, as given by the early Church, by Origen, Jerome, Cyril, Eusebius, Procopius, etc., by Lowth, Cocceius, Calovius, Vitringa, etc., while rejecting the notion held by some of its denoting the First Advent as utterly inconsistent, yet, accepting of the notion of personality admitted, by a comparison of Scripture, it will be found to sustain a Pre-Mill. Coming. (2) The exceeding prominence given, and frequent allusions made, to the Sec. Advent, which is only reconcilable with our doctrine. (3) The general prophetic announcements of the Pre-Mill. Coming are sustained by the same given without symbol in a plain grammatical sense, as e.g. Zech. 14. This has indeed proven to be one of the most difficult passages for our opponents to spiritualize. Some have candidly confessed that they know not what to do with it; and if the order there laid down is observed, it is impossible for them to fit it into their system. (4) The design in giving the transfiguration (see Prop. 153 on Transfig.). (5) Even Isa. 49:2, embracing (Alex. versions) the sharp sword out of Christ's mouth, is admitted by numerous commentators to refer to His personal Advent; but the same thing is said of Him in Rev. 19. (6) "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world," John 9:5, this taken in connection with the fourth verse, as Neander well states (S. 198, note, Life of Christ) has reference to "His personal, visible manifestation," being "the Sun of the world, visible upon the earth itself." Now, considering how Christ employed the figure, can we not justly and forcibly employ it, when interpreting "the Sun of righteousness" of Mal. 4, as denoting the same visible presence, especially when the context demands it? The early Church, and many writers, thus regarded it. (7) So if we were to take ancient comments on Mal. 3:1, 2, an argument could be formed by comparison of Scripture. For, Clement (First Epis., ch. 23) quotes Mal. 3:1, 2, to be fulfilled hereafter, and Augustine (City of God, b. 18, ch. 35) has: "in this place, he has foretold both the First and the Second Advent of Christ; the First, to wit of which he says, 'And He shall come suddenly in His temple,' etc. And of the Second Advent he says, 'Behold, He cometh, saith the Lord Almighty, and who shall abide,' etc. (8) The entry into Jerusalem by which as many admit "the Saviour appears to have awakened and nourished those earthly Messianic hopes" (Olshausen, Com., vol. 2, p. 142) is only reconcilable with our view of this Coming and Kingdom. (9) Every dispensation in the historical development of Redemption is preceded by a personal manifestation of God, as the Adamic, Mosaic, the present; and as the Millennial differs from this one also, introducing a new era, and promises in glowing terms a special manifestation, we cannot see why it should form an exception. (10) If we do not divide or separate what the Mill. descriptions contain, but allow them to describe one period of time here on the earth as they evidently do, then our doctrine legitimately follows. Hence, against us, by spiritualizing, the most arbitrary measures are taken with these predictions, locating part here and another part in heaven, and making a part present and a part future, etc. (11) The dominion that Adam forfeited was to be exercised here on the earth personally, now if the Sec. Adam restores that dominion in his own person, it must also be exhibited personally. The Mill. predictions require this feature in their demands, so that the three aspects in which Paul represents Christ (as many writers have shown) meets this condition: (a) sub-angelic humiliation; (b) heavenly exaltation; (c) earthly dominion. (12) The last seal, Rev. 6:15–17, evidently describes a personal appearance of Christ, "hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne and the wrath of the Lamb," etc. This period is made by many writers, as Woodhouse, Lord, Cunningham, etc., to synchronize with latter part of Rev. 19; and the same is asserted by others, even by some of those who have an inchoate fulfilment on the year-day interpretation. We are not now concerned in its application, excepting that it is Pre-Millennial; that it somehow includes the personal presence of Christ; and that the same idea is used by Jesus in reference to His personal Advent in Luke 23:30. (13) A prophet like unto Moses, Deut. 18:13–19, is supposed by many to include characteristics which Jesus will only fully reveal at the Sec. Advent, such as Judge, etc. The connection, etc., requires a personal presence.

Obs. 11. Again, we ask the reader to consider the peculiar and distinctive work that is to be accomplished in the Mill. age, and are we not abundantly justified in insisting upon a personal Coming which alone (Prop. 120) can adequately account for its performance? The resurrection from among the dead, the renovation of nature, the restoration of all things, the re-establishment of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, the complete subversion of anti-christian domination, the exaltation to power and authority of the pious, the entire reversal of the moral, social, and political condition of the world, the binding of Satan, the utter destruction of the

enemies of God, the perfect vindication of truth and justice, etc.—all this, embracing the most radical and grand changes that the world has yet witnessed, demands the personal intervention of Him in whom all power is lodged. Therefore the general analogy of Scripture, as our line of argument clearly evinces, insists upon, and takes even for granted, this personal Pre-Mill Advent.*

Obs. 12. Considering the prominence and preciousness of this doctrine of a Pre-Mill. Advent, it is strange that men should so persistently reject and condemn it, notwithstanding the cautions and warnings given. The reason for its unpopularity and bitter opposition must be found in its condemnatory nature. It sets aside all human systems, all worldly schemes of regeneration, all man-devised plans to realize the Messiah's Kingdom on earth, all confidence in the resources of nature, reason, etc., declaring that the personal intervention of Jesus, the Christ, is requisite to bring about the world's restoration to Millennial blessedness. This is humbling to man's pride, to his worldliness, to his schemes of reformation, all of which this Advent dooms to destruction. This exalting of the Christ and His work is condemnatory of man and his work, and hence man hates it, for it is a constant and jarring protest to his vain ideas of progress and reform, to his estimate of the Church's and world's actual mission and condition.*

Obs. 13. This Sec. Advent will be the greatest and grandest event that the world has ever yet witnessed. Great and glorious as was the First Advent—unspeakably precious and indispensably necessary unto Salvation—yet it was a Coming in humiliation and ending in death, with a glimpse at exaltation, but this is a Coming in overwhelming power, splendor, majesty, and glory—a Coming in triumph and like the mighty Theocratic King. To this Coming the Scriptures especially turns the eye of faith and speaks of it in the most lofty and exultant strain; and we may rest assured that what God thus describes, and to which He directs the hope of prophets, Apostles, and believers, must be inconceivably magnificent. It is an honor to aid in upholding and directing attention to it.*

Obs. 14. The early Christians, as numerous writers assert, had as their watchword the expressive "Maranatha" or "The Lord Cometh." This word "Maranatha", was used by the Jews (comp. Macknight, Ency. Relig. Knowl., etc.) expressive for "our Lord comes" (Lange, 1 Cor. loci). and is appropriately applied by Paul (1 Cor. 16:22) to the Sec. Advent of Jesus, thus according with the "Coming One" of Matt. 11:3; Luke 17:19, 20; John 6:14, and 11:27; Jude 14, and in Revelation. The usage (see Props. 74 and 75) and belief based thereupon forbid the notion of an intervening Millennium. Considering the Scriptural testimony for our faith already given (and much to be presented in following Propositions), and the exceeding preciousness of this Coming, well may we conclude this Prop. by urging the reader to have impressed upon mind and heart the pregnant word "Maranatha" (comp. Brookes's Maranatha, pp. 7–11).

PROPOSITION 122. As Son of Man, David's Son, Jesus inherits David's throne and Kingdom, and also the land of Palestine.

This has been already proven under the Propositions pertaining to the covenant (49, 50, 51, 52, etc.), and was so understood by the Jews and the early Christians. Leaving the proof already assigned, directly derived from the covenant, attention is now called to the manner in which this inheritance is spoken of in the Scriptures. (With this comp. such Props. as 117, 131, 132, 137, etc.)

Obs. 1. Writers by confining themselves to the Divine Sovereignty and overlooking the specific promises to David's Son, have Christ now in the enjoyment of the promised inheritance. To make this out, the language is spiritualized until David's throne and Kingdom is elevated to heaven and the land itself is converted into the Church or heaven or the universe. Besides this, it is rashly asserted that for Jesus to come again and obtain such a Theocratic rule here on earth would be derogatory to His dignity, etc. Having already replied to this and showed the impropriety and danger of our prejudging what is right and proper for Christ to perform, we rest content with the plain and repeated statements of the word. And, moreover, it can be seen that the fulfilment of these promises will subserve noble purposes. The humanity of Christ. His contact with man in David's line, gives Him the leverage for Redemptive purposes; so also His contact through humanity with the throne and Kingdom of David gives Him the requisite leverage for a Theocratic rule, a divine government over the human race for the completion of Redemption. In looking closely at this wonderful arrangement, we find it most singularly adapted to secure the happiness of the creature man. In the infinity of matter, in the immensity of the universe, the man feels himself in almost the condition of an atom, and he finds only a consoling point of contact, of union, with the Infinite Architect in the Incarnation of Christ; so in the astounding, outgrowing laws of government, felt to be necessarily universal, acknowledged to be inseparable to order, happiness, etc., and yet in the history of the world running in selfishness and antagonisms through depravity, man can only find a point of union and needed support with the Divine in the reign of the glorified humanity of David's Son. It brings God to man and man to God in the highest of all relations, that of religious, social, and civil law and order.*

Obs. 2. Having previously shown how Jesus as David's Son is entitled to David's throne and Kingdom; how the same throne and Kingdom over thrown and for a long time remaining overturned is finally restored (Ezek. 21:25–27; Hos. 3:4, 5; Amos 9:11; Acts 15:16, etc.), it is only necessary to indicate how the Scriptures in their general tenor preserve the idea that such is the inheritance of David's Son. This Kingdom is declared to be "His inheritance" the Lord's (1 Sam. 10:11): "mine inheritance" (2 Kings 21:14), "Thine

inheritance" (Ps. 28:9 etc.), and "the inheritance of the Lord" (1 Sam. 26:19 and 2 Sam. 21:3), in view of the Theocratic arrangement, for, as Solomon stated in his prayer (1 Kings 8:51, 53), this nation is "Thy people and Thine inheritance," "for Thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth to be Thine inheritance, as Thou spakest unto Moses." Hence they are called "the tribes of Thine inheritance" (Isa. 63:17), "the mountain of Thine inheritance" (Ex. 15:17), "a people of inheritance" (Deut. 4:20), "Thy people and Thine inheritance" (Deut. 9:26, 29). Such language repeatedly employed must have a significant meaning, and this is only found in the special relationship that the Jewish nation sustains to God as their Ruler. But having shown that this Theocratic rule is absorbed and manifested in the Davidic line, and culminates in the Person of Jesus Christ, who is both the Son of David and the Son of God, the Scriptures speak of this inheritance belonging to Christ in this double relationship; but especially, because of the Covenant with Abraham and then with David, speak of it as pertaining to Him as David's Son, the Son of Man, seeing that the Kingdom is to be administered by Him because of His descent in the covenanted line, and only through this Humanity can the Ruler Himself be exhibited, etc. In addition to our previous argument showing that as David's Son He inherits David's throne and Kingdom, we add in this connection—that "heir of all things" (Heb 1:2) to whom the heathen also shall be given as an "inheritance" (Ps. 2:8): yea, even the kingdoms of this world (Dan. 7, and Rev. 11), yet He is also "out of Judah an inheritor of My mountains" (Isa. 65:9), who will "return for Thy servants' sake, the tribes of Thy inheritance" (Isa. 63:17), for "the Lord shall inherit Judah, His portion in the holy land and shall choose Jerusalem again" (Zech. 2:12), because "the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever" (Luke 1:32, 33). Men may think that this Heir of David's will not care for such an inheritance, but "the Lord will not cast off His people, neither will He forsake His inheritance" (Ps. 94:14), for the time will come when this Heir whom His own people Killed shall return again and claim His right. The reasons having been given under the covenant, this will be confirmed by showing in the following Observation that not merely the throne and Kingdom but even the territory, the land itself, is claimed as part of this inheritance. If the latter is the case, then the former is the more readily acknowledged.*

Obs. 3. Jesus, as David's Son and the Theocratic Ruler with whom the Father is united and identified, is the Heir of Palestine. If any one is disposed to object to what follows, on the ground that such an Heirship reduces Christ too much to the level of man, we remind him that this is of God's own ordering and for the purpose of accomplishing the most noble designs pertaining to Redemption. Precisely the same reason might be (and has been) adduced against the Incarnation itself, and, therefore, we should be guarded in bringing forward objections based on our own ideas of the fitness of things. It is natural to suppose that to a believer who accepts the Word as written by faith, the simple reason assigned in Ps. 132 would be sufficient to remove all objections; for David, after declaring God's fixed determination confirmed by oath, "of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne," adds: "for the Lord hath chosen Zion; He hath desired it for His habitation. This is my rest forever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it." The Theocratic-Davidic arrangement involves the actual, real possession of the land by the Ruler. The covenant, prophecy, and promise demand it. Let the reader notice that just so soon as this Theocratic arrangement is entered into, and God condescends to act in the capacity of earthly Ruler, then special claims are made in reference to the land occupied by His nation. The land is expressly called "His land," and cannot be sold in perpetuity (Lev. 25:23); "the land shall not be sold forever: for the land is Mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with Me." It is frequently called "the inheritance of the Lord," and by names indicative of its sustaining a peculiar affinity to God and His Son Jesus Christ. This nearness of the land, its possession, is even represented under the figure of marriage, that the Saviour is married or united to the land (Isa. 62:4). Having proven (Prop. 49) that the land is Christ's, it only is requisite to show that His inheritance is not vitiated by the sad condition in which the land has lain for many centuries. This is done abundantly by the prophets who predict its restoration to an Edenic fruitfulness, etc. It is amply sufficient, for the present, to say that God in Lev. 26 declares that in case of wickedness and rebellion He will make the land desolate and waste, even an astonishment, but that He will not "break His covenant;" for, after all the desolation, the time will come, when "I will remember My covenant with Jacob, and also My covenant with Isaac, and also My covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land." This is still more distinctly asserted in the remarkable predictions in Deut. 32, which is particularly commended to the reader's attention. After describing that "the Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance," that this people would rebel and that fearful, prolonged disaster would occur to them and the land, he informs us that God will return again for purposes of vengeance and restitution, breaking forth: "Rejoice, O ye nations with His people, for He will avenge the blood of His servants and will render vengeance to His adversaries, and will be merciful unto His land and to His people." We need not be surprised at this, seeing that it is a solemnly covenanted land, "a land which the Lord thy God careth for (marg. read. "seeketh"); the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year." This land so near and dear to God; so intimately associated with His Son Jesus as His representative Ruler of that land; so united with the legal, royal, covenanted claims of David's Son, is yet destined in the Divine Purpose to play the most important and glorious part in the history of this world. And, if we are wise, those divine intimations of God's condescension and intentions, will be gratefully received. This land, which is called by way of pre-eminence and relationship "His Sanctuary" (Ex. 15:17; Ps. 78:54, etc.), will finally be cleansed and become as predicted "the Sanctuary" for the nations of the earth. This "rest" of the Lord's which He desires to dwell in, shall, in the age to come, gratify the desires and secure the blessedness of His co-heirs and co-dwellers, who will also delight in it with gladness and singing.*

Obs. 4. The absence of the Lord as indicated by the parable of the nobleman; His concealment, as noticed by Isa. 49:2, during this

period of removal, is only preparative to the final return and enforcement of His claims as the mighty and irresistible Heir. Take e.g. the chapter of Isa. just alluded to and we have (1) this hidden position of the one called from the womb; (2) an allusion to His rejection at the First Advent; (3) His ultimate success in the restoration of the Jews, the conversion and subjection of the Gentiles and the glorious reign; (4) to effect this He delivers the prisoners, He restores the earth, removes the desolations, in an especial manner blesses Zion, etc. The delay of fulfilment is no reason for believing that it never will be realized, because the fact of such postponement accords with the previously given predictions intimating it.*

Obs. 5. The student will see that the inheritance covenanted is not typical of something else. The mystical views that would make it a type of something spiritual are refuted by the literal tenor of the covenant, and that all the prophecies and promises reiterate that literality which is corroborated by the idea of inheriting. The Kingdom at the time of the covenant was literal; the promise of inheriting is literal, confined as it is by the express terms to the literal Theocracy; the Coming of the Heir is literal; the postponement is literal; all is literal. Whatever spiritual blessings and additional glory may be added, the inheritance cannot, without the greatest violence, be transmuted into something else. The same tabernacle fallen down (Acts 15:16) is Christ's inheritance, and to fulfil the covenant is to be rebuilt again when Jesus, David's Son, comes again. It is the same Kingdom that (Props. 69, 70, and 71) the preachers of the Kingdom under special Messianic instruction declared as seen e.g. in Acts 1:6. It is (Props. 32 and 33) the same Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom that was removed, that is finally, after (e.g. Hos. 3:4) a long interval, to be restored.*

Obs. 6. The continued covenanted relationship of Jesus to the throne and Kingdom of David is asserted in the last revelation given, as in the Apoc. 3:7, "He hath the Key of David." This is indicative of the Messiahship, the Key (Horne's Introd., vol. 2, p. 466) being symbolical of "power or authority," or (so Barnes, Com. loci, with which compare Bush, Lowth, Alexander, etc., and the Chaldee Targum on Isa. 22:22) rather of "regal authority," "government." It is equivalent to saying that He is the Theocratic King to whom David's throne and Kingdom is given. It is not merely "supreme power" (Lange, etc.) that is meant, but such power and authority as pertains to the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, i.e. the dignity, etc., pertaining to David now relates to David's august Son. But while having this "Key of David," He does not now exert its power (just as He has also the keys of death and the grave), for He awaits the period of the Sec. Advent when this bestowed authority will be duly manifested.*

Obs. 7. The time will come, when this covenanted and predicted truth, now so ignored and perverted, will be fully recognized by earthly Kingdoms. And this recognition will be the real cause for the formidable array of the nations against the Christ at His open revelation, for they will be unwilling to yield to this re-establishment of the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom (comp. Props. 160, 161, 162, and 163).

Obs. 8. It may be added: unless this Theocracy is restored in grandeur and glory, as covenanted and predicted, then God's earthly government in the union of the civil and religious (Church and State) has, amid the Kingdoms of the earth, proven a failure (comp. Prop. 201). God, as an earthly King, has had rule but a brief period. Will it ever be so? No! God's Word assures us that when He comes again, it is to a glorious reign. Once "He came to His own land and His own people received Him not" (Campbell's rendering of John 1:11; so Alford, "His own inheritance or possession and His own people," etc., comp. Matt. 8:20 and 21:33), but when He comes again to His own land or inheritance, His own people will receive Him with penitence and gladness, and then the Theocracy will be manifested in and through Him with an exaltation and splendor commensurate with the predictions given.*

PROPOSITION 123. The Pre-Millennial Advent and the accompanying Kingdom are united with the destruction of Antichrist.

This is a decided landmark in prophecy, and nearly every prophet dilates, more or less, on this feature, viz., that Antichrist is destroyed at the personal presence of the Christ. We, for the present, only direct attention to three: Paul in 2 Thess. 2, Daniel in ch. 7, and John in Rev. 19. The early Church and a long line of witnesses held that these synchronize; and we know of no legitimate argument adduced by our opponents to the contrary; while, on the other hand, a host of admissions, favorable to their identity in time and destruction of the Antichrist, could readily be gathered. If we can give decided proof that one of these predictions relates to a personal Coming to destroy the Antichrist, the others naturally—describing the same event and results—range themselves in the same order. 2 Thess. 2 is selected as a special subject for examination in this connection.

Obs. 1. It is admitted by all our recent prophetic writers that Antichrist shall exist previous to the Millennial age—this is so plain in the confederation of nations existing then, that it needs no additional proof—now if we can show that he is destroyed by the personal Coming of Jesus, we have a personal Pre-Mill. Coming. The predictions relating to the Millennium clearly portray the removal of the man of sin and of his adherents before that age; and they reveal the impossibility of reconciling their presence with the realization of that age of blessedness. The true sense of the Scripture is contained in 2 Thess. 2, "which" (as Taylor, Voice of the Church, p. 293, remarks) "all Pre-Millennarians with the Hon. B. Storer pronounce to be 'the unanswerable argument;' and of which they may well declare in the decisive words of Bish. M'Ilvaine, 'It is wholly unanswerable.' " And the reader is requested to notice, that in the following discussion we are not chargeable with endeavoring to make out, or force, a meaning; seeing that we are accepting of that

which is given to it by many of our opponents and a host of men rejecting our Mill. views. This makes the testimony more valuable and correspondingly more conclusive.

Obs. 2. The passage to which special attention is called reads: "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His Coming," 2 Thess. 2:8.* Owing to its importance and the efforts made to give it an interpretation adapted to the modern Whitbyan theory, it will be best to examine it in detail.

A. Those to whom Paul wrote were looking for the personal Advent of Christ. This appears from several considerations. 1. The Apostle distinctly and repeatedly mentions the personal Coming. Thus in 1 Thess. 1:10; 2:19; 3:13; 4:16; 5:23; 2 Thess. 1:7; 2:1; 3:5. Hence the minds of the Thessalonians were specifically directed to this subject. 2. This very Coming, we are told, 2 Thess. 2:2—the subject matter of Paul's discourse—was calculated to shake and trouble them, deeming it past and they not saved. If a "spiritual" or "providential Coming" was only intended, as some contend, it is singular that Paul does not explain it as such; if it was to "convert" and not "to consume and destroy," it is astonishing that Paul does not declare the same; and if it was a providential Coming at Jerusalem (as a few assert) in which the Thessalonians were not personally concerned, it is strange that the Apostle does not mention the fact to relieve their minds. The only satisfactory explanation which meets the condition of their trouble is, that they supposed the day of Christ had come, was inaugurated, and hence they expected that a personal Advent had taken place. They believed in such a personal Coming from Paul's previous teachings. They supposed it at least to be imminent, if it had not already transpired. The Apostle seeing that this supposition agitated their minds, etc., makes the imminency, the nearness of such a visible Coming as they believed in, the subject of his remarks. It would, in the nature of the case, be unreasonable for him to introduce any other Coming than the one under consideration, without a specific mention that they were mistaken in their ideas respecting such a personal Coming; or, if another Coming was to be understood, growing out of the one stated, without pointing out, in some way, the distinction between them. 3. The reference to a personal Coming is established by the phraseology appended, "as that the day of Christ is at hand." The period when the Messiah is to be personally manifested as the Judge, the King, etc., is often called "His day" etc., and was so understood both by the Jews and early Christians. This phrase clearly proves that the Apostle was writing to those who not only held to a personal Advent, but united the day of Judgment, the distinctive day of Christ in which His Power and majesty was to be revealed, with that Coming. Paul's endeavoring to show that such a day of Christ (see how he used the phrase in Acts 17:31; Rom. 2:5; 1 Cor. 3:13; 2 Cor. 1:14; 1 Cor. 5:5; Eph. 4:30; Phil. 1:6, 10), of which he had told them in the First Epis. (1 Thess. 5:2), "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" was not so near as they apprehended, that certain great events would intervene, unmistakably corroborates his entire and exclusive reference in this verse to a personal Advent.

B. The Apostle then designs to correct the mistake respecting the presence or nearness of that personal Coming in which they believed, and the manner in which he does this confirms the allusion to the personal Coming. Instead of denying such an Advent (which he could not do) he enters into the question concerning the time of the very Advent whose expected speedy approach or supposed occurrence caused their alarm. He enlightens them on time and confirms their ideas of personality. He introduces the subject by several distinct references to the personal Advent, and then asserts, that it shall not come until at least a certain event, viz., the appearing and power of the man of sin, was first witnessed; then after this it would occur as stated in the passage under consideration and "the day of Christ" would be witnessed. His argument is not that they were mistaken in a personal Coming, or that it would not at some time or other take place, but is directed to the time when it will be manifested. To show the latter, that it is not "at hand" or "present," as they supposed, he introduces the predicted fact that before that visible Advent or day of Christ, the wicked one must arise and be exalted in power. It legitimately follows from the tenor of the proof given, that this personal Advent is not "at hand" or "present," that it will, after an intervening event has been fulfilled, then come to pass. Any other construction than that which makes the writer speak of the same day of Christ and Advent which the Thessalonians expected, which troubled them, and which he stated was only to be expected after the accomplishment of the revelation of the son of perdition, is a manifest violation of the Apostle's reasoning, and a gloss put on the passage.

C. The Apostle's proof of the day of Christ and hence also the personal Advent not being "at hand" or "present," thus fully accords with the analogy of Scripture. Many are the predictions and pointed allusions that Christ's visible personal Advent only takes place at a time when Antichrist or a mighty confederation of wickedness is developed, and that He will at such a Coming take vengeance and utterly destroy the wicked arrayed against Him. All prophecy agrees in uniting the destruction of the Anti-Christian power with a personal Advent. The simple fact that acts of judgment and the destruction of the ungodly are united with, in passages admitted to relate to the Sec. Advent (as in this same Epistle, ch. 1:7–10), and that the same is expressed here in this Scripture when the purpose of the Apostle was to tell the Thessalonians why "the day of Christ" and its attendant Advent was not present or immediate, or near, firmly establishes the truth that no other but a real personal one is intended. The proof alleged by him thus accords with all his previous utterances on the subject, with the tenor of the Record, and was suited to convince those brethren that a delay in the Advent was inevitable, since it would require time, and probably a long time, for such an apostasy to develop itself into the giant form of wickedness predicted.

D. The Apostle, in introducing the Coming of the Lord Jesus to destroy this Antichrist, was undoubtedly aware of the views of the Jews on this subject. The Jews, impelled by the prophecies, looked for a personal Coming of the Messiah to destroy the wicked one.

If their belief was an erroneous one, why is it that Paul employs the very language, calculated (see below) beyond any other, to express such a Jewish faith, and thus confirm them, should any see the Epistle, in it? The knowledge that such a belief was extensively current among them, if it were an unscriptural one, should have led him to use different words—not words which in their naked, primary meaning corroborate their opinion. This union of the destruction of the wicked one with words that literally import a personal Coming is the strongest possible indorsement of their faith.

E. The import of the two words rendered “brightness of His Coming.” Epiphaneia, *ἐπιφάνεια*, called here “brightness,” and Parousia, *παρουσία*, translated “Coming.”

1. Notice how these words are used in the New Test. (a) The word Epiphaneia occurs six times, 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 1:10; 2 Tim. 4:1 and 8; Tit. 2:13, and in this place. In one place it refers to the personal First Advent, and in the four remaining, as our opponents concede, to the personal Sec. Advent. Now, why, unless the clearest proof can be given, should it in the only remaining place, with the light before us, attain another meaning? Whoever undertakes to foist a definition at variance to the New Test. usage, ought to be able to give conclusive reasons for such a departure. (b) The word Parousia is used in the New Test. twenty-four times, Matt. 24:3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Cor. 15:23, and 16:17; 2 Cor. 7:6, 7, and 10:10; Phil. 1:26, and 2:3; 1 Thess. 2:19, and 3:13, and 4:15, and 5:23; 2 Thess. 2:1, 8, 9; James 5:7, 8; 2 Pet. 1:16, and 3:4, 12, and 1 John 2:18. In all places where applied to persons it denotes, as all admit, a personal presence or arrival, and hence we have no just reason to discard that meaning in this place, especially since the argument of the Apostle makes the retention of the meaning thus given necessary.

2. But in addition, the fact that the Apostle unites together those two words, each one expressive of a personal Advent, adds weight to the interpretation we claim. As if aware of the future denial of such a personal Coming, and purposely to guard against it, he employs two words unitedly, each one of which is singly applied to the Sec. Advent. Why select two such, so expressive of a real, actual presence, if he did not intend to teach the same? One of these words would be sufficient to sustain our argument, both make it irresistible. Dr. Duffield (On Proph., p. 324) well says: “If neither, when separately used, can be metaphorically understood to denote a spiritual Advent, much less can both when united. If the words, ‘the shining forth or appearance of His presence,’ do not mean the visible personal revelation or manifestation of Himself, it is impossible to employ terms that can express it. Human language is utterly incapable of being interpreted on any fixed and definite principles whatever, if it be not a literal personal manifestation and Coming.” Dr. Seiss (Last Times, p. 48), after using very nearly the same language, adds: “Either of these words is held sufficient in other passages to prove a real and personal appearing and presence. And when both are united, as in the case before us, how is it possible that they should mean anything less than the literal, real, and personal arrival and presence of Jesus, with reference to whom they are used?” The same was noticed by earlier writers, and has been frequently repeated as worthy of attention.

3. The testimony of lexicographers.* (1) Epiphaneia. Pasor, N. T. Lex., says it denotes “appearance. In one place it is applied to the nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Tim. 1:10; in other places of the Scriptures for His glorious Coming to judgment, as 2 Thess. 2:8.” Stockius, Clavis, vol. 2, remarks: “1st, It denotes, when applied to genus, any appearance whatever. 2d, when applied to a species, it properly denotes the appearance of some corporeal and shining matter which bursts forth with great splendor. In a metaphorical sense, it is applied to the appearance of Christ: First, His gracious appearance in the flesh, which is called His first Coming; second, His glorious appearance to judge the world, which will be gracious to the righteous and faithful, but terrible to the sinner and infidel, and which is called His Second Coming, 2 Thess. 2:8,” etc. Leigh, Critica Sacra, p. 161, writes: “This word signifieth a bright, clear, glorious appearing, from which word we take our Epiphany, specially Adventus Numinis (i.e. the Coming of the Divinity). It is taken for the First Coming of Christ, 2 Tim. 1:10; for His Sec. Coming, as 2 Thess. 2:8,” etc. Suicer (Thess. Eccles., vol. 1, p. 1202), “after mentioning the use of the word, 1st, the heathen use of it in reference to the manifestation of one of their gods; 2d, in reference to the First Advent, proceeds: 3d, ‘This is frequently applied by the Apostle to the Second Coming of Christ, which will be to judgment, 2 Thess. 2:8.’” Scultetus, Exer. Evang., Lib. 2, ch. 1, after noticing that the pagan writers called any appearance of the gods by this word, adds: “The Apostle also applies *ἐπιφάνεια*—appearance—to the first and last Coming of Christ.” Bretschneider, Lex., “*ἐπιφάνεια* is used in the New Test, in the writings of Paul concerning the splendid appearing and future Advent in which Christ, who is now concealed from our view in the heavens, shall appear coming in the clouds (literally, borne on the clouds or wafted by the clouds) to administer judgment, 2 Thess. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 4:1, 8; Titus 2:13; and concerning His appearing in the world, which has already taken place, viz., when He was born, 2 Tim. 1:10; or, in other words, His first Advent.” Wahl, Lex., defines the word to be an appearing, and quotes the same passages, and expressly applies 2 Thess. 2:8 to Christ’s “future glorious return.” Pickering, Lex., defines it to mean an appearance, and applies it to “an unexpected coming and to the Advent of Christ.” Donnegan, Lex., gives the more classical use, “appearance or apparition, particularly that of a Deity, or of one who comes up suddenly to offer aid or for other purposes,” etc. Liddell and Scott, Lex., “the appearance, manifestation, e.g. dawn of the day—specially of the appearance of deities to aid a worshipper.” Greenfield, Lex., “brightness, splendor, 2 Thess. 2:8, an appearance, i.e. the act of appearing, manifestation.” (2) Parousia. Bretschneider directly refers the word in 2 Thess. 2:8 to “the Advent of Christ from heaven to administer judgment.” So Wahl, to “the future Advent of Jesus the Messiah, to enter gloriously upon His Kingdom.” So also of the others quoted under Epiphaneia. Pickering, “presence, arrival, to be present;” Donnegan, “to be present, to arrive;” Greenfield, “a

coming, arrival, advent;" Liddell & Scott, "a being present, presence of a person or thing, especially present for the purpose of assisting, arrival," etc.

F. The opinions of commentators—of the class who have no sympathy with our views, but yet are candid enough to concede this vital point, and of others who express themselves independently of any theory or bias, etc. Barnes, *Com. loci*, on ch. 2:1, says, that the phrase "by His Coming," etc., means "respecting His Coming," and refers it to a personal one, the same specified in 1 Thess. 4, and argues that the alarm, etc., of the Thess. was produced by the expectation of the speedy Advent of Christ to judgment. He then consistently explains v. 8 to embrace a personal Coming in the following words: "this (with the brightness of His Coming) is evidently a Hebraism, meaning His splendid or glorious appearing. The Greek word, however, rendered 'brightness' means merely an appearing, or appearance. So it is used, 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 1:10, and 4:1, 8; Tit. 2:13, in all of which places it is rendered appearing, and refers to the manifestation of the Saviour when He shall come to judge the world. There is no necessary idea of splendor in the word, and the idea is not, as our translators would seem to convey, that there would be such a dazzling light, or such unsufferable brightness that all would be consumed before it, but that this Antichristian power would be destroyed by His appearing; that is, by Himself when He would return. The agency in doing it would not be His brightness, but Himself. It would seem to follow from this that, however this enormous power of wickedness might be weakened by truth, the final triumph over it would be reserved for the Son of God Himself on His second return to our world." This honest but fatal concession destroys at one stroke all the reasoning abounding in his commentaries against our doctrine. Dr. Adam Clarke, *Com.*, after quoting Bh. Newton, who endorses our view, says: "the principal part of modern commentators follow his steps," and notwithstanding his cautious and in some respects contradictory exposition indorses the same. For in his pref. to 2 Thess. he informs us that Antichrist will be destroyed "by a visible and extraordinary interposition of the power of Christ in the government of the world," and on Rev. 17:17 he more plainly declares: "This deplorable state of the world is not perpetual, it can only continue till every word of God is fulfilled upon His enemies, and when this time arrives, which will be that of Christ's Sec. Advent, then shall the Son of God slay that Wicked with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of His coming." Dr. Scott, *Com.*, is forced to acknowledge, notwithstanding his efforts to make out a figurative coming, that it will only receive its ultimate fulfilment at the coming of Christ to judgment, for he writes: "He will shortly destroy the whole Papal authority, and all obstinately attached to it, by the brightness of His Coming, to spread the Gospel through the nations, and He will finally condemn and punish with everlasting destruction all the actors in this delusion when He shall come to judge the world." Bloomfield, *Gr. Test. Notes*, speaks of it as indicative of "His very presence," "His glorious presence," and adds: "Indeed the expression is often both in the Scriptures and classical writers used to denote Divine Majesty."* Matthew Henry, *Com.*, says: "The apostle assures the Thess. that the Lord would consume and destroy him (viz., the Antichrist); the consuming of him precedes his final destruction, and that is by the spirit of His mouth, by His word of command; the pure Word of God, accompanied by the Spirit of God, will discover this mystery of iniquity, and make the power of Antichrist to consume and waste away; and in due time it shall be totally and finally destroyed, and this will be by the brightness of Christ's coming. Note: the Coming of Christ to destroy the Wicked will be with peculiar and eminent lustre and brightness." Ferguson, *Com. on Epis.*, "He shall utterly destroy him, that is, utterly abolish, enervate, make void, and that with the brightness of His Sec. Coming, for the word rendered 'brightness' is usually joined with His coming to judgment." Salmasius, *Com.*, after refuting Grotius, says: "It is not true that Paul in the limits of the same discourse was so wandering as to commence to speak concerning one coming of Christ and end in speaking of another," etc. "From whence $\pi\acute{\iota}\varphi\alpha\nu\epsilon\alpha$, when applied to Christ, in my opinion, is always used to denote the last coming of Christ." Schoettgen, *Heb. Com.*, " $\pi\acute{\iota}\varphi\alpha\nu\varsigma$, that manner of coming which bursts brilliantly upon the eyes of all, the majesty and exceeding splendor of which no one can deny." Westminster Assemb. Annotators (*Bonar's Com. and Kingdom*, p. 360), "On 2 Thess. 2, 'destroy with the brightness of His Coming,' that is, at the day of judgment, for then shall He come in flaming fire, taking vengeance," etc. Jenks, *Comp. Com.*, makes the total and final destruction at the Sec. Advent. So also Lange, Bengel, Alford, Roos, Gill, Olshausen, Steir, Jones, Ebrard, etc.

G. It is important to notice the opinions of the early Apostolic Fathers, who being acquainted with the language as a living spoken one, and who receiving their interpretation of a passage which would excite special attention from the hands of the apostles or their immediate disciples, may thus afford strong corroborative evidence. Knowing that they were all decidedly Millenarian, that they all believed that Antichrist would be destroyed by the personal Sec. Advent, we have sufficient testimony concerning their mode of interpreting 2 Thess. 2:8. Having previously given the authorities, it is only necessary to append a few examples of this belief. Thus, e.g., Barnabas (martyred about A.D. 75) says (*Apost. Fath.*, p. 186): "The day of the Lord is at hand, in which all things shall be destroyed together with the Wicked one." On the Creation week he adds: "And what is that He saith 'and He rested the seventh day;' He meaneth this: that when His Son shall come and abolish the Wicked one and judge the ungodly, and shall change the sun, and moon, and stars, then He shall gloriously rest on the seventh day," alluding to the Millennial era. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, 8 v. c. 35) takes the same view, and declares that when "Antichrist" has reigned his allotted period "then the Lord shall come from heaven, in the clouds with the glory of His Father, casting him and that obey him into a lake of fire, but bringing to the just the times of the Kingdom, that is, the Rest or Sabbath, the seventh day sanctified, and fulfilling to Abraham the promise of the inheritance." Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho*, referring to Micah 4:1, etc., see Bh. Kay's Justin) pointedly unites the Second Coming of Jesus in glory with the destruction of "the man of apostasy."

H. Even after the allegorizing interpretation, introduced by the Alexandrian school, by which such passages as these are so readily transformed into various meanings, the Divines still insisted that this Scripture taught a personal coming to destroy Antichrist. In fact, so general was this opinion, that both Millenarians and their opposers held to it. The names of Cyprian, Lactantius, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyril, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Hilarian, Theodoret, and a host of others, embracing various classes, etc., clearly teach this, referring to the phrase itself, adducing it as a warning, etc. Thus to illustrate: Augustine, on 2 Thess. 2:8, wrote: "No one doubts that the apostle said these things of Antichrist, and that the day of judgment, which he here calls 'the day of the Lord,' will not come, unless he whom he calls an apostate, that is to say from the Lord God, shall first come." (City of God, B. 20, c. 19, B. 18, c. 53.) "Truly Jesus Himself shall extinguish by His presence that last persecution which is to be made by Antichrist," quoting as confirmatory Isa. 9:4; 1 Thess. 1:9. How the passage was regarded is proven, not only by the writings and commentaries handed down to us, but by the prevailing looking for of the Antichrist as stated by history; and this continued until some suggested, in order to avoid making professedly Christian Rome the seat of the Antichrist (as alleged by many, although some confined it to Jerusalem), that Pagan Rome was said Antichrist and the coming a spiritual one, etc. But few even of those dared, in the face of the general testimony to the contrary, to tamper with 2 Thess. 2:8, and admitted that it also referred to the future day of judgment and a literal coming of Christ. So that of the great number who adopted anti-millenarian views, nearly all, so far as we have any record, indorsed our meaning of the phrase, "the brightness of His Coming." It was only when the modern Whitbyan theory came in vogue that men were found bold enough to interpret the verse in such a manner as to make it consistent with that theory, and then insist upon such an interpretation as the true one. But even many of the advocates of the Whitbyan theory (as we have shown under this and previous propositions), unable to oppose the express words with any degree of candor, have honestly confessed its legitimate meaning without any effort to reconcile it with their system of belief. Those also who have been Anti-Millenarian, opposed to a Millennium in the future (either locating it in the past, or denying that any shall be witnessed on earth), freely (saving perhaps Grotius, Bossuet, Hammond, and a few others) admit the force of the passage, and locate it in the future. Dr. Greswell (Exp. of Parables), a Patristic student, says: "That Antichrist must come and must be destroyed by the Advent of Christ; in this perfectly agree all, whether friends or foes of the doctrine of the Millennium. The only distinction was that the advocates of the Millennium expected their Kingdom to begin and proceed after the destruction of Antichrist; the opponents of the doctrine expected the same of the Kingdom of heaven."

I. The Popish writers, however they may apply it, ascribe it to a personal Advent. The larger and more learned portion (See Calmet and Encyclops. art. "Antichrist," and Prop. 161) refer it to a personal coming of Jesus at the destruction of a future Antichrist. Another party, in retaliation for the application of the terms "man of sin," etc., to the Pope, apply the same phrase to Luther or the Reformation, but nearly all of these also apply it as an ultimate fulfilment to the day of judgment, when the Christ shall come to destroy the wicked.

J. The opinions of the Reformers, although making the apostasy and the man of sin to be one and the same, are distinctly in our favor. Thus to give a few illustrations: Luther, as is well known, making the Pope or the Papacy Antichrist, frequently expresses his belief that the Papacy was not to be destroyed by human agency or by the power of the truth, but by the personal Advent of the Christ. Thus e.g. "Our Lord Jesus Christ yet liveth and reigneth, who, I firmly trust, will shortly come and slay with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His Coming, that man of sin" (D'Aubigne's His. Ref., vol. 2, p. 166). "The apostle expresses this Pope's destruction thus: 'When the Lord shall consume,' etc. The laity, therefore, shall not destroy the Pope and his Kingdom. No, he and his wicked rabble are not deserving of so light a punishment. They shall be preserved until the coming of Christ, whose most bitter enemies they are and ever have been (Pope Confounded, p. 177)." In opposing the Anabaptists, one leading argument against them consisted in his constantly declaring that Christ's personal coming would overthrow His enemies, etc., appealing to Paul and Daniel as foretelling their destruction, not by the hand of man, but by the Advent of Christ. (Sleidan's Com. L. 5.) Melancthon held similar views. The sentiments of the other Reformers are given in Elliott's Horæ. Apoc., Voice of the Church, including Zwingle, Latimer, Calvin, Knox, Cranmer, etc., and require more space than is really necessary to show a continuous line of interpretation. They are, however, as pointed as the following: Beza, Notes on N. T., "Thus I have deemed it best to translate the name *πρωτεύειν*, which Paul designedly used in order to represent to our eyes that most brilliant splendor of His last Coming." "At length by the word of the Lord that impiety will be exposed, and by the Advent of Christ wholly abolished." Bh. Jewell, Com. loci, says: "The Lord shall come and shall make His enemies His footstool; then shall the sun be black as sackcloth and the moon shall be like blood. Then shall Antichrist be quite overthrown," etc. "He will overthrow the whole power of Antichrist by His presence and by the glory of His Coming."

K. The opinions of eminent Divines who endorsed the Whitbyan theory. Having already given a number, an illustration will suffice to indicate the spirit: Dr. Knapp, Ch. Theol., s. 155, 5, p. 543, says: "The Christian Church will hereafter be subjected to great temptation from heathen profaneness, from false delusive doctrine, and extreme moral corruption, and will seem for a time to be ready to perish from these causes; but then Christ will appear, and, according to His promise, triumph over this opposition; and then, and not till then, will the end of the world come; Christ will visibly appear and hold the general judgment and conduct the pious into the Kingdom of the blessed. This is the distinct doctrine of Paul, 2 Thess. 2:3-12, and is taught throughout the Apocalypse." The

reader will notice the admission made in the last sentence; and we may well ask if 2 Thess. 2 synchronizes with Rev. 19, etc., how can it be fitted without violence into Knapp's system? Leaving quotations, which might be given from a host of able writers, either directly Millenarian or at least rejecting the idea of a conversion of the world previous to the Advent, who favor our interpretation, we turn, in conclusion, to the concessions made by two prominent opposers, viz., by Whitby himself, author of the prevailing Millennium theory, and by Dr. Brown, author of a work specially devoted to its defence. Whitby allows (Com.) that a literal coming is the most consistent interpretation of the coming in 2 Thess. 2:1, but makes the coming (in violation of connection thus admitted) in verse 8 a providential coming to destroy Jerusalem, and then says, in view of the use of the word in the First Epistle: "It may be thought more reasonable to refer this passage to the same (i.e. the second personal) advent." Why give utterance to such a thought if it did not commend itself as "more reasonable"? Surely it is far "more reasonable" than the interpretation which he has foisted on the passage to aid him in his "new hypothesis"—an interpretation which even the mass of his followers reject as utterly untenable, being only held by a few Universalists and some others classed among the destructive critics. Dr. Brown (Ch. Sec. Com.) writes: "There can be no doubt that the whole passage admits of a consistent and good explanation on the view of it above given—i.e. the Pre-Millenarian view. Nor is this view (i.e. of a literal personal coming to destroy Antichrist) confined to Pre-Millennialists. Those of our elder divines who looked upon the Millennium as past already, and considered the destruction of Antichrist as the immediate precursor of the eternal state, understood this 'coming of the Lord' to destroy Antichrist, of His Sec. personal coming. There are other opponents of the Millennial theory, who explain this coming to destroy the man of sin, of Christ's Sec. Coming. They make 'the apostasy,' 'the man of sin,' 'the lawless one,' here spoken of, to embrace all the evil, apostasy, and opposition to Christ, which are to exist till the consummation of all things; in which case the destruction of it will, of course, not be till the Sec. Advent. In neither of these views, however, can I concur." Here we have the frank, manly admission that our interpretation is "a consistent and good explanation," and that many others, beside Millenarians, concur in making this coming a personal one. Dr. Brown, however, in viewing the ground upon which the Whitbyan theory rests, was too wise and prudent to admit our interpretation, well knowing that it would be fatal to his own theory (Whitbyan); for had he admitted that this coming, taught by Paul, was a personal one, then the necessary and inevitable conclusion would follow that no such a Millennium of holiness, happiness, security and blessedness as predicted, could possibly arise before it, seeing that that would make the apostasy and subsequent man of sin contemporaneous with it. Hence, while he rejects Whitby's theory of "the Coming" as inconsistent, he frames one to suit the case, viz., that Christ comes providentially to inflict judgments on the apostate Roman Empire, etc. But this theory of "the Coming" is also so unreasonable, even to many who adopt the Whitbyan Millennium, that they refuse to accept of it, and continue to hold (as Barnes, etc.) to the old view of a personal Advent.

We hold, therefore, that 2 Thess. 2:8 teaches a personal coming of Christ to destroy the Antichrist (whatever the latter may be), and in support of such an interpretation confidently appeal to the kind of Advent the Thess. were anticipating; the design the apostle had in view in writing the passage; the plain import of the words rendered "brightness" and "coming;" the N. T. usage of these words; the union of two such words; the testimony of lexicographers, critics, commentators, divines, reformers, friends and foes, the early Fathers, the concessions of opponents, etc. If we have established our position authoritatively, then, as intimated, such an Advent is necessarily Pre-Millennial. For, it is utterly impossible to reconcile the existence of Antichrist with the state delineated in the Millennium—a state in which all shall be subject to Christ, all shall be righteous, and all shall enjoy a condition of security and happiness. On the other hand, we have his complete destruction and consignment to the lake described in Rev. 19 (with which the Prophets coincide) as immediately preceding the Millennium, and what the Spirit has so plainly described and located we dare not deny and transfer. The same Spirit in both places, in accord with the tenor of prophecy, promises no intervening or contemporaneous Millennium, but predicts a developing and overshadowing power of an apostasy which must be destroyed by the personal Advent of the Son of Man, and then, only then, shall the promises of Millennial glory be fulfilled.

Obs. 3. Dr. Warren, in *The Parousia*, while endeavoring to invalidate our views (by making Parousia equivalent to age or dispensation), fully admits the literalness of the language expressing the same, as e.g. rendering 2 Thess. 2:1; James 5:7, 8; John 2:12, etc., by "the presence." He, indeed, from this very literalness, claims, wrongfully, that the term "Second Coming" is unscriptural. The concessions made by him, as we have already shown, are amply sufficient to overthrow his position. It is too late in the day (but exceedingly suggestive of the predicted denial of this truth by the Church) for a Divine to make the Parousia an entire dispensation—the Christian. And as to the scriptural basis of the term "Second Coming," this is seen (1) in Heb. 9:28; (2) in Jesus' own references to a future personal coming in His address to Jerusalem, Parable of the Nobleman, etc.; (3) in the constant teaching that this Parousia is something future; (4) in linking with it certain great events which are at the end of this dispensation; (5) in the reference of the angels, Acts 1:11; (6) in the uniform teaching of the Primitive Church, etc.*

Obs. 4. It is scarcely necessary to add anything additional to Dan. 7:13 to indicate a personal Advent. All the early Fathers, as well as those who followed them, even such a writer as Jerome (*Bickersteth's Guide*, p. 112, quotes from, and also shows how Jerome made the little horn of Daniel 7 synchronize with the man of sin 2 Thess. 2) made it refer to the personal Sec. Advent. The earliest apologies, as e.g. Justin's *First Apol.*, ch. 51, apply this to the future, and not to his First Advent. There is, at least, consistency in such an interpretation, because the tenor of the prophecy describes a coming very different from the First, which, the latter, was in humiliation and unto death, while the former is a triumphant Advent resulting in the overthrow of all enemies. It is very different in that respect from the amazing and rash exposition, given by many writers, which affirms that the coming of the Son of Man is a

going or ascension to heaven, into which even so excellent a writer as Flavel falls, who (Foun. of Life, p. 500) makes Dan. 7:13, 14, “accomplished in Christ’s ascension.” Even Waggoner (Ref. of Age to Come, p. 133) cannot see an Advent here unless it is assumed that the Ancient of Days is on the earth. The entire scene is one here on the earth and not in heaven; the acts that are performed, as the destruction of the beast, etc., are not in heaven but on the earth. What a definition such theories involve of the words “coming” and “came.” What a shrinking from having God or His Son present here on earth, as if it embraced a desecration of person. Such views introduce an antagonism into the vision irreconcilable both with its simplicity and with its synchronism with Rev. 19; 2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 14:14–20, etc. Over against all such theorizing is set the application of this passage of Daniel by Jesus Himself, when before the High Priest, to His future personal Advent—a fact which a host of our opponents, overlooking its connection with Daniel, frankly admit in their expositions of Matt. 26:64. (Thus, e.g. Barnes, Com. loci, makes it refer to the future personal Advent.) The reader is requested to notice how the personal Advent is sustained and proven by the judgment day which, as Mede has shown (Works, p. 762), the Jews derived from Daniel 7. (See Prop. 133, on the Judgment Day.) Those theories which lead to extravagance in belief are utterly opposed by the sober exegesis of the Church Fathers, and a multitude of able divines. We can safely adopt the interpretation given by the pious Jews to Daniel 7:13, sustained as it is by Christ Himself.

PROPOSITION 124. This Kingdom is delayed several thousand years, to raise up a nation or people capable of sustaining it.

It has been shown how the Kingdom failed in its Theocratic and Theocratic-Davidic establishment through the depravity of man, and how its re-establishment at the First Advent was rendered hopeless by the wickedness of the nation. Then a new feature in the plan of God appears, viz.: to postpone the Kingdom during a period called “the times of the Gentiles;” and during this season of delay gather out a chosen people to be associated in the re-establishment of the Kingdom on a firm and everlasting basis, beyond the reach, owing to the tested character, etc., of the rulers, of depravity (comp. Props. 59–65, 86, 87, 88, etc.).

Obs. 1. Just as there was a preparatory growth and development of Abraham’s seed before the Theocratic government was instituted, so now there is designed and carried out by the Divine Will a preparatory gathering of Abraham’s seed until a sufficient, predetermined number is obtained. These are called the Elect. Made like unto Christ, when they appear with Him, they are “joint heirs” with Him. The results following from such a body incorporated in the Theocratic government can well be imagined to be such as the most glowing prophetic delineations portray. This inheriting of the saints both of the Kingdom and of the land when Christ comes to His inheritance will be presented (Props. 142, 154, etc.), after passing over some preliminaries, the object now being to indicate that to secure such an inheriting a resurrection, pro-millennial, must be experienced.

Obs. 2. This view of the Kingdom sustains the doctrine of an intermediate state, in which, whatever the condition of the saints, they are waiting for the period of redemption, waiting for the crown and promised inheritance. (See Delitzsch, Sys. of Bib. Psyc., pp. 496, 498, 527–8.) This idea of the intermediate state is, however, not peculiar to our system, but belongs to various others. (Comp. Prop. 136.)

Obs. 3. The Kingdom itself is predetermined (Prop. 1) from the foundation of the world, so also (for all things fall under the Omniscient Will) is this preparatory gathering of saints. In Eph. 1: “He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world,” just as Christ Himself “was foreordained before the foundation of the world” (1 Pet. 1:20). In noticing the passages bearing on this point, we find (1) that God predetermined the reign of Christ; (2) and that with Him a certain number should be united in this reign; (3) and this predetermination only includes those who believe and are obedient; (4) and this predetermination is openly manifested “in the dispensation of the fulness of times,” when all things are gathered in one in Christ (Eph. 1:10); (5) and includes the obtaining of the inheritance, because “being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own Will” (Eph. 1:11). It cannot, therefore, fail; and the constant gathering going on through the Gospel reminds us of the continued existence of the Divine Purpose and its ultimate certain result.

Obs. 4. Until a certain number are gathered out to form the basis of rulership, guidance, etc., in this Kingdom, it is vain, owing to natural proneness to evil and to this Divine Plan for its correction, to expect its establishment under existing circumstances, or in this dispensation.*

Obs. 5. We may well imagine the astonishment and joy of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, when this natural and engrafted seed is all gathered and occupy their allotted places in the Kingdom. The Prophets seem to make allusions to this, as e.g. Isa. 29:22, 23 (Alexander’s version); Isa. 49:18; 60:4, etc.

Obs. 6. Christ tells us that the Passover shall “be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God,” Luke 22:16. They who partake of the Paschal Lamb, slain for us, shall experience the deliverance afforded by this entrance into this Theocratic state. The Prophets have much to say concerning the deliverance of God’s people and their exaltation at the time of the end. What was imperfectly realized in the

removal from Egypt under Moses will be perfectly experienced under Jesus Christ, when He comes “the second time unto salvation,” viz., complete, realized redemption. Then, too, the order of arrangements, etc., will be committed to a people who are better qualified by previous training and present advantages to receive and perpetuate them. The costly sacrifice required for them, the observance of God’s dealings, the personal experience, etc., all, in connection with the wonderful bestowments of glorification and the presence of the Saviour, will combine to produce the very qualifications so indispensable to a pure, perpetual Theocratic government. It is in view of this future deliverance of God’s people from a worse than, Egyptian bondage, the bondage and darkness of the grave, the last terrible persecution of the Church, that Jesus Himself is represented as saying: “I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God,” and “I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come,” Luke 22:16, 18. Here in these expressions is a wonderful commingling of certainty in the deliverance, its connection with the Kingdom, its delay for a season, its combination with Christ, and even the departure of David’s Son and a certain waiting for the Kingdom. This gathering of all of those who eat Christ our Passover, must first be experienced, even down to the last one (Props. 65 and 86), before the Kingdom of God shall come, and David’s Son will drink of the fruit of the vine.*

Obs. 7. Christ only introduces into His Kingdom those that He chooses, and, as Alexander’s version of Isa. 65:9, they are “chosen ones.” This has been sufficiently represented in our views of the election, and we refer to it here in order to disclaim all fellowship with that exclusive narrow spirit characteristic of some professing small bodies of believers, which condemn as unchristian and lost all who do not in all things conform to their doctrinal belief. Aside from Christ only being the Judge to decide in reference to the final status of professions, all, who cordially receive, believe and trust in Christ, exhibiting their faith by producing the enumerated graces of the Spirit, are to be recognized by us as Christians, no matter whether, on various points, they differ from us. (Props. 135, 130, 179, etc.)

PROPOSITION 125. The Kingdom to be inherited by these gathered saints requires their resurrection from among the dead.

We have conclusively shown that the covenant necessitates a resurrection; that the description of David’s Son, who is to reign, demands a descendant of David possessing, in some way, immortality, seeing that His rule is everlasting, thus implying a resurrection—that a resurrection is predicted of Him, etc.—and now the fair inference is that those selected to be His co-heirs, being gathered out during a long period of time, and having died “without receiving the promises,” must also experience the power of the resurrection before they can inherit the Kingdom of God.

Obs. 1. Leaving the proof of this union of resurrection and Kingdom for the following Propositions (as we only desire now to introduce the subject of the resurrection), every reader, keeping in view that Christ’s appearing and Kingdom are united, 2 Tim. 4:1, that a resurrection follows His Second Advent, and that an inheriting of the Kingdom succeeds this appearing and resurrection, must concede that when the righteous “are recompensed at the resurrection of the just” (Luke 14:14), this also includes the inheriting of a Kingdom. So that, for the present, we are content with the general tenor of the Word, indicating first a resurrection and then the reception and enjoyment of a Kingdom. And, as food for reflection, it is suggested that if the appearing and Kingdom are synchronical, then, as Mede observed, “The appearing must precede the Millennium, for” (taking now the doctrine of our opponents for granted) “at the final resurrection the Kingdom does not commence, but is ‘delivered up,’ then cometh the ‘end,’ ” etc. Refuge indeed may be taken in a Kingdom in the third heaven, but this, as shown, is not the Kingdom of covenant or prophecy, which is a Kingdom here on earth.

Obs. 2. All along, the position has been taken that, owing to the postponement of the Kingdom, a preliminary dispensation of grace to us Gentiles has intervened, and that even the dead saints, whatever their position in this interval, are waiting until “the day of Redemption,” the time of the resurrection for their inheritance, etc. This is confirmed by the language of Paul in 1 Cor. 15:32, who lays the greatest stress on the resurrection as the necessary and appointed means by which the blessings that are covenanted can be obtained. The memorial, the Abrahamic covenant, the Davidic covenant, promise after promise, involve a resurrection from the dead, and the resultant reception of blessings; and hence the emphatic language of Paul, because of this very relationship, “what advantageth me, if the dead rise not.” He well knew that inheritance, crown, and Kingdom belonged to the period of the resurrection. Auberlen (Div. Rev., p. 208) justly argues that one of the doctrinal defects of the Reformation was, that the resurrection of Christ was not made sufficiently prominent as compared with His sacrificial death, while in the apostolic preaching the Crucified and the Risen held equal place. And this feature extended finally in an undue exaltation of the intermediate state, until the resurrection is almost practically ignored as of comparative little consequence to the honor, glory, etc., of the deceased saint. To appreciate the force and pertinency of the resurrection, there must be a return to the scriptural presentation of the matter.*

Obs. 3. This resurrection includes a resurrection of dead saints, or, in other words, is a corporeal, literal resurrection. The changes or modifications that the body may undergo in the process of glorification, or the question whether the whole body or a portion, etc., is raised up, we leave for other works (e.g. art. “Resurrection,” McClintock and Strong’s Cyclop.) to discuss, the point under

consideration being merely that of an undoubted, veritable resurrection of the bodies of dead saints, sufficiently distinctive to preserve personal identity, and to make it recognizable to others as a real restoration from the dead. A line of argument can only (owing to lack of space) be indicated. 1. The resurrection necessitated by the covenant promises requires the personal resurrection and continued identity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. 2. That applied to David's Son demands the same, and the distinctive preservation of His humanity, so as to sustain a continued relationship to David as His Son. 3. The belief in a literal resurrection of the body, according to numerous writers, was a common one among the Jews at the time of Christ (Matt. 22; Luke 20; Acts 23:6–8; John 11:24, etc.), and the language of Christ and the apostles is pre-eminently calculated to confirm them in their belief. 4. That the language of Christ and the apostles taught such a resurrection, is confirmed by the fact that all the early churches distinctively proclaimed it as their faith, thus corroborating the views entertained by the Jews. And this general belief was not confined to Jewish but was embraced in the Gentile churches. 5. Seeing what immediately preceded and followed the First Advent in attachment to this doctrine, if an error, it seems reasonable to anticipate either from Christ or His apostles a plain and unequivocal denial of it. 6. But the Scriptures themselves establish the doctrine. This they do, (1) in the usage of words which denote both in classical and scriptural writings a revivification of the dead. (2) In applying these words to deceased persons in their graves. (3) In representing those "asleep in the dust of the earth," those "whose flesh rests in hope" etc., as the ones who shall experience it. (4) In speaking of it as something well understood, as e.g. Acts 14:2 and 23:6, etc. (5) In declaring that the unjust (Acts 24:15), "all in their graves," John 5:28, 29, shall undergo its power, removing the idea of simple moral regeneration. (6) In appealing to us not to think it incredible that God should perform such a work, Acts 26:8; Heb. 11:19. (7) In the examples of dead persons being restored to life (e.g. Matt. 27:52, 53), which is a sign of what will be done at the Sec. Advent. (8) In the body being specifically mentioned, as e.g. Rom. 8:23 in "the redemption of the body," Phil. 3:10, 21. (9) In the contrast made between death and the resurrection from the dead (1 Cor. 15:21, 22), and in the effects of death and the consequences following the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:42–54). (10) In the rejection of those who spiritualized the resurrection, 2 Tim. 2:17, 18. (11) In the removal of it to a certain fixed period, Eph. 4:30; 1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:14, 17, etc. (12) In the fact that "the first begotten of the dead" underwent a literal, corporeal resurrection, as the various Gospels prove; that even in the process of glorification following it He retains His personal identity sufficiently that when He comes again He comes emphatically as "the Son of Man," David's Son, and that His resurrection is represented as a pattern for that of His saints, Rom. 8:11; 1 Cor. 4:14; 2 Cor. 4:14; Rom. 6:5; Phil. 3:21; 1 John 3:2. (13) In the mortal, i.e. the part subject to death putting on immortality, 1 Cor. 15:52–3; Rom. 8:11. (14) In the effects of Paul's preaching the doctrine on Athenians, etc., Acts 17:32; 26:6, 8, etc. (15) In the fact that if the body is not also redeemed, restored to its forfeited condition, then the Redemptive process is in so far incomplete. Such considerations, with especially the deeper and more significant one that the Davidic-Theocratic arrangement necessarily by covenant insists upon it, are amply sufficient to cause us to retain the old form of doctrine.*

Obs. 4. The views of the Gnostics relating to matter, and the consequent rejection of this doctrine, has influenced many to imitate Hymenæus and Philetus. From Manes down to Eckermann, Henke, Ammon, Priestley, Des Cotes (Knapp's Ch. Theol., p. 532), Bush, Owen, etc., men have endeavored either to spiritualize the language, or to explain it away as an accommodation, or to refer it to the bestowment of something new immediately after death. Indeed, this leaven has so far worked through the mass, that concessions are made by our theologians which virtually vitiate the whole doctrine so far as its relationship to the future is concerned. An illustration may be in place. Dr. Dwight in expounding (Ser. 64, On. Res.) Matt. 22:31, 32, not seeing how the covenant promises give the key (Prop. 49) to its meaning, opens wide the gate of arbitrary exegesis; and of his exposition Prof. Bush, in his *Anastasis* (denying the resurrection of the body) gladly avails himself. Dwight asserts that the word here translated resurrection denotes throughout the New Test., "existence beyond the grave," or "a future state or existence." It is a matter of amazement that so able a writer, to make out a special case of interpretation, should commit himself so erroneously, and thus aid the efforts of those who deny a bodily resurrection. This assertion has no weight with himself afterward, as he advocates a literal resurrection, indicates that it is applied to the corporeal resurrection of Jesus, and admits that the Jews, etc., employed it (as e.g. John 11:24) to denote a revivification of the body.* Why, then, make so sweeping a declaration, which is abundantly disproved by even the simplest passage relating to the resurrection; for, if he is correct, and Bush is right in indorsing it, then his interpretation is synonymous with the word, *anastasis* or resurrection. Let it be tested as a synonym with John 11:25; 1 Cor. 15:42, etc., and its absurdity will appear. Hence, our ablest critics and most talented theologians, as a matter of simple consistency, accept of the word "*anastasis*" or "*resurrection*" as legitimately denoting a revivification of the dead, a restoration to life. The student need not be reminded that innumerable testimonies derived from ancient and modern writers can be adduced to support this meaning. To give but a recent illustration: Thompson (*Theol. of Christ*, ch. 14), following Knapp and others, declares that the word was used by the Greeks, by the Grecian-Jews, and by the Scriptures to denote a restoration to life of the dead. This leads us again to remind the reader that in the following discussion, such candid admissions from those who have no sympathy with our doctrine possess considerable weight, in view of the fact that the selection of such a word which Christ and the apostles well knew was thus employed, indicates, that if a spiritual resurrection or existence beyond the grave is meant by the resurrection, no word could have been selected better calculated to deceive hearers and readers.*

Obs. 5. An important feature that ought to be noticed in this discussion, is this: Commentators and others quote largely from the writings of the Jews, showing that they derived from the Old Testament the belief that the pious dead would be raised up at the

Coming of the Messiah, and that they would remain with Him here on earth in His Kingdom. A few specimens will suffice: Eisenmenger (Bush, Anast., p. 221) states that the Jews held that the souls of pious Israelites were in a state of detention until the resurrection, awaiting a deliverance which was to be wrought for them by the Messiah, the Son of David. Bush quotes (Anast., p. 225), as favoring such a resurrection, R. Joshua Ben Levi, who thus applies Hos. 13:14 and Isa. 35:10, and also the Bereshith Rabba ad Gen, thus interpreting Micah 2:13. Priest (View, p. 40) says that J. Ben Uziel when referring to the prophecies of Eldad and Medad concerning Gog and Magog "in the last days," adds: "All the dead of Israel shall rise again to life, and shall enjoy the delights prepared for them from the beginning, and shall receive the reward of their works." R. Eliezer speaks of a resurrection preceding the Millennial age or thousand years. In the Test. of Simeon (Twelve Patriarchs) when "the Lord God, the Mighty One of Israel, shall appear upon earth as man," it is added: "Then will I (Simeon) arise in joy and will bless the Most High for His marvellous works, because God hath taken a body, and eaten with men, and saved men." In the same work, in the Test. of Zebulun, he is represented as saying: "And now, my children, grieve not that I am dying, nor be troubled in that I am passing away from you. For I shall arise once more in the midst of you, as a ruler in the midst of his sons; and I will rejoice in the midst of my tribe," etc. Having given Jewish testimony in various places, and reserving others for following propositions, this, in connection with the collections given by Burnet (Theory), Lightfoot (Works), Mede (Works), Manasse Ben Israel (On Res.), Herzog's Cyclop., Smith's Bib. Dic., and found in our commentaries, is corroborative of the notion entertained by Jews themselves of a corporeal resurrection, and of its occurrence at the appearing of the Messiah. And, what is remarkable, this very expectation of a resurrection at the time of the reign of the Messiah, a Pre-Millennial resurrection, a resurrection deemed indispensable to fulfil the prophets and the covenant itself to Abraham, etc., is so fully incorporated in the phraseology of the New Test. that not the slightest disconnection is to be found existing, so that Paul himself, Acts 26:6, 7 (comp. Acts 23:6), links "the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come," with the resurrection itself; and John in the Apocalypse, as many writers have admitted, gives a representation of the resurrection in full accord with Jewish opinions. At least the language chosen in its natural, grammatical meaning confirms these hopes not only in Jewish but in Gentile converts. The latter circumstance is to be considered the stronger in our favor, since, as many authors have shown, the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead was particularly absurd and offensive to Greeks, Romans, etc. Surely this continued reception of "Jewish conceptions" by Gentile churches must have its significance. This doctrine was taught by the apostolic Fathers and their successors as indispensable to their system of faith; and it was regarded as cardinal and exceeding precious, owing to the covenanted Kingdom and blessings being identified with it. Justin Martyr (Dial.s with Trypho, ch. 80) gives the general view held when he says: "But I and others, who are right-minded Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead (or as Newton, of the flesh), and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare," quoting Isa. 65:17–25; Ps. 90:4; 2 Pet. 3:8 and the Apoc. in confirmation.*

Obs. 6. But in view of the variety of theory concerning the resurrection, something more must be stated. Many writers refine the resurrection by using it as a figurative expression, so that it is constituted something coeval with the history of the Church; or as an accommodation denoting the unfolding of greater capacities and newer powers; or as indicative of an inner body or life continued after death, making death not penal, but necessary and friendly to the development of life; or, as the reception of something exclusively spiritual, either the complete transformation of the material into spirit or the union of two spiritual natures into one. There is no end to the variety and scope of mystical language in this direction, and under the guidance of men of learning and genius, it becomes bewildering. But all such notions, however learnedly and eloquently expressed, are opposed to the simple idea of the resurrection as entertained by the Jews and early Christians, and as represented in the Scriptures. We frankly admit that the subject is one of faith, and thus accept of it; but, at the same time, a solid foundation sustaining such faith is produced. Leaving the connection that it has with the body itself in the grave, with the corporeal resurrection of Jesus, with the meaning of the word anastasis as aptly given by Pearson on the Creed, with the corporeal resurrection of some after the crucifixion, etc., we plant ourselves on the "redemption of the body" (Rom. 8:23), which clearly teaches that not another body is given and glorified, but the same body, made subject by sin to death and corruption, is raised up again and given immortality and renewed (even spiritualized) powers and capacities. We still have faith to accept of the scriptural statements that death is penal in its nature, that it is an enemy and not a friendly messenger to introduce a spiritual resurrection, or to bestow the inheritance, crown, and Kingdom. We are old-fashioned enough in our belief to cling with hope to that day beyond the intermediate period or state, when the redemption of the body will also be effected. And this, because we rest on a perfect, complete Redemption. Our Saviour is a perfect Redeemer; and the early Christians evinced not only faith but logic when they claimed in and through Him "the Redemption of the body." Everything else that man and the race forfeited by sin is restored through Christ, and we can make no exception in favor of the body, given over to death and corruption, without making Redemption in so far incomplete, and giving in this particular the victory and triumph to Satan. We dare not limit the redemption of the believer, seeing that God designs and has promised, through Christ, a complete restoration to all forfeited blessings; and even superadds to the same, in virtue of relationship to the Redeemer, increased exaltation and glory. Hence, every theory, however plausible, and no matter by whom advocated, that proceeds to limit Redemption, the work of Christ, must be rejected as irreconcilable with the honor, power, etc. of God in Redemption.*

Obs. 7. If charged with credulity in our belief, we answer, that it requires far more to spiritualize away the plainest of facts. Thus, e.g.

if the resurrection consists merely in a continued spiritual or future life, why is so much said of the burial of Christ, of the grave, the sealing, the stone rolled away, the rising on the third day (and not after death), the visitation to indicate no absence of the body, etc.? How can these facts be reconciled with such a theory? Again: the precise idea is conveyed of a resurrection "from among or out of the dead," as all critics admit (as e.g. Phil. 3:11, etc.). Prof. Bush (Anast., p. 139), noticing this peculiarity in Luke 20:25, says: "This usage is very remarkable, and must be founded upon some sufficient reason." The reason he assigns is, that it denotes a moral or spiritual resurrection from among or out of the dead in sin, or a future state. But the facts in reference to this usage are decidedly against such a view, for the identical language is employed to denote Christ's resurrection from among or out of the dead as is seen in Acts 4:2, comp. Acts 17:31; and hence, if the pleading is valid, it denotes in Christ's case a moral or spiritual regeneration or a continued future life. How, too, reconcile this usage of language with precisely the same employed by the Jews to signify, as the words indicate, a separate and distinct resurrection of some of the dead?*

Obs. 8. Candor requires the brief examination of the only passage which can, by careless concessions, be adduced as favorable to this notion of a purely spiritual resurrection immediately after death, viz., that of 2 Cor. 5:1–8. If we entertain the opinion, given by various writers, that this change of body is experienced at death, we are at once plunged into difficulties, for then, (1) we make Paul contradict himself in his teaching concerning the resurrection. For he not only in other places teaches a corporeal resurrection, but he precisely locates this resurrection and transformation at the future Coming of Christ (e.g. 1 Cor. 15, and 1 Thess. 4), when "the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven," etc. (2) In consoling those who lost friends and endured tribulations (1 Thess. 4:13; 2 Thess. 1:4–10, etc.), he refers them to an experience of the power of the resurrection at the same period, and professes the same respecting himself (Rom. 8:23). (3) That none of the churches established by him, or their immediate successors, believed, so far as we have any knowledge, that believers experienced such a change immediately after death, which omission of faith is corroborative evidence that the passage was apprehended without such an interpretation. If we concede that the change is after the death of the believer, then the concession is seized by Swedenborgians, Universalists, etc., as proof of the non-resurrection of the bodies of the saints. Is this concession necessary, or is it demanded by the passage? The reasons just assigned have already sufficient weight to urge us to avoid it for the sake of consistency; and the solution, if we allow the general analogy of Scripture to speak, is not difficult. It is only a forced comment to say, as some do (e.g. MacKnight, Hodge, etc.), that the resurrection body is not denoted, but only "the heavenly mansions" or places in the third heaven, for then the contrast is not preserved. It is contradictory to profess a belief in a bodily resurrection at the end of the age, and yet when we come to this passage, give the saints (as Barnes) in this intermediate state a body and even "a glorified body." To say that Paul desired to be with Christ in a disembodied state does violence to the desire as expressed, or to say that a temporary body is given until the day of resurrection is opposed to its being "eternal." The explanation of Locke that Paul expected the speedy coming of Christ, and desired a transformation, without dying, although plausible, as Barnes admits, is not necessary to reconcile the passage with other statements of Paul. The opinion of that class of commentators who advocate that the resurrection body is denoted, is the only one that accords with the tenor of the resurrection doctrine. Paul is accustomed, owing to the inheritance, etc., being linked with the Second Coming, to pass over the intermediate state, examples of which are found (e.g. Rom. 8:30; Heb. 12:22, 23, etc.) in several epistles. Before entering upon the words of the passage, he expresses his strong faith in the things not seen, in the things eternal, and among those things he had just enumerated (ch. 4:14), "knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise us up also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." Hence, grasping by faith the blessings connected with the resurrection by Jesus, he, passing by the intermediate state as not worthy of comparison with what follows it, makes a general affirmation of the resurrection, his desire to experience it, and his safety and blessedness whether he presently, or not, experience it. That his mind was impressed by the desire for a bodily resurrection appears, (1) that this body is "eternal in the heavenlies" (see Prop. 107), which accords with the position and rank of the Rulers after the resurrection; (2) it occurs here on earth for "the house is from heaven," i.e. the change, etc., is made by God through His Son Jesus (for our "resurrection" even is in heaven); (3) this change is made "that mortality might be swallowed up of life," i.e., the body itself, the mortal part, is endued with immortality, otherwise it is not correct to say that the mortal receives or attains to life, but it should be (if spiritualized) that the mortal body gives place to another and different body never susceptible to mortality; (4) the "earnest of the Spirit," given as a pledge for the performance of this, indicates it, as a comparison with Rom. 8:23; Eph. 1:14; Eph. 4:30, etc., will show. Such considerations, to say the least, are ample enough, whatever view we may entertain respecting particular parts of the passage or concerning it as a whole, to prove that we need not indorse a spiritual endowment or resurrection immediately after death, making the resurrection of the body unnecessary and redundant; for, admitting the apostleship of Paul, the writer does not contradict himself, which he inevitably does if we force such an interpretation upon his words.*

Obs. 9. Attention is called to the circumstance that many of our opposers frankly acknowledge that a literal Pre-Millennial resurrection is taught in the Scriptures. Of these we have several classes, (1) such as receive the inspired Word, and profess themselves forced by philological and exegetical reasons to receive the doctrine, but very carefully have these resurrected saints removed to the third heaven. Such are Prof. M. Stuart, Priest, etc.; and the Com. of Stuart and his Excursus on Rev. 20 are commended to the special consideration of the reader, because his candid admissions are particularly valuable both on account of his known hostility to our doctrine. and by reason of this concession of a literal resurrection being antagonistic in spirit and principle to his own theological system. (2) Then there are some hard to understand and contradictory; admitting in one place a literal Pre-

Millennial resurrection, without the Advent of Christ, and in another place rejecting it. Thus, e.g. Kurtz (Sacred History) admits, s. 196, a literal resurrection to precede the Millennium, as his reference to Matt. 27:52, 53 indicates, and yet in sections 198 and 199 he speaks as if all the Scriptures pertaining to the dead of Christ were only fulfilled at the close of that age. He, too, is guarded in placing those resurrected ones preceding the Millennial age in an “invisible and celestial” reign, just as if the predicted Kingdom of the prophets was an invisible one. The concession, however feebly given, is worthy of notice, as in so far it coincides with “the ignorance and folly” of Jewish expectations. (3) Another class are those who, imitating some ancient opponents of Chiliasm, reject the Apocalypse mainly on the ground that it teaches a two-fold resurrection, the first of the saints at the beginning of the Millennial age, the second at its close. So Lücke and others, see Prof. Stuart’s Introd. to Apoc. (4) Some, as Prof. Bush (Mill. and Anast.), Neander (Works), admit that the language is well adapted to teach a Pre-Millennial corporeal resurrection, that such an opinion was entertained by the early Church, that it was well suited to sustain the martyrs, etc., but that its true spiritual conception was to be developed by the growth of the Church. (5) Rejectors of Revelation, as Gibbon (History, vol. 1, p. 534, etc.), admit it, and in various works and periodicals it is presented and derided as decidedly too “Jewish.” A writer, e.g. in Westm. Review, Oct., 1861, p. 261, speaking of this doctrine, portrays it thus: “The subjects of this long-desired theocracy are primarily the decapitated martyrs, and then all the true adherents of the now triumphant Messiah. Their restoration to a happy and sinless corporeal existence constitutes the first resurrection,” but pronounces it after all only a splendid idea derived from Jewish Messianic expectations, unworthy of credence. Very recent attacks on the Apoc. by talented men correspond with this in tone and spirit. (6) Still others fully admit the literalness of the Pre-Millennial resurrection, but injure its force, and materially affect the harmony of prophecy, by linking with it, and regarding as identical in time, events which are separated by the Millennial era. Thus, e.g. Keith in his Harmony of Prophecy. Thus from various sources, antagonistic, and some even hostile, to us, we have the important admission made, so requisite to our system of faith, that a literal Pre-Millennial resurrection is taught in the Scriptures.

Obs. 10. An objection, urged by Barnes and others, may as well be noticed here. It is to the effect that in more detailed descriptions of the Resurrection, as in 1 Thess. 4, and 1 Cor. 15, Paul does not connect the personal reign and Kingdom of Christ as following here on earth. But if this proves anything, it proves too much, for it would exclude other things also mentioned as occurring, such as the creation of new heavens, etc., the resurrection of the unjust, the last judgment, etc. The omission is decidedly in our favor, for (while Paul in other places unites “the appearing and Kingdom”), he here takes it for granted, from the universally entertained views that the Kingdom is joined to the appearing of this Son of Man, that the parties addressed will supply the order of events omitted, and discusses only that part of it, viz., the resurrection of the dead, which to Gentiles, like the Thessalonians and Corinthians, was the most incredible, etc. If the objection is appropriate, then we might frame another in the same spirit, and ask, Why then, seeing that these Thessalonians are charged by Neander and others as holding to “Jewish forms” of the Kingdom, did not the apostle, when on the subject of the resurrection, refute their Jewish notions of the Kingdom? The one objection is as pertinent as the other.

PROPOSITION 126. In confirmation of our position, the Old Test. clearly teaches a Pre-Millennial resurrection of the saints.

Our entire argument, step by step, leads to this as a necessity, otherwise the Kingdom as covenanted and predicted cannot appear, and cannot be inherited. Leaving the reasons already assigned (under the discussion of the covenant and memorial, see. Prop. 49), we now appeal to others which show that before the Messianic Kingdom can be realized the righteous dead must first be raised up from among the dead.

Obs. 1. No one doubts that Isa. 25:6–8 is descriptive of the Messiah’s Kingdom. If we regard it, as it ought to be, representative of a state here on earth to be witnessed during an appointed time, and if we do not take the unwarranted liberty of dividing and subdividing it, allotting portions of it to one time and other portions to another time, or, ascribing parts of it to earth and others to the third heaven, then it will be very easy to locate the period of its verification or realization on the authority of the Apostle Paul. In turning to 1 Cor. 15:54, after a description only of the resurrection of the righteous, the apostle emphatically adds, “then” (i.e. at this very time of this resurrection) “shall be brought to pass the saying that is written ‘Death is swallowed up in victory.’ ” Isaiah’s Millennial description, which all agree is a delineation of Christ’s Kingdom, is, according to this testimony, to be fulfilled or brought to pass when a resurrection is experienced by the saints. This is corroborated by the statements given in Isaiah, corresponding with such, that we know are only to be realized after death is abolished. But Paul adds another saying which is also “then,” at that time to be brought to pass, viz., the one given by Hos. 13:14 (gives the spirit of it), “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” The question that arises here is this: Paul well knew that Hosea 13:14 (as well as Isa. 25:8) was a favorite passage of the Jews to support a resurrection of righteous Jews at the inauguration of the Kingdom by the coming of the Messiah—how, then, could he locate its fulfilment at a resurrection of saints, conjointly with the Kingdom description of Isaiah, unless he fully and freely indorsed such a Jewish view? This testimony is plain and convincing, unless we charge Paul with prevarication. As an inspired man, as a follower of Gamaliel, as a preacher of the Kingdom, knowing the Jewish views, he could not give them such an indorsement unless it was true.*

Obs. 2. In Daniel 12, we have, according to the early Church and many eminent writers, a literal, twofold, and Pre-Millennial resurrection foretold. The English version gives, v. 2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." That the language indicates a literal resurrection is fully admitted even by those who spiritualize it, or who apply it to the time of the Maccabees; that it is expressive of or drawn from the doctrine of a literal resurrection all critics confess. "Sleep" used for death; "sleeping in the dust of the earth;" "awake" employed to denote restoration to life; this awaking of such sleepers to "everlasting life," all in the phraseology and contrast enforce such a meaning. To avoid the charge of forcing an interpretation, we shall rely on the renderings given by our opponents. Prof. Bush, a critical scholar, gives the following: "And many of the sleepers of the dust of the ground shall awake—these to everlasting life, and those to shame and everlasting contempt." He contends that the words in their precise meaning demand a twofold resurrection, one class being raised up to life while another are not then awakened. As to the latter part of the verse and the controversy originated by it, we may in this discussion pass it by, only saying, (1) if it has the meaning given by Bush, then it forms an additional argument in our favor; (2) but if the contrary, as Barnes and others, is to be received, viz., that the just and unjust are both raised at the same time, then it may be referred, as many do, to the resurrection of professed believers good and bad. The first part of the verse is sufficient to sustain our position, viz., that of a partial resurrection of the dead—a resurrection of some out of or from among all the sleepers in the dust of the earth. The awaking is predicated alone of the "many of" and not of all men. Those who resort to making "the many" consist of "all" are restricted by the peculiar, significant, and conclusive "many of." Hence we find the candid confession of Dr. Hody (*Res. of the Body*, p. 230): "I fully acknowledge that the word 'many' makes this text extremely difficult. I know what expositors say, but I am not satisfied with anything I have hitherto met with. Some tell us that 'many' is sometimes used in the Scriptures to signify 'all,' but this does not clear the difficulty; for there is a great difference between 'many' and 'many of.' All that sleep in the dust are many; but many of them that sleep in the dust cannot be said to be all they that sleep in the dust. 'Many of' does plainly except some." In the examination of various writers, all, without exception, acknowledge this restricted import, declaring that its removal does violence to the passage. The language then expresses a literal, partial resurrection. Now in its connection it describes a Pre-Millennial one, briefly, for the following reasons: (1) It is placed at the end of certain prophetic periods, which, as nearly all commentators agree, precede, or run down to, the commencement of the Millennial period; (2) it is connected with a deliverance of the people of God, pre-eminently characteristic of the beginning of the Millennial era; (3) it is identified with a period of great trouble, distress, etc., which, as many prophecies declare, precedes the ushering in of that age; (4) it is related to the period when the wicked shall be rooted out, etc., which is descriptive of the commencement of this age; (5) and the identifying of the promise annexed by Jesus Himself to the time immediately after the harvest, "then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun," for, as Joel and John show, the harvest immediately precedes the Millennial glory.

Obs. 3. But we have stronger evidence than this even in the chapter, for the resurrection of the righteous being mentioned; God graciously assures Daniel himself that he shall be among those many thus favored. In verse 12, we read: "But go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot, at the end of the days." It being foreign to our design to discuss prophetic periods, it is only necessary to say that, taking the admissions of a host of Anti-Millenarians and others, these prophetic days being, in accord with prophetic usage, years, no matter what period is assigned to their commencement, they require many centuries before their close. And hence the promise to Daniel at "the end of the days" is to be witnessed, after a long series of years has passed, even, as many contend, extending down to the Millennial age. At least, if we limit these periods to literal days, there is not a particle of proof that the promise was realized in Daniel's case. Down to the present day Daniel has not yet stood up in his lot, and, if we leave due weight to one pregnant expression, we can plainly see the reason why it is not yet fulfilled—"when He shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." Then the end of these days has come, and then God's promise is verified; not sooner and not later. But look at history and the facts as they exist to-day. Are not the Jewish people still dispersed and their power scattered among the nations of the earth? Is not Jerusalem itself still trodden down by Gentiles? How, then, can it be said that God's purpose in reference to this people has been accomplished in this respect, when we see it going on before our eyes? No! the end has not yet come, but as God's promises are sure, and now Yea and Amen in Christ, when the end of Jewish tribulation and dispersion comes a glorious resurrection also comes in which Daniel will participate. In noticing the promise, it is legitimate to avail ourselves of the admissions of those who oppose our Millenarian views, and it ought to be accepted as impartial evidence. Barnes (*Com. Dan. loci*), after showing that Daniel could not possibly have lived during the entire period of the events previously enumerated without experiencing death, advocates the standing up at the end of the days to mean a literal resurrection, saying: "This is admitted by Lengerke, by Maurer, and even by Bertholdt, to be the meaning, although he applies it to the reign of the Messiah. No other interpretation, therefore, can be affixed to this, than that it implies the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and that the mind of Daniel was directed onward to that. With this great and glorious doctrine the book appropriately closes." The death of Daniel, before the events predicted come to pass, is announced in the "for thou shalt rest." This is appropriate language in view of the previous "sleep in the dust." But we again leave Barnes explain: "During that long interval Daniel would 'rest.' He would quietly and calmly 'sleep in the dust of the earth,' in the grave." "I do not see that it is possible to explain the language on any other supposition than this. The word rendered 'shalt rest' would be well applied to the rest in the grave. So it is used in Job 3:13 'then had I been at rest,' Job 3:17, 'there the weary be at rest.' " The language of the promise, too, implies the personal presence of Daniel at the time the end shall be. More than this, it is requisite, for then he is to obtain his "lot." Now,

whatever meaning is attached to "the lot," whether of station, rank, degree, etc., it is certain from numerous promises that Christians are represented as receiving their "lot" after the resurrection is experienced. Daniel receives his portion or reward allotted to him by God. But when? Turning to Rev. 11:15–18, under the last trumpet, preceding the Millennial era, we find "the time of the dead that they should be judged and that Thou shouldest give reward unto Thy servants, the prophets." Such is the striking harmony of the utterances of the divine Spirit, indicating a Pre-Millennial resurrection.

Obs. 4. However ultra it may seem to some, we are willing to, and readily do, accept of Ezek. 37:1–14 as teaching a Pre-Millennial resurrection. This view was held by the Jews (e.g. 2 Esdras 2:16, 23, 31), by the early Church (being quoted by Irenæus, Fifth B. Ag. Heresies, Justin, in 1st Apol., Tertullian in chs. 29, 30, On the Res. of the Flesh, and Greg. Nazianzen, Funer. Oration, e.g. by others), and by different writers from that period to the present. Some authors, not entirely satisfied with a figurative application, give a twofold fulfilment, one a spiritual or civil, and the other literal, as e.g. Dr. Clarke, Com. loci, who also admits that it has an ultimate reference to "the resurrection of the body." Others, as Rationalists, etc., receive it as teaching a literal resurrection, but reject it as a "Jewish figment." While still others, as Delitzsch (Sys. of Bib. Psyc., p. 485, in response to Hofman, who advocated that Isa. 26:19 and Ezek. 37:1–14 contained figures of restoration), and many Millenarians, hold that such a literal resurrection is taught as covenant promises require. The reasons which influence us to such a belief are the following: (1) The explanation given by God Himself of the vision indicates a literal resurrection. The vision of the dry bones extends from v. 1 to 10, and if this were all, then, indeed, we might be at a loss to determine its exact meaning, but God appends to it an explanation; and, like in all explanatory clauses, we have no right to spiritualize them away. It is weakness to place the vision and the explanation in the same category, and treat the one like the other. We dare not, without disrespect to the Divine explanation, make it denote something quite different from what the words truly and actually represent. Keeping in view the distinction, overlooked by the multitude, between the vision and its interpretation by the Spirit, how else can we receive the words, unless teaching the doctrine we claim, when it says: "I will open your graves and cause you to come up out of your graves," etc. (2) It is scarcely consistent for the resurrection of the body (whatever may be true of the simple word resurrection) to be taken as a figure or symbol of the renovation of the soul, seeing that in the Scriptures a moral change of the soul is uniformly held to be a prelude to a blessed resurrection of the body unto life. This would be reversing the order of events, and involving a certain incongruity. It is nowhere done unless this and Rev. 20 form exceptions to a general rule. (3) The language, "Behold they say, 'our bones are dried and our hope is lost,' " shows that a corporeal resurrection is meant. For, if we turn to Ps. 141:7, this is the expressive complaint of the house of Israel, "our bones are scattered at the grave's mouth as when one cutteth and cleaveth wood on the earth," and God here gives the assurance that these very "bones scattered at the grave's mouth," shall be again raised up. In the 89th Ps., where this lost hope is plaintively presented, we have the covenant, and the assurance that David's Son shall gloriously reign on David's throne; then follows, however, the prediction of the casting down of David's crown and throne to the ground, of the cast-off condition of the nation and the non-fulfilment of the covenant, and the question is asked, "How long?" Then follows: "Remember how short my time is; wherefore hast Thou made all men in vain? What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave? Lord, where are Thy former lovingkindnesses which Thou swarest unto David in Thy truth?" How is this hope so lost, even absorbed by the all-devouring grave, to be realized? The plain, God-given answer comes to us in this passage of Ezekial, if we will only receive it. Here the question asked in Ps. 35:10 is replied to; and prophet after prophet assures us that when this shall occur "those bones shall flourish as an herb." It is in accord with this that David in Ps. 31 affirms that although his "bones are consumed" and in his "haste" he said, "I am cut off from before Thine eyes," he will trust in God for deliverance, because the wicked alone shall "be ashamed" and "be silent in the grave." This confidence is again and again declared, so that the bones given over into "the hand of the grave" shall "come up out of the grave." God says that the house of Israel declares "our hope is lost and we are cut off." In Lam. 3:18, we read, "And I said, my strength and my hope is perished from the Lord," but farther on the prophet again professes hope "for the Lord will not cast off forever ... to crush under His feet all the prisoners of the earth." No! some of those "prisoners of the earth," which (as we shall hereafter show) are the dead that the earth holds in confinement, which are now "dwelling in the dust" (Isa. 26:19), "the earth shall cast out." The "prisoners of hope," Zech. 9:12, shall be delivered according to the "hope toward God," expressed by Paul, Acts 24:15. The analogy of faith, the appeal of God to words connected with corporeal death, and the stubborn fact itself that the covenant given by God to Abraham and David cannot possibly be realized until the enemy death, which holds its chosen ones, is overcome, these things prove, what so many pious have joyfully accepted, a literal resurrection, by which the grave is made to surrender those to whom precious covenant promises were made. Now, indeed, the enemy triumphs; they are cut off "from the land of the living;" faith and hope almost falters at the gloomy prospect; wise men here and there declare it is folly to expect its realization; scientists insist upon its impossibility; even good men think it too much to anticipate, and explain it away; but God, the Almighty, points to this very faltering faith and hope, produced by literal death, and in His gracious majesty speaks: "Then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it and performed it." How can we change God's words or challenge His work? (4) The emphatic language here is corroborated by other examples. Thus e.g. when we keep in view how the Jews understood this vision and explanation, then the language of Jesus addressed to Jews is a confirmation of a literal resurrection. For in John 5:28, 29 the expression of Ezekial is almost repeated "all that are in their graves" shall "come forth," and this, too, in connection with what He said, that this raising up shall be (e.g. John 6:39, 40, 44) "at the last day" as the Jews held (comp. John 11:24). Again, Hos. 13:14, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave," etc., contains the same ideas, and Paul applies it directly to the resurrection of the righteous. Hence, in view

of the application of similar language by Jesus and Paul, corroborating Jewish views of Ezekiel, we cordially accept of it in the same spirit. (5) The expression “bring you into the land of Israel,” which has led so many to apply this figuratively to a “national restoration,” under the supposition that mortal men in this life are only alluded to, is, instead of a stumbling-block, indispensable in such a resurrection. The covenant, if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are to personally inherit the land, the covenant promises, if the meek are to inherit the land, etc., absolutely, demands just such bringing of the dead ones into the land of Israel, the promised inheritance. Ezekiel only establishes what the Millennial descriptions present, viz., a return of the ransomed of the Lord to this identical land, as the most sacred of God’s assurances declare. (6) This description of the prophet is too sublime and wide-reaching in its sweep to be regarded as fulfilled in the weak and partial restoration of the Jews under the Persian kings and afterward. The facts are not equal to the representation; and the Jews themselves, who experienced this restoration, had no such idea of its performance. It is a belittling of the prophecy to confine it to such an event; it is a dwindling away of God’s appeal in reference to the knowledge obtained of His Omnipotence when this should occur; it is a frittering away of the promised gathering of “the whole house of Israel,” of the implied continued prosperity, of the union, strength, etc., then granted to them. No! greater, inestimable greater blessings than God’s people have ever yet realized are embraced in this precious promise, even those connected with a literal, Pre-Millennial resurrection.

Obs. 5. Numerous passages plainly teach a Pre-Millennial resurrection. Thus, e.g. Jer. 31:15–17, “a voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not. Thus saith the Lord: Refrain thy voice from weeping and thine eyes from tears; for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border.” This is applied (Matt. 2:17, 18) to a literal slaughter, and the resurrection promised is also literal. But this does not fulfil the entire promise; for it includes not only a raising up from the dead, a return from the land of the enemy death, but a return, a “coming again to their own border,” to the very land where the enemy triumphed over them. The time when this is to take place is specified in the context, v. 10–14, when Jacob is “redeemed and ransomed from the hand of him that was stronger than he.” The same spirit characterizes Hannah’s prayer (1 Sam. 2), which the Chaldee version (Dr. Clarke) says, “And Hannah prayed in the spirit of prophecy,” in which the resurrection is pointedly predicted, “the Lord killeth and maketh alive; He bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up.” The Jews (see Targums, quoted by Dr. Clarke, Com. loci) so understood it. But this is connected even with a period when vengeance comes, the righteous are exalted, and the “wicked are silent in darkness;” and if reference is made to the parallel passage in Deut. 32:39, it is also connected with a time of vengeance, deliverance of God’s people, and God’s land. The faith that David expressed in Ps. 142, 116, 27, etc., of finally walking before, or in the presence of, the Lord “in the land of the living,” is one in such a resurrection. This is seen by noticing the context, and by comparing of Scripture. Thus in Ps. 142 he describes his trouble by which he is brought “very low,” even into “prison” (which a comparison shows is the grave), for his enemy is stronger than he. But he expresses the hope that God will be his “portion in the land of the living,” and that God will “bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise Thy name; the righteous shall compass me about; for Thou shalt deal bountifully with me.” In Ps. 116, he is plainer, telling us that “the sorrows of death compassed me and the pains of hell got hold upon me.” He then prays that God would “deliver my soul,” adding his trust: “Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with me. For Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears and my feet from falling. I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living.” This faith, in an ultimate happy deliverance from the power of death, causes him to say: “Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints;” and, exulting in the hope set before him, declares, “Thou hast loosed my bonds,” and that he, David, shall praise “in the Lord’s house, in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem.” Here, then, death is an enemy; David fell under this enemy and is bound by him in a prison; but he shall yet triumph over this enemy through the power of God; he shall return again to the promised rest, praise God, associate with all the righteous, and enjoy the blessings of Jerusalem. The detention in the grave is figuratively represented by “a prison,” “prisoner,” “captive,” “captivity,” etc. In Isa. 42:7; 61:1; 49:9, etc., where it is promised that Christ shall “bring out the prisoners from the prison and them that sit in the darkness out of the prison house,” that He shall bestow “liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound,” these things primarily describe the resurrection, for the simple reason that “the year of the Lord” and the restoration and blessings promised in immediate connection cannot be inaugurated, according to the tenor of prophecy, without such a resurrection. The people now are given up as a prey to the enemy death, and are forcibly represented as “hid in prison houses,” Isa. 42:22, as “prisoners resting together” Job 3:18, as “prisoners of the earth,” Sam. 3:34, as “the lawful captives,” or (marg. reading) “the captivity of the just,” Isa. 49:24, etc. This idea accords with Ps. 79, where, after describing the desolations of Jerusalem, the fact that “the blood” of the saints has been shed and their “dead bodies” have been exposed, the Psalmist significantly asks: “How long, O Lord?” Then praying for God’s help, he says: “Let the sighing of the prisoner come before Thee; according to the greatness of Thy power preserve Thou those that are appointed to die.” What the Prophet means by this is apparent from Ps. 102, where, after complaining that “days are consumed,” that he is “cast down” and “withered like grass,” he relies on the blessed truths that God “endures forever,” that He shall “arise and have mercy on Zion,” adding “when the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory” (not humiliation), “He will regard the prayer of the destitute and not despise their prayer. This shall be written for the generation to come; and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord. For, He hath looked down from the height of His sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth; to hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death (Heb. the children of death); to declare the name of the Lord in Zion and His praise in Jerusalem; when the

people are gathered together, and the Kingdoms, to serve the Lord." What else, if the prayer of these prisoners is ever answered, but a Pre-Millennial resurrection is to be anticipated? For, taking such passages together, what have we here but a reference by the prophet to his own death and to dead saints, to the ability of God to raise them up or deliver them, to "the set time to favor Zion," which is to come when the Lord shall appear the second time unto salvation, and this prayer to be released from death shall be answered, to a joyful gathering of the people to praise the Lord in Jerusalem, when "the children of death" shall be loosened? If we were only prepared to receive it, we would find the Bible full of this Divine Purpose, and that the unity of the Spirit teaches it again and again, sometimes briefly, or concisely, or even obscurely, and sometimes openly and more fully. Even in such a Ps. as the 69th, faith grasps the resurrection, in the words: "The Lord heareth the poor and despiseth not His prisoners," for death is brought before us in the preceding verses, when suddenly the strain is changed into exultation, and we are told that the prisoner shall be released, and they shall return with praise to the holy land.

Obs. 6. So interesting is this subject and abundant the material (showing how the Spirit regards it), that the reader will pardon us, if additional illustrations are given. Thus the word "hell" is used to denote the grave. If we turn to Ps. 86, the hope is expressed, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell" (marg. reading is "grave"), and while praise is tendered for such deliverance, the wicked shall be "ashamed." Other passages could be adduced, but let us take a clearer one, the representation of the grave by "the land of darkness" "the shadow of death," "darkness," etc. (Job 10:21, 22; Ps. 88:18; Eccl. 6:4; Ps. 143:3, etc.). In various predictions the saints are to be delivered from this darkness, just as the Millennial era is to be ushered in, and this prepares us the better to appreciate the force of Col. 1:12, 13, "Giving thanks unto the Father which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who" (at the time the inheritance is given) "hath delivered us from the power of darkness" (the grave or place of the dead), "and hath translated us into the Kingdom of His dear Son." That this "power of darkness" refers to the enemy death or grave is proven by the use made of the expression by Jesus, Luke 22:53, who, when the Jews came with stones and swords to take Him, knowing the predetermined result death and the grave, said: "This is your hour and the power of darkness" (comp. John 12:27; Micah 7:8, etc.). So the reverse of darkness, viz., "light," is employed to denote the removal of the darkness of the grave at the resurrection morn, and forms a remarkable feature in the opening, etc., of Millennial descriptions. The manner in which the Spirit introduces the words "enemy," "sleep," "prey," "pit," "awake," "dust," "quicken," etc., shows how prominently the notion of a Pre-Millennial resurrection is incorporated in the Scriptures. Let us e.g. take "quicken," which Paul forcibly employs in Rom. 8 to prove that God will fulfil His promise to Abraham to be "heir of the world," and that "the promise might be made sure to all the seed," by saying: "God who quickeneth the dead." (Comp. Rom. 8:11; 4:17; John 5:21; Ps. 3:8.) Now, allow this New Test. confirmatory usage to be adopted as an interpreting guide, and we have Ps. 71 pointedly expressing this resurrection: "Thou shalt quicken me again and shalt bring me up again from the depths of the earth;" and then speaks of his "greatness" being increased here on the earth. Comp. Ps. 80:17, 18; Ps. 143:11, etc., keeping in view the key note given by 1 Pet. 3:18, where Christ Himself is raised from the dead, being "quickened." This becomes decisive when the fact is observed that the resurrection from the dead is represented as "a birth," "a begetting," "a regeneration." Notice that Christ's resurrection is (Heb. 1:5, 6, comp. with Acts 13:33; Rom. 8:29, etc.) a begetting or being born again, so that He is, in virtue of this second birth, called, Col. 1:18, "the first-born from the dead," and in Rev. 1:5, "the first begotten of the dead." What a flood of light this phraseology throws on the Pre-Millennial resurrection; for surely, if the appropriate figure of a birth is thus applied to the resurrection of the Head, designedly too, we are not perverting the Word if we accept of the same in reference to the members. Let us see what the Spirit says, e.g. in Isa. 66:7, 8, 9, "Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a manchild. Who hath heard such a thing? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? Or, shall a nation be born at once? For, as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children. Shall I bring to the birth and not cause to bring forth? saith the Lord; shall I cause to bring forth and shut the womb? said the Lord," etc. Here we have the earth (not church) bringing forth at the appearing of the Lord (v. 5), at a time of vengeance (v. 6), at the ushering in of Millennial glory (v. 10-14), at a time when the wicked are to be ashamed and utterly removed (v. 5, 15, etc.), at the time new heavens and new earth are created (v. 22), at a gathering and overthrow of nations, etc. And, moreover, those thus born are to enjoy this very Millennial blessedness, while the wicked are so cut off as to become "an abhorring to all flesh." This corresponds precisely with the statements of events preceding the Millennium; while the suddenness of the event, the brevity of time in which it is accomplished, the astounding and unexampled nature of the occurrence, all confirms its denoting the resurrection. Then Micah 5:3, 4 has a remarkable disclosure on this point; for after describing the smiting of the Judge of Israel, the very Ruler of Israel that came to them, the result of that smiting, as witnessed by us in the rejection of the Jewish nation during the times of the Gentiles, is alluded to: "Therefore will He give them up until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth." This birth is delayed during the dispersion of the Jews; it is not to be experienced until the time when their restoration comes; it is connected with a revelation of the strength and majesty of Christ's rule. Hence this being born again, this regeneration is referred by Jesus to the future in Matt. 19:28, to the period when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory," and the apostles shall "sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." For the word translated "regeneration" means "born again," and was anciently employed to denote the resurrection. Now, the reader is prepared for an additional reason for believing Ezekiel's resurrection to be a literal one, viz., the clause, which above all others is supposed to teach a spiritual one, "And shall put My Spirit in you, and ye shall live." This Spirit is put in these dead ones that are in their graves, and this corresponds with Rom. 8:11. Therefore, this Spirit is called in 1 Cor. 15, "a quickening Spirit" (Barnes, loci, "a vivifying Spirit, giving or imparting life"). This quickening or birth is performed by Christ (John

5:21, 26, etc.), and Paul in 2 Cor. 3, in his argument to show that the covenant is to be fulfilled by the Spirit giving life, says: "Now the Lord is that Spirit," and when this is done we find announced in Phil. 3:20, 21, "from whence (heaven) we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself." It is this resurrection Spirit that God promises in Ezekiel to give, that the dead may live, for they, too, are (Eph. 1:13) "sealed with the Holy Spirit, of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession." This again is confirmed by the use of "redeemed," "ransomed," etc., and the phraseology of Hos. 13:14, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death," and of Paul, Rom. 8:23, "the redemption of the body," is amply sufficient to illustrate the meaning of the prophet. Thus to apply it to Isa. 51:11, "the redeemed of the Lord shall return and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain gladness and joy; and sorrow and mourning shall flee away." Preceding this we have this people consumed by the worm (v. 8), and following it this is said to be done that the captive exile "should not die in the pit;" and when they return they enjoy what only is to be realized in the Millennial period. The parallel in Isa. 35:10, "the ransomed of the Lord shall return," etc., also teaches that this is performed when "God cometh with vengeance," to "save you," and forms thus what Paul calls "the day of Redemption" for fulfilling the covenant, for as Ps. 111:9 forcibly puts it, "He sent redemption unto His people; He hath commanded His covenant forever."

Obs. 7. This doctrine of a literal Pre-Millennial resurrection we admit, is "Jewish." This term of reproach (given in this sense by man) we cheerfully accept, for it is a distinguishing feature of our faith, seeing that we find it in the covenant given to Jews, in Jewish Prophets, in the teaching of a Jewish Saviour and Jewish apostles, and in agreement with Jewish statements of doctrine; and that only such who are engrafted into the Abrahamic stock and become members of the Jewish commonwealth, shall participate in it. It belongs pre-eminently to the introduction of that Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom promised to the Jewish select nation. Even Rabbinical lore is full of intimations respecting it. That, therefore, which forms such an objectionable feature to many, is only an additional reason for retaining it. (Comp. e.g. Prop. 68.)*

Obs. 8. We measure what estimate to place on Reuss's assertion (His. Ch. Theol., p. 57): "It is a fact admitted in our day by all unprejudiced exegetes, and which should never have been denied, that the doctrine (of the res.) was never taught by the prophets previous to the exile, especially in any close association with the idea of a future reward." This is abundantly refuted by what we have produced from the Pentateuch, the historical books, the Psalms, Isaiah and Ezekiel. Even if this language is to be spiritualized (which these men do, and, therefore, cannot find a resurrection), critics fully admit that the language is based on, or the figure is derived from, a doctrine of the resurrection, which must then have been well known. But over against Reuss, Jesus Himself told the Sadducees that it was taught even by Moses; so Peter, in proving the resurrection of Jesus, affirms the same respecting David; and so Paul, Heb. 11:35, concerning the ancients generally. It was taught both directly or inferentially, but, of course, if the most direct passages are to receive Origenistic interpretation and manipulation, then it cannot be found—the doctrine is prejudged. The Jews themselves appealed to passages in the writings before the exile for their belief, and found it even, where all Scripture places it as necessarily implied, viz., in the Covenant itself. Even Stanley (His. of Jew. Ch., 2 Ser., p. 170) speaks of "the defects" of the Psalms in this particular, and adds: "Hardly in the silence of the Pentateuch or the gloomy despair of Ecclesiastes, is the faintness of immortality more chilling than in the 30th, 49th, and 88th Psalms." The "defect" in this case is in the interpreter, and not in the Psalms. For what can be more significant and cheering than the plain statement in the 30th that he will praise God, "for Thou hast lifted me up and hast not made my foes (death and the grave as he afterward explains) to rejoice over me"—"O Lord, Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave; Thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit," i.e., remain there as the wicked. And this comes to pass owing (marg. reading) "to the memorial," which we have shown (Prop. 49) pledges God to a resurrection to insure the fulfilment of the Covenant promises. This, too, takes place in "the morning," see Prop. 139. Then again he refers to death, to his happy deliverance from it, to the establishment of his "mountain" or Kingdom, to the fact that he would "not be silent" as the wicked then will be. Whether others can see it or not, the Psalm is radiant with hope of blessed immortality. The 88th is, as has already been shown, jubilant with the same hope, while the 40th, not so distinctive, gives, as parallel passages will indicate, evidences of the same.*

Obs. 9. From what preceded, it is evident that the unbelief of those is inexcusable, who, in a measure, removed from gross Rationalism, still, like Lücke in his *Introd. to the Apoc.*, and Bleek in his works on Daniel, make these prophecies a kind of poetical fiction; or, like Reuss in his *Analysis of the Apoc.*, speak of them as a résumé of exploded Jewish expectations. So rooted are they in the Divine Plan, so entirely embedded in the Plan of the Redemption, that to deny their validity is to sacrifice Divine Unity, to deal a blow at one of the most vital parts of Salvation. We see, too, in the union between Paul, the other writers, and the Apocalypse, how fanciful is the opinion of the Bauer school that they are in opposition to each other, when, in fact, they mutually sustain each other in "the one hope".*

Obs. 10. This Pre-Millennial restoration aids in solving a difficulty (unnecessarily such) felt by theologians, viz., that the first books of the Bible are only confined to temporal, earthly blessings, or rather, as it should be worded to be correct, blessings here on earth. The question deduced is: Why is the hope constantly held up to the Jews of living in their promised land and none presented of rewards in the third heaven? The substance of the answer given by those who reject the key afforded by the Covenant and this

resurrection, is this: that the Jews were not then prepared for other promises, and that the real hope and destiny was to be gradually revealed as they could bear it, etc. Learned dissertations are filled with just such nonsense, or “worldly wisdom.” Such reasoning places both man and God in a false position. The former, as if he were then so intellectually and morally weak as to be disqualified to appreciate his own destination, and now, even in the case of heathen or all men, so strong as to be able to bear such knowledge; the latter, as if He would conceal the true destination of those who trusted in Him and excite their hopes, etc., by either false or temporary motives. No! never does God thus deal with man. The true reason, and the one underlying the Covenant and all these promises, is, that the land, the earth, is truly—as always affirmed—their inheritance, and that God will raise them up out of their graves and fulfil the promises given by bringing them into the land; and, moreover, God never changes from this divine purpose, for the promise (Prop. 142) exists to-day, as it ever did, “Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit” (not the third heaven but), “the earth.” The language of Moses and others is the best that could be used, for it is the truth—the truth of God which in His own time He will see is realized. We are not to come to God’s Word and gauge it by a monkish third heaven theory, which makes the third heaven the saint’s inheritance instead of the one that God uniformly through every prophet has promised, and then by it judge of the propriety and truthfulness of the Divine utterances. Would that Abrahamic faith were more characteristic of believers! (comp. Props. 144, 151, etc.).

PROPOSITION 127. In support of our view, the Apocalypse unmistakably teaches a Pre-Millennial resurrection of the saints.

It is most reasonable to suppose that “the testimony of Jesus,” the last words, given expressly to impart information on eschatology, should coincide with the Old Test, teaching, and bestow upon us additional information. This it does as follows:

Obs. 1. The reader is directed to Rev. 11:18, and under the last trumpet, preceding (as all must admit) the Millennium, we have “the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward,” etc. Here is a distinctive Pre-Millennial resurrection asserted in connection with a time of wrath and rewarding, which the general analogy asserts as belonging to the Second Advent of Jesus. To acknowledge a resurrection of dead ones to be here announced, and then to postpone the same until after the 1000 years, is a mere subterfuge, seeing that the connection demands its fulfilment, under the seventh trumpet, or at the period of time thus designated.*

Obs. 2. We now come to Rev. 20:1–6 which was so universally held by the early Church to teach a literal resurrection, and to be so thoroughly consonant with Jewish views, that the Apocalypse narrowly escaped proscription by the enemies of Chiliasm (comp. e.g. Lardner’s Works, vol. 2, P. 643; Stuart’s Introd. to Apoc., Barnes’s Introd. respecting Caius and Dionysius). The application of the Origenistic system of interpretation, as many have noticed, saved and gave it canonical authority.* If we reject the early Church belief in this particular, the veracity of Apostolic Fathers, who assert that they received their interpretation of it from the Apostles and their associates (see Prop. 75) is impeached, and the teaching of the Apostles themselves which directly led to such a faith in all the churches established by them is open to grave suspicion. It is not necessary to trace the varied spiritualistic opinions engrafted on this Scripture, denoting either a spiritual, moral, or ecclesiastic resurrection, or to note in detail the varied dating of the thousand years based on such interpretation* from the ministry of Christ, conversion of Constantine, etc. Popery indeed (Prop. 77) almost crushed the early interpretation of the passage; but others held fast to it, as e.g. Paulikians, Waldenses, and Albigenses. Various writers, some men of acknowledged ability and talent, have continued from the Reformation (Prop. 78) down to the present, to entertain the same, and to-day some of the most able men in nearly all, if not all, denominations, accept of this ancient faith. The prevailing view taken, is that of Daniel Whitby (who died 1727), who was the first writer who advocated what he himself calls “a new hypothesis,” viz., a spiritual resurrection and Millennium still future before the Advent of Christ. Men of the highest ability have adopted this “hypothesis,” and through their influence it is almost generally received. While this is so, it is also true that some of our most bitter opponents unhesitatingly yield this passage to us as teaching a literal first resurrection. Thus Prof. Stuart (Com.), before alluded to, who appeals to Phil. 3:8–11; Luke 14:14; 1 Cor. 15:23, 24, etc., as favoring the idea, and even makes this admission, “Even the Old Test. contains some passages which may very naturally be applied to the Messianic or first resurrection.” Prof. Bush, and many others, who spiritualize it, frankly acknowledge that the language itself, literally understood, unmistakably presents the notion of such a resurrection, but regard it as a presentation of truth in the shape of “milk,” such as “the babes” in that early period required; forgetting, however, that this “milk” happens to be just like that which the Jews previously received, and hence, if the former is deleterious the latter must be the same. With these preliminary remarks, let us proceed to give the reasons for holding that this Scripture presents the doctrine of a literal Pre-Millennium resurrection, aside from the one which might be urged at length, viz., that the language and spirit of it accord with the Old Test. delineations and confirm the interpretations of the Jews (which latter, even as Reuss, His. Ch. Theol., p. 57, the Pharisees made “one of the principal points of their teaching”).

Obs. 3. 1. This describes a resurrection of persons. The word “soul” is used to denote the person (as e.g. Numb. 31:8; Prov. 6:30; Isa. 29:8; Lev. 22:11; Jos. 11:11; Jer. 2:34; Acts 3:26; 2:41; 27:37; 1 Pet. 3:20, etc.). The “souls” are persons because (1) they were

“beheaded,” which can only apply to such; (2) the language “foreheads,” “hands,” etc., indicates such; (3) the resurrection of the members is appropriately described in terms similar to that of the Head. Thus, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (Hades, grave), neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption,” is applied by commentators, following Peter, to a literal resurrection; (4) the word designedly chosen is in accord with Jewish usage, so that, e.g. the Targum renders “The souls which I have made” in Isa. 57:16, “I will restore the souls of the dead” (Dr. Clarke, Com. loci); (5) the early Christians familiar with the phrase in a living language had no difficulty unanimously in making such an application; (6) David foreseeing his resurrection from the power of death calls it a deliverance of “my soul” Ps. 6:4, etc.; (7) a change of condition is predicated of these “souls” that had died, implying a previous “living,” which can only be asserted of persons. May we not, therefore, ask (Ps. 89:48), “Shall he (man) deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?” and answer, No! for his soul can only be delivered through the power of Christ.

2. These souls previous to this resurrection were “beheaded,” suffered death because they witnessed for Jesus, remained faithful to the truth. It seems absurd to press this passage into a spiritual or moral conversion in the face of the beheading which was endured for the Word, since it is virtually affirming that the sinner, previous to his conversion, suffers death because of his witnessing for Jesus; that the unregenerated man endures a beheading for his unswerving devotion to the truth; and then, after such an exhibition of love, he is resurrected, i.e. converted, etc.

3. The beheading itself indicates a literal death. For (1) it cannot be asserted, taking our opponents’ views of spirit, that the spirit or soul can be beheaded. (2) The state of a wicked man cannot be called a headless stone, for in the case of these souls it would prove too much, viz., being beheaded, implies that previously they had them in possession. (3) The beheading results from their previous moral action. (4) The word translated “beheading” denotes “decapitation by the axe,” a violent death. This literal death is shown in Rev. 13 and Rev. 14:4. The persons who have part in this resurrection are such as were converted to the truth before this death. This is proven by (1) the witnessing they gave which caused others to put them to death. (2) The “holy” only have part in it. (3) A distinguishing resurrection is promised to the saints. Hence, this is a promise of a resurrection given because they are “holy,” and not one to make the wicked “holy.”

5. This resurrection is bestowed as a reward of well-doing. This agrees with Luke 14:14, “Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just” (also Rom. 8:11, 23; Heb. 11:35, etc.). The entire spirit of the prophecy claims this as a great, unspeakable blessing.

6. The “thrones” that were placed, is only met by a similar Millennial description of Dan. 7:9, 22, 27, the promise to the Apostles, Matt. 19:28, the enthronement of the saints.

7. The same is true of the “judgment” mentioned, and as will, farther on, be shown in the judgment committed to saints.

8. The reign with Christ corresponds with the dominion mentioned by David, with the promises of Kingship and Priesthood to risen and glorified saints. The passages bearing on the enthronement, judgment, and reign will be given under separate Propositions.

9. The meaning of the word “lived,” and the use made of the same, fairly teaches a literal resurrection. Barnes, loci, tells us that Robinson (Lex.) gives the primary meaning to be, “to live, to have life, spoken of physical life and existence,” and adds: “It may be applied to those who were before dead, Matt. 9:18; Mark 16:11; Luke 24:23; John 5:25; Acts 1:3; 9:41,” etc. Prof. Stuart (Com. Rev. loci) says that the word means “revived,” came to life, i.e. returned to a life like the former one, viz., a union of soul and body. So does the word signify in Rev. 2:8; 13:14, and in many other passages cited in the remarks on Rev. 2:8. In addition to the texts given by Barnes, he adduces Acts 25:19; Rom. 6:10, 13; 2 Cor. 13:4. Nothing stronger can be given in our favor than the argument of Prof. Stuart: “If, then, as it would seem, we must reject all these meanings” (viz., those opposed to the early Church view), “how can we well avoid coming to the conclusion that ezesan here must mean a reviving or rising from the dead? The use of zaō elsewhere in the Apocalypse shows very plainly that it may mean revived, lived again in reference to the body which had been dead. Thus the Saviour speaks of Himself in Rev. 2:8, as being He who had been dead, kai ezeze, and had revived, lived again, after the death of the body. Thus, too, it is said of the beast (Rev. 13:14), which had the deadly wound of the sword, that ezeze, it revived.” Surely, if the Spirit employs the word to signify the literal resurrection of Jesus, and that, too, in the same book, we are justified in applying it in the same way to the resurrection of His brethren, contrasted as it is with a previous death.

10. Those who thus “lived” enjoyed the Millennial period, and those who “lived not,” i.e. the rest of the dead, did not realize it. Now, if the word “lived” means (as our opponents declare) conversion, increased Christian zeal, etc., it proves too much, viz., that not a single soul of “the rest of the dead” will be converted, etc., until the thousand years are finished. Then we have a moral resurrection at the beginning of the age, and the other at the end. For, the same word “lived” is used of both parties, and consistency demands the same meaning in both places.

11. But if this meaning is preserved, then it follows that after an interval of one thousand years “the rest of the dead” are all converted, etc., which is forbidden by numerous explicit passages.

12. Those who have part in the first resurrection are never subjected to “the second death,” but the implication is that “the rest of the dead” will experience it, and this is confirmed by the resurrection following after this Millennial period (same chapter), in which the second death largely figures. Now, if the living of these two classes is the same, it legitimately follows that the one portion will be given over to the power of the second death, for having no lot in the first, it falls under the second resurrection. The reason why they did not have part in the first is not removed before the second takes place, for they remain “dead” until the second occurs after the thousand years.

13. What is asserted, “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death shall have no power,” is a bestowal of eternal life by the power of the resurrection, as is seen at length in 1 Cor. 15, etc. It is the bestowal of immortality to that which was mortal, so that as in Luke 20:36, “neither can they die any more,” or, they become like the Head, Rom. 6:9, “that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him.”

14. This again is confirmed by the natural conclusion which the passage impresses, that each one thus raised up lives and reigns during, at least, a thousand years, which cannot be applied to mortal man. Moral or spiritual advancement does not bestow such longevity.

15. These resurrected ones “reigned with Christ.” Jesus then sits on His own throne, and the saints

reign with Him (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:29, 30, etc.). This involves a consideration of the period of Christ's reign, etc., but it is sufficient to point out what even our opponents admit, that such a reign of Christ will be witnessed at His Coming, and that it is the happy portion of saints to reign with Him. Hence, this prediction is in sympathy with such a reign. 16. Martyrs (one class) obtain this resurrection, not that the resurrection produces martyrs, as some affirm, or revives the martyr spirit, as others say, or causes, as others declare, a eulogy of martyrs. And, we may well ask, Does the Millennial period here described with Satan bound, Christ and the saints reigning, with, as the prophets write, all righteous, with peace, safety, prosperity, knowledge, and glory covering the earth, does this require martyrs or the spirit of martyrdom? Is the binding of Satan and this reign so ineffective that murderers of saints, that dangerous enemies, still exist? What, then, becomes of God's promises, if persecution, sore trial, threatened death and violent death itself is the characteristic of the Millennium? 17. The persecuting beast and prophet are removed before this Millennial period begins, as is seen in preceding chapter. The persons resurrected are those who had previously refused His worship, mark, etc., and as we read (Rev. 13:15, etc.) were killed. In this Mill. age they have no such power, for the reason given, Rev. 19:20. All persecuting power (v. 2, 3) shall be confined. This exactly corresponds with the prophetic delineations of the Millennium (as e.g. Isa. 25, 26, etc.). The very persons (not others) killed by the beast are the ones who live and reign during the thousand years. 18. This resurrection is accompanied by God's heavy judgment upon His enemies, resulting in their overthrow and destruction, which agrees with what is said of this literal resurrection elsewhere. 19. Taking the explanation given by our opponents to the word "first," it cannot denote what they claim. Thus e.g. Barnes, loci, "It is called the first resurrection in contradistinction from the second and last, the general resurrection." Now, if it means conversion, revival of martyr spirit, distinguished piety, etc., how can it properly bear such a contrast to the second, seeing the difference in kind? The fact that it is called "the first" or "better" or pre-eminent resurrection implies a second of the same kind, but of a lower grade, i.e. not so distinguished, etc. If we make the one moral, etc., the other must be the same. 20. The rest of the dead only live after the one thousand years are finished, and as this resurrection is not included in the first or better one, it must be the second. In the same chapter after the thousand years we do read of a second one that transpires in which "death and the grave delivered up the dead which were in them." If the second is literal (as nearly all admit) the first must be also the same. 21. the juxtaposition of these two resurrections, the one at the beginning and the other at the close of this age, indicates a peculiarity and significance in the use of the word "first." This does not mean priority of time, as is almost universally supposed, for this would not be true either of the theory of our opponents or of our own. The word "first" has reference to the privileges of the first-born, which were, Deut., 21:17, (1) a double portion, i.e. distinguished position, comp. Gen. 25:31–34; (2) a right to the priesthood, Numb. 3:13; (3) government and dominion, Gen. 27:29. God already so early in history develops the idea purposed in the Divine Will of a selected number of the first-born, first begotten of the dead, of whom Christ is the Head. Hence the peculiarity of the language here, "first resurrection" is, that these also, the ones subject to this great tribulation during the period of Rev. 14:9–13, shall come forth also having the privileges of the first-born, i.e. they are not of the second or future ones, but belong to the first as well as those who may have preceded them. (The reader will clearly see the force of this when we come to the reign of saints, etc.) The word "first" is, as Parkhurst (Lex.) and others assert, employed to denote "dignity of persons" in the sense of "chief," "principal," etc., as in Matt. 20:27; Acts 13:50; 1 Tim. 1:15; Acts 17:4; 25:2; 28:7, 17, etc. This resurrection is, therefore, the chief, principal, pre-eminent one, because it pertains to that of the first-born, constitutes the persons embraced in and experiencing its power the first-born that belong exclusively—in a peculiar sense typified by the Jewish first-born—to God Himself. Hence not time but distinction is denoted. Now, this forms a unison with the general tenor of the word respecting this very resurrection pertaining to the saints, and the harmony is remarkable, being never broken by the slightest discord. 22. The resurrection at the close of this chapter is almost generally acknowledged as a literal one. Now, the same rules of interpretation that make this one literal, will, if applied to the first, make it the same. For both represent a visionary spectacle embracing persons, acts, events, and conditions still future, which prefigure or symbolize persons, etc. They both stand or fall together. Sound criticism must acknowledge this feature. 23. "This is the first resurrection," is an explanatory clause, and, like all explanatory language, must be received in the sense that usage, etc., affords. 24. These resurrected saints are "blessed," which is the condition promised to believers raised up at the last day, Luke 14:14, etc. 25. In this Millennial period Satan is bound so that he shall not "deceive the nations" during its continuance. But this cannot be realized down to the personal Advent of Christ, for a multitude of passages authoritatively teach that wars, wickedness, even so great that it is contrasted with that of the days of Noah, nations hostile to Christ, the Church itself a commingling of tares and wheat, shall exist down to the Advent, which is connected with the resurrection of the saints. 26. The "harvest" (Matt. 13:30, 39), which is identified with the resurrection period, is one that precedes this Millennial era, as is seen by reference to Rev. 14 and 19, when "the harvest of the earth is ripe," and it is gathered, following, too, closely on a terrible persecution. 27. If the Advent recorded in Rev. 19 can be proven to be a personal Pre-Millennial one, then this resurrection as a literal one follows. Leaving this for a separate Proposition (Prop. 121), we only now say, that the fact of such a special Advent being designated as immediately preceding this resurrection, and the acts that He performs being similar to those ascribed to Him when He comes to raise the dead, is in direct accord with the doctrine of a resurrection. It is a resurrection linked directly with a Coming of Jesus for purposes of vengeance and salvation. 28. The thousand years specifically mentioned were identified by the Jews with a literal resurrection, and the Messianic reign. Now, the adoption of the same phraseology, united with a resurrection, which—primarily understood—refers to a restoration of life to dead ones, is virtually an indorsement of the Jewish idea of a literal resurrection, or else it is a most cruel deception, confirming men in error. 29. This resurrection is sustained by the "lake of fire burning with brimstone," Rev. 19:20. Almost every one acknowledges that a resurrection of the saints either precedes or is connected with Matt. 25:31–46.

Now, in this latter passage, we have the personal Advent, the holy messengers with Him, the sitting on His throne, the gathering of the nations (as Joel, John, etc., describe), the saints inheriting the Kingdom, and then, notice, the wicked cast into the fire preceding the Millennial age; for "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." These wicked are cast into the fire which is only prepared for the devil, etc.; for, as the Spirit carefully (Rev. 20) shows, after the thousand years, the devil is cast into the lake of fire where the others have been during the thousand years (see Prop. 134). 30. The "marriage of the Lamb," and "the marriage supper," Rev. 19:7, 9, sufficiently identify the nature of this resurrection with that connected with "the manifestation of the Son of God," in Rom. 8:19–23, with the one related to the feast of Isa. 25:6–8, etc. 31. A comparison of the expression "but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished," with other Scriptures sustains a literal resurrection.

Obs. 4. The last reason assigned is so much overlooked that it is worthy of more extended notice. Remark (1) the same word "lived" is applied to both, the saints favored with the first resurrection, and to the rest of the dead, and must mean in both cases the same kind of a resurrection; i.e. a corporeal one; (2) that "the rest of the dead" not being raised up from the dead, do not live or exist during this Millennial period, remaining in their graves. Is this view that John gives sustained by the analogy of faith? The answer from numerous passages and different writers is affirmative. But first let us observe that "the rest of the dead" are the wicked or unbelieving, seeing that the reason why they did not obtain the resurrection is because they were unholy, did not witness for Jesus, and did not reject the worship and mark of the beast. They were regarded as unworthy of it, and the reign, etc., is only promised to the righteous. Now let us compare what the Spirit, alone capable of indicating the line of God's purpose, says the fate of the wicked dead is during these thousand years, and if the general tenor of the Word represents their condition similar to the one here portrayed, then we have an ample vindication of our position. 1. Even the wise man in Prov. 21:16 intimates their fate: "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." Now, both righteous and wicked are still "in the congregation of the dead," but this shall not always be so, for the "set time" is coming when the man void of understanding "shall remain" among "the dead," while the man of understanding shall be removed "out of or from among the dead ones." 2. Hannah in the prayer already alluded to, 1 Sam. 2:9, after expressing her faith in a resurrection, in God's bringing up again from the grave, and then in the exaltation of saints to be princes, significantly shows her faith in its priority: "He will keep the feet of His saints, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness, for by strength shall no man prevail." How often is this repeated, that God will deliver the feet of His saints from the pit or grave, that by strength no man can deliver himself from death, that the wicked shall remain in darkness, that "they shall be blotted out of the book of the living and not be written with the righteous," etc. 3. Then a large class of passages teach that a time is coming when (as Ps. 52:5, etc.) the wicked shall be utterly "rooted out of the land of the living." The righteous shall live and rejoice, while the wicked are removed from the face of the earth. To what period can this refer but to this one, seeing that down to the very Advent itself a multitude of the wicked do exist. This is the more conclusive when we come to examine the passages more closely. Thus, e.g. Mal., chs. 3 and 4, gives (a) a day or time when God will "make up," bring together, His "jewels"; (b) "Then shall ye return;" (c) For there shall be "a discerning between the righteous and the wicked;" (d) the wicked shall be utterly rooted out; (e) the righteous shall in that day find the wicked "ashes under the soles of their feet;" (f) it is a time for "healing" the breach of His people and is performed by Christ. In the 37th Ps. it is united with the time when "the meek shall inherit the earth," for "evil-doers shall be cut off; but those that wait upon the Lord they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall not be," etc. (see vs. 20, 22, 28, 34). This inheriting of the earth Christ promises to all the meek (Matt. 5:5), but to do this they must, of necessity, arise from the dead, and when they inherit the wicked are "cut off," "perish," "are not," etc., thus corresponding with the period under consideration. 4. In the 140th Ps. is typically presented the last confederation of wickedness, under the title of "the violent man," who is not "to be established in the earth," but is to be "overthrown," for it is said "Let burning coals fall upon them: let them be cast into the fire: into deep pits, that they rise not up again," while the poor are delivered and "the upright shall dwell in Thy presence." In Ps. 146 there is (a) the dead, even princes, perish; (b) but he is happy who has God for his help in such an extremity; (c) because "the Lord looseth the prisoners, and (d) reigns." Then is verified Ps. 147, "The Lord lifteth up the meek, He casteth the wicked down to the ground;" Prov. 12:7, "The wicked are overthrown and are not, but the house of the righteous shall stand." 5. The concealment of the wicked in their graves during a certain time is to be verified in the case of "every one," and is appealed to as God's prerogative to perform. In Job 40:13, the Lord Himself is represented as saying: "Look on every one that is proud and bring him low, and tread down the wicked in his place. Hide them in the dust together and bind their faces (persons, Barnes, loci) in secret" ("in prison," so Barnes, "darkness," others). The meaning of this may be found in another part of the same book, ch. 27:19, where they are represented as not among "the gathered." For opening with v. 13, "This is the portion of a wicked man with God and the heritage of oppressors, which they shall receive of the Almighty" he announces, "The rich man (wicked) shall lie down, but he shall not be gathered; he openeth his eyes and is not." 6. A most circumstantial statement indicating the Pre-Millennial resurrection and that the rest of the dead do not participate in it, is found in Isa. chs. 24, 25, and 26. (A) In Isa. 24, after delineating the fearful "day" when the Lord shall punish the high ones and kings of the earth (as in Rev. 19, etc.) just preceding the Millennial glory, the prophet, referring to the wicked, adds: "And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit (Heb.—with the gathering of prisoners), and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days they shall be visited." When this is done, "then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem and before His ancients gloriously." Here we have (a) a complete overthrow of God's enemies; (b) their confinement to prison or the grave at the very time Christ reigns at Jerusalem; (c) that after "many days," corresponding with the

thousand years, "they shall be visited," i.e. made manifest, released, "live again." (B) In the Mill. prediction of Isa. 25:6–8, we find it preceded and followed by a representation that the wicked are destroyed, removed from the face of the earth, a work directly attributed to God. In the Millennium death is swallowed up in victory alone in the case of the righteous, as we have already shown, while the enemies of God are removed and the impression is made, nothing being said of them but what indicates death and the grave, that they remain under the power of the grave, while the people of God are released. If both the righteous and the wicked are to be resurrected at the same period, how do we then account for the resurrection of the saints being mentioned in connection with this period, while the wicked are represented as non-resurrected? (C) This is clearly established in the next ch., 26, in "the Song," which is to be "sung in the land of Judah," "in that day," viz., at the time the Millennial age is ushered in. The peace, happiness, prosperity, deliverance from enemies in that day is alluded to, and of the enemies it is emphatically said: "They are dead; they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." And in order that we need not misapprehend the meaning, the condition of these wicked is contrasted with that of the righteous, as follows: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Do we need stronger confirmatory evidence, when it is added that, as in Rev., etc., "the Lord cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain," i.e. those martyred for the truth, etc.? 7. In Ps. 31, when death is represented as befalling the Psalmist, he expresses his hope in redemption from the grave, and says of God, Thou "hast not shut me up in the hand of the enemy (i.e. death); thou hast set my feet in a large room" (i.e. equivalent to rich deliverance), and repeating his trust, he contrasts his hoped-for experience with that of the wicked: "let me not be ashamed, O Lord; for I have called upon Thee; let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the grave (marg. read., let them be cut off for the grave.)" But this is more definitely given in Ps. 49, where all men are said to "see corruption," being unable to redeem themselves from death, so that "like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them," and marg. reads, "the grave being a habitation to every one of them," but a hope is expressed in favor of the righteous; "but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave," etc., while the others remain in their graves, for farther on it is said of this class that "they shall never see light," comp. Ps. 56:13, as those who are brought again into the land of the living under the Mill. light of the glorious Sun of righteousness. 8. Indeed, on all sides we find Scripture which imply or take for granted this detention of the wicked dead in their graves and the priority of the res. of the righteous. Even in such passages as Luke 20:34–36, in addition to the argument already based on the preposition "out of or from among," the use of the phrase "they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead" implies that some shall not be accounted worthy, and hence shall not then be raised up. So also the language of Ps. 115:17, 18, comp. with Ps. 88:10, 11, 12, 13, receives increased pertinency if this idea is noticed. To illustrate our meaning, Isa. 42 is selected as an example. Here is (1) the promise of the Messiah; (2) the work He shall perform, including the delivering of "the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house;" (3) the Mill. blessedness; (4) for the Lord cometh as "a man of war" (comp. Rev. 19); (5) to the utter overthrow of His enemies; (6) the release of His own people; (7) but while He asserts this release and the blessings that follow, He declares of the wicked and of those addicted to image-worship (comp. Rev. 19 and 20): "But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison houses; they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore." But in the redemption promised, as parallel passages show, only the pious portion of Israel is restored, which implies that the image worshippers and other wicked remain in their "prisons." For the more obscure passages must be interpreted by those decisive, as Isa. 26, etc. The connection of this doctrine can even be seen in Isa. 43:17, for of the Babylonians (we need not consider whether typical name or not) it is said, "They shall lie down together; they shall not rise; they are extinct, they are quenched as tow," and the prophet passing rapidly to "the new thing" which God will perform in the Millennial period, speaks of those first-born of the dead who shall arise: "This people have I formed for myself; they shall show forth my praise" (comp. Ps. 102:18, etc.; Eph. 1:10–12, etc.). 9. But there is still another class of passages which confirm the rising of the rest of the dead at the end of the thousand years, as in Isa. 24:22, when after "many days" those detained by death shall be released. Thus in Ps. 6:10, there is an evident allusion to the return of the wicked dead after an interval of time. Observe that the Psalm describes (1) the death of the saint; (2) prays for a release from death and the grave; (3) asks "how long," as the martyrs do, before the release comes; (4) expresses the fact that God has heard and granted his supplication and prayer, which implies, of course, his resurrection; (5) but while this prayer is answered in his own experience, the enemies, the wicked, are to "be ashamed and sore vexed; let them return and be ashamed suddenly;" (6) he declares that the Lord will "return" (implying, as the facts in the history of Christ prove, that He is removed for a while), that "the workers of iniquity" shall be removed, but finally "return" and realize a sudden shame, such as a second res. will produce; (7) and the earnest praying, longing, and even weeping, for such a res. shows it to be a significant one, very different in order and allotments from that of the wicked. In Ps. 109 we have the wicked, v. 15, "cut off from the earth," but the poor and needy shall be delivered, and then follows again, in reference to the adversaries, "when they arise, let them be ashamed." Ps. 59, so difficult of explanation by commentators, receives new light and consistency when viewed from this standpoint. For (1) "the mighty," the wicked are described as arrayed against God, just as predicted (Rev. 19, etc.) before the Millennial period; (2) the God of Israel is to consume them with His wrath, just as then happens; (3) they are removed, "that they may not be," i.e. cease to exist on earth; (4) but they shall return again; for, as we shall abundantly show hereafter, the Millennial day has its morning and its evening, they return in the evening of the day, "they return at evening," i.e. the same enemies destroyed shall come back again at the close of the Millennial day; (5) when they return then shall "they make a noise like a dog and go round about the city," which

encompassing the city is precisely what follows the ending of the thousand years, Rev. 20:9; (6) for “a city” pre-eminent for dignity and glory shall characterize the Millennial era; (7) and this is done when “God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth,” i.e. when the predicted Theocratic Kingdom is firmly and universally established.

Now, taking all these considerations together, and how they so accurately correspond with the general tenor of the Word, with the Covenant and the promises based on the Covenant, it seems that the early Church faith was eminently logical, scriptural, and necessary, and that we have a literal Pre-Millennial resurrection of saints unmistakably presented.

Obs. 5. Some might regard our work imperfect if we did not notice the objections alleged against our interpretation of Rev. 20. For this passage is wrongfully supposed to be the citadel (when merely an outpost) of our doctrine, and hence is the chief object of attack. Let us therefore briefly pass them in review. 1. That it is presumptive evidence against us that a literal Pre-Millennial res., if taught at all, is only found in this place, so Barnes, etc. Reply: We leave the student to judge for himself, in view of the Jewish belief and that of the early Church based on Old Test. passages. 2. It ought, if teaching such a res., to be less ambiguous, so Barnes, etc. Reply: It is sufficient, distinctive for the wise and prudent, even for Prof. Stuart, etc., for God’s expressed purpose is that it shall come as “a snare” upon the wicked. 3. The objection grounded on the use of the word “souls,” urged by Witsius, Brown, Barnes, Fairbairn, etc., has been sufficiently met.⁴ 4. That nothing is mentioned of “books being opened,” so Barnes and others. Reply: This is done by the Spirit in Dan. 7:11 and 12:1, both Pre-Millennial. 5. That Millenarians differ in the details, so Waldegrave and others. Reply: This is a double-edged weapon that can be turned with damaging force against themselves, for while we are a unit in the grand outlines of our doctrine, our opponents have fundamental diversities and antagonistic theories based on the passage. Besides, diversity of opinion among themselves is not urged by us as proof of the falsity of a doctrine, our appeal is to the Word itself. 6. Nothing is said of their employments, so Barnes. Reply: It is said that they shall reign. 7. No “reason” is assigned “why they are raised,” Barnes. Reply: It is given in their reigning. 8. Nothing is stated “of the new circumstances of their being,” Barnes. Reply: It is given in their immortality and reigning. 9. Nothing is said “of their condition when the thousand years shall have ended,” Barnes. Reply: That is done in other places, for the thousand years do not limit their reign (Prop. 159). 10. But various writers urge that reigning during these thousand years limits it only to that period, so Barnes, etc. Reply: This is a mere quibble, for the thousand years are expressly referred to as intended to denote the period of the binding of Satan, and that also during this period of binding the reign of the saints is established. The duration of the reign must be sought for in passages which describe it. 11. No mention is made of “bodies,” so Ralston, Barnes. Reply: Not necessary, as we have shown, according to usage of language. Besides, this is spoken of dead ones who have been beheaded, etc. See Barnes, Com. Acts 2:27, and compare with his Com. Rev. 20:4 for a complete answer. 12. It is alleged that if this is a lit. res., then all the righteous must be included, but only two classes are referred to, viz., the martyrs and those who did not worship the beast, so Barnes and many others. Reply: If it were necessary, the concessions of numerous critics, Stuart, etc., might be used to embrace others also, but we, with the meaning of “first resurrection” before us, cordially accept of these two classes alone, believing as we do that the resurrection of the others preceded this one. The line of argument adopted by our opponents proves too much, for it would exclude the res. of the saints after Christ’s crucifixion (Matt. 27:51–53), etc. 13. No res. of the unjust is mentioned, so Brown, Barnes. Reply: This is a mistake, it is to take place after the thousand years. This objection is based on the supposition (Popish) of a general universal resurrection, simply because both resurrections, without specifying order or time, are mentioned together. This has been sufficiently answered. 14. That such a reign of Christ as we hold, with “a splendid capital at Jerusalem,” etc., is not mentioned in the passage, so Barnes. Reply: If we are to adopt such a criterion to test the truth of any portion of Scripture, then we must yield up many a valuable proof of our Christianity. Our answer is, a comparison of Scripture must indicate what belongs to the period. The Spirit to test faith, etc., gives us truths in a disconnected form, often isolated, which we are to bring together. 15. That if this is a lit. res., saints do not need the assurance “on such the second death hath no power,” so Barnes. Reply: This has been already answered. We add: It is not for us to prescribe what is needed. Besides, a res. of dead ones being mentioned, it appears exceedingly appropriate, since so many desire to doubt it, to declare it to be a res. unto immortality. 16. That there are two classes only, one who are resurrected, and another who are under the power of the second death; “into which of these classes are we to put the myriads of men having flesh and blood who are to people the world during the Millennium?” so Barnes. Reply: Into neither of them, for this passage only describes the dead, and not the living. Who the rest are can easily be ascertained. 17. If a lit. res., then the rest of the dead must also literally arise “immediately after the thousand years are finished, but that is not stated,” so Barnes and Brown. Reply: The concession is made that if the first is literal the other must be the same; this at least indicates our consistency. But the rest does not follow, for the phrase “immediately after” is not in the text. If we can show, as we have done, that “after” the thousand years, even if some time after (for the text only alludes to their non-resurrection during the thousand years), a second res., also literal (as Barnes himself admits), takes place, that is amply sufficient to sustain our position. 18. It is a symbolic representation, so Barnes, etc. Reply: Precisely so, and real, actual occurrences are symbolized, not figurative ones. Besides, the symmetry of symbolism must be observed, for e.g. it would be incongruous to make a violent death received, and dead ones, made so for the truth’s sake symbolize sin, evil, etc. 19. All the dead, vs. 1–15, will be raised up at Christ’s Coming, so Brown, Barnes, etc. Reply: This proves too much, for some of the dead have been previously raised. Besides, concise passages which state in general terms and in juxtaposition the res. of both just and unjust must be interpreted by those in which the order is laid down; while in Rev. 20:11–15 the dead then mentioned are those found in that

condition at that period, for in no shape or form is it intimated that it is the only res. 20. There is no Advent of Christ connected with this res., so Barnes. Reply: There is; see preceding chapter. 21. "All the righteous and wicked will be judged together, and both at the Coming of Christ," so Barnes, Brown, etc. Reply: Notwithstanding the assertion that "it is utterly impossible to explain these passages," etc., given as proof, we unhesitatingly pronounce this doctrine pure assumption, a virtual adoption of old monkish views, irreconcilable with the facts stated in those very Scriptures, and antagonistic to the statements of the Divine Spirit. For full proof we refer the reader to the Propositions on Judgment (Props. 132 and 133), to the analysis (Prop. 134) of Matt. 25:31–46 (the main proof text relied on), and to the order of Judgment which follows that of the resurrection (as e.g. Props 161–164). Many of the proofs alleged simply refer to judgment of all men, which we receive; or to the judgment of the righteous and of the wicked at Christ's Advent, which we also believe, and not one of them asserts that at the Coming of Christ both the righteous and the wicked dead shall be raised up, and a general judgment of these two classes will then be held. This is simply inferred, as we shall conclusively show hereafter. If the modern notion is correct, then the pious Jews and early Church groped in worse than Egyptian darkness. 22. The rise of Gog and Magog is against the idea of a literal resurrection, so Brown and others. Reply: We fail to see it; for if God intends to raise up certain of the dead previously to Gog and Magog (whatever these names may denote), it will be performed. 23. That if the res. be literal, then some of the Apostles and other good Christians would be excluded, so Fairbairn. Reply: This has been answered, but we may add: This objection overlooks the fact that not all martyrs, but only those at a particular period of time (during the time of the beast and prophet) are specified, viz., those under the last persecution. Again, it reads this res. isolated, whereas to obtain the whole doctrine all the passages (as e.g. in ch. 11; 1 Cor. 15; Isa. 25, etc.) bearing on the subject are to be recognized in their proper order, which, of course, includes the Prophets, Apostles, all saints. 24. "The rest of the dead neither awake nor live during the thousand years, nor at any other time," so Bush and Paræus. Reply: This is directly opposed by the text, as admitted by many—nearly all—of our opponents. The effort to sustain this objection by altering the text from "lived not again" to "lived not," on the authority of a few MSS., is a failure, since all the MSS. more ancient are opposed to it, fully sustaining our version. Even if the change were allowed, it would still favor our doctrine. These are the leading objections urged against our interpretation, and the student can readily see that many of them are merely captious, i.e. seeking for difficulties and manufacturing them; others, nearly all, are inferential; while not one of them is based on a direct, positive, scriptural statement, unless obj. 21 forms an exception. The value of the latter will appear as we proceed. Recent writers (as Hodge, Sys. Div., in part relating to Eschatology) have presented no new objections, but simply reiterate what have been repeatedly answered, without observing and replying to our line of argument founded in the covenant itself.

Obs. 6. The subject of the res. is frequently referred to and implied in the Apoc., but it would be foreign to our design to enter into a detailed statement respecting each allusion. A few remarks respecting the more prominent will answer, and we can only specify, leaving the student to investigate. The res. of Rev. 11:18, occurring under the last trumpet, and thus Pre-Millennial, has been sufficiently noticed (Obs. 1, with which compare the concessions of many of our opponents, e.g. Barnes, etc.). Rev. 14:1–5, embracing the first-fruits preceding the harvest, includes necessarily a res., and will be treated under the subject of the translation. The "man-child" of Rev. 12:5 is by many able prophetic writers interpreted as symbolic or representative of the resurrected saints. Those who (like Dr. Seiss and others) hold to a literal day fulfilment, still future, of the Apoc., find the res. implied in the 4th and 5th chaps, of Rev. and in ch. 7, etc. The passages which obscurely refer to it or imply it are to be interpreted by the plain and decided teaching on the subject (comp. Prop. 130).

Obs. 7. Two things connected with Rev. 20:4–6 may be noticed—the persons raised and the time when raised. 1. The persons raised are martyrs, and only martyrs. Mede was so strongly in favor to apply this to the martyrs and "confessors equipollent to martyrs" as "a prerogative to their sufferings above the rest of the dead," that he inclined to the opinion "that all the righteous will rise during the course of the Millennial Kingdom." Burgh, and many others, insist that martyrs only are designated. Brown and others make two classes, viz., martyrs and those who did not worship (although others, in our estimation, more correctly apply the latter as a characteristic of the martyrs and the reason assigned why they were martyred). Pre-Millenarians and Post-Millenarians make two classes or bodies, the former to include all saints in the first res., and the latter as a mere exegetical addition, having more (so Barnes) than the martyrs intended. Even Witsius (Exer. Sac., p. 516) has a class beside the martyrs. Kliefoth (Offenbarung Johannes, p. 260) advocates a literal res., and has, like Bengel, two bodies announced (not of the dead, but) one of the dead (martyrs) who are raised up, and another of the living (confessors), who are translated. But this evidently is designed to make it fit with 1 Thess. 4:17 and 1 Cor. 15:51–53; comp. also Sirr on The First Res., and works advocating the same view, and it will be found that under the impression that all the righteous are raised simultaneously, and in order to make Rev. 20 to correspond with other passages supposed to teach the same, two classes are introduced into the passage, and into the last body (confessors) the remaining righteous are crowded. We are not forced to this procedure, which is an evident violation of the passage, because it refers exclusively to "the dead," as the phrase "the rest of the dead" plainly shows, and to a body of men who suffered martyrdom in view of their confession of faith and rejection of the still future Antichrist. Even if it were admitted, on exegetical grounds, that two bodies are included, these bodies could not possibly, by any legitimate reasoning, be made to include all the saints of this, and past centuries, seeing that it is entirely descriptive of those who pass through the yet future tribulation under the culminated Antichrist. A misconception of the meaning of "first" (comp. Obs. 2) has a weighty influence in its application. The res. and translation of a select

portion occurs previous to the fulfilment of this prediction, as seen e.g. in Rev. 14, as the first-fruits are similar in nature to the succeeding harvest, and precedes the rise and persecution of the culminated Antichrist. All these resurrections occur under the Second Advent in its secret or thief-like stage. But this will appear plainer by looking at the second subject. 2. The time when these martyrs are raised up is of course associated by all Pre-Millenarians with the Second Advent, but many, by not distinguishing between the stages, and by being exclusively wedded to some favorite year-day interpretation of the Apocalypse, apply its fulfilment to the period immediately after the open Parousia of ch. 19. Now while, as against our opponents who deny a literal personal Sec. Advent, we can properly use (as we have done) this passage as one associated with the res. of the saints (for without a personal Sec. Advent there is no res.), yet when we come to consider the exact time in the period of the Sec. Advent when this res. of the martyrs is experienced, we find the most conclusive evidence that it also takes place during the secret stage, and previous to the open Parousia of ch. 19. Let the reader consider, as introductory, two facts proven in detail in other places (Prop. 130 and Prop. 166, etc.), the two stages in the Sec. Advent, and the still future Advent of the last Antichrist (Props. 161–164), who causes the death of these martyrs and is overthrown at the open manifestation of King Jesus and His saints. Now turn to Rev. 15, and we find that before the seven last plagues, which fill up the wrath of God, are poured out, the identical persons described in Rev. 20:4, who resisted the beast and his image and mark, are already exultant in acquired salvation, and this follows the gathering of the first-fruits as the enforced worship of the beast, image, and mark (Rev. 14:9) also follows it. It precedes the open Parousia, as these victorious ones witness (Rev. 16:2) the vials poured out upon “the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshipped his image.” It precedes the open Parousia, because they, with all saints, shall be connected with the announced “marriage of the Lamb,” and they belong (as a portion due to them “to execute the judgment written”) to the armies that accompany the King of kings. In view, therefore, of the deliverance of these martyrs before the vials are poured out and their coming with Jesus at His open Advent, Rev. 20:4–6 is retrospective. If the student carefully ponders the construction of the passage he will find (1) the binding of Satan and its duration announced; (2) then follows the reign of the saints in place of Satan’s previous dominion, and this is portrayed (a) by the “thrones” and “judgment,” a general announcement; (b) by a particular specification (as an encouragement, and to lead us not to limit these reigning ones) of the martyrs; (c) by expressions indicative of the nature of the reign, and that all who participate in it have the privileges and honors of the first-born.

Obs. 8. If Mede’s argument is once admitted, viz., that Rev. 20:4–6 and Dan. 7 are synchronous, then it is impossible, without direct violation of the order laid down, to avoid a Pre-Mill. resurrection. Bush, in his *Anastasis*, admits Mede’s position, owing to the parallelism of the two prophecies, but endeavors to avoid our conclusion by making both to describe the Gospel dispensation. But in doing this, he not only makes a fearful Millennium of suffering and martyrdom (against all prophecy), but he reverses the facts of history. For, instead of such a removal of antagonistic powers—a sealing, binding, and detention of Satan so as not to deceive—the history of the Church and of the kingdoms clearly proclaim, in the persecutions endured, the tyranny exercised, the murders committed, the crimes and wars indulged, etc., that neither Dan. nor John have yet been fulfilled. It matters not whether we make the dragon a symbol of tyrannical dominion or of a personal devil; in either case the predictions of the Prophets have not been realized; and what is more to the point, in the order laid down by themselves, if followed in the evolution of history, it was impracticable, for the simple reason that before this exaltation, etc., of the saints, certain events, running down to the present and still extending in the future, must first be fulfilled. Any other position makes the Bible contradictory both to itself and to history.

Obs. 9. Those who deny a literal res. in Rev. 20 generally have much to say concerning the indefiniteness and obscurity of figurative and symbolic prophecy—the difficulty of understanding it until the fulfilment shows its intended meaning, being upheld by some—but when they come to explain it themselves, then all difficulties vanish, and no other interpretation can possibly be allowed. This, to say the least, is indicative that they have no confidence in their assumptions against us, and that, when necessity requires it, they esteem themselves fully competent to elucidate, with the utmost charming confidence, even “obscure” predictions. The reader may draw his own conclusions.*

Obs. 10. There is a res. of the wicked dead, Obs. 4. It will not answer, as many do, to assert a res. of just and unjust at the beginning of this age and none after; or to affirm, as others do, that there is no res. of the wicked whatever. Without discussing the destiny of the wicked, the passages that we have presented distinctly show that after the thousand years are ended the rest of the dead “lived again,” i.e. were raised up from the dead; that they, “after many days shall be visited;” that they shall “return,” and return at evening time; that they shall be made subject to the endurance of “the second death;” that those dead whose names are not found in the book of life are also raised up and judged; that there is a res. of some unto shame and contempt, which those that return in the evening experience; that the res. of the dead is affirmed in their order of all men, both just and unjust; that a prior, pre-eminent res., etc., involves another of a lower class, which must include the wicked; and that the res. of the dead and a judgment to follow is held up as a motive of repentance to men. These considerations are sufficient to sustain the position of John in Rev. 20. To quote the passages which speak of the wicked as “silent in the grave” as “not being,” “remaining in the congregation of the dead,” etc., to prove a non-resurrection, is only bringing forth part of the truth, viz., that there is a non-resurrection of the wicked for a certain period of time, and this is thus strongly, by way of contrast to the blessed condition of the righteous, presented. But the whole truth as given by the Spirit demands their “return,” their also “living again.” Any other interpretation flatly contradicts divine statements. Let us receive all that is written, observing the same order laid down by the Spirit. If it be asked, Of what practical use or

benefit can such a res. unto condemnation and shame be? the answers are various; such as, to vindicate the justice of God; to prove the truthfulness and reality of His representations and mercy; to apportion “the few or many stripes” that the guilty merit; to fulfil His declaration that all the wicked shall see and acknowledge the Divine power; to show that death itself, as many fondly hope, is no refuge for the sinner; that a res. unto eternal life is the special gift of God through Jesus Christ; to contrast the condition of the res. saints with their own; to root out in the most effectual manner every remnant of evil; to give to the creatures of God, the universe itself, a sublime and abiding idea of the nature and consequences of sin. If it be asked, Why does God give the righteous so long a priority and cause the wicked only to “return” after so long an interval? the reason, as we gather it from intimations, here and there, seems to be this: This Millennial era is designed to fulfil covenanted promises; these require the resurrection of the saints and their triumphant establishment in the earth. To do this demands, as almost every Millennial description portrays, the removal of God’s enemies to clear “the inheritance” of its oppressors. Being thus removed, the triumph of the saints, their victory over death, the bestowal of dominion—in brief, the ample and continued fulfilment of God’s promises in real, actual experience is fully exhibited and tested during these thousand years, clearly and fully vindicating the truthfulness and faithfulness of God, and the honor, dignity, and power of David’s Son. Now, it is declared that this faithfulness, etc., is to be manifested not only to angels, to the glorified, to the restored Jewish nation, to spared Gentiles, but also to the wicked. The time selected is at the close of the Sabbath of the world’s week, in the very height of completed fulfilment of promise, and sway of saintly reign, and the accumulated glory of the rule of David’s Son; then the wicked arise and are filled with “sudden shame” and “confusion” when they behold the justly forfeited blessings in the possession of those whom they despised, rejected, and even persecuted. This res. is therefore delayed, not merely to give the saints an honorable precedence by way of reward, and as a punishment to the wicked for refusing Christ and His proffered mercy, but to place the saints, the inheritance, the world, yea, even Christ Himself in the covenanted position by which the majesty and glory of God is the more fully seen, felt, and appreciated in the then proven, tested immortality and reign of the saints, renewal of the earth or removal of the curse, etc. At the end of the thousand years, so faithfully is it proven that all the promises of God are “yea and amen” in Christ, that none can gainsay it, for the covenant is more than fulfilled, and to forfeited blessings additional and greater have been added. This is the time, gloriously, yea, sadly suitable, which God has appointed for “the rest of the dead to live again,” and behold with their own eyes the glory they have lost by not obeying God—a glory shining forth in the land, in the Theocratic government, in the subjects, in the immortal kings and priests, and in the exalted, enthroned Son of Man. Imagine just such a “return,” under such circumstances, and then tell us, are “holy men of old” wrong when they depict the shame, degradation, and unhappiness of the wicked at this period? Imagine Voltaire, Paine, Strauss, and a multitude like them to thus “return” and see what they ridiculed, and what must then memory and conscience say?

Obs. 11. Out of the abundant testimony favoring a twofold resurrection, and the literal, eclectic res. of Rev. 20, we select a few as illustrative. Dean Alford (Com. loci) remarks: “I cannot consent to distort the words from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy, on account of any considerations of difficulty, or of any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the Millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles, and the whole Church for three hundred years, understood them in the plain literal sense; and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence for antiquity, complacently casting aside the most cogent instance of consensus which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where two resurrections are mentioned, where certain persons lived at the first, and the rest of the dead only at the end of a specified period after that first—if, in such a passage, the first res. may be understood to mean spiritual rising with Christ, while the second means literal rising from the grave; then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything. If the first res. is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none will be hardy enough to maintain; but if the second is literal, so is the first, which, in common with the whole Primitive Church and many of the best modern expositors, I do maintain, and receive as an article of faith and hope.” Van Oosterzee (Ch. Dog., vol. 2, p. 786) advocates “more than one resurrection; first a partial one and then an absolutely universal one. Of the former, not only does the Apoc. seem to speak, ch. 20:4–6, but also the Lord, Luke 14:14, and Paul, 1 Thess. 4:16, as also 1 Cor. 15:23, as compared with verse 26,” etc., and then, referring to the latter (the universal one), speaks of a poetic-prophetic grouping together of that which in reality will be seen realized, not side by side, but in succession.” Ebrard (The Rev. of John) advocates a literal Sec. Advent, a literal first res., a literal reign here on earth over the spared nations, etc., and in his Gospel His. (p. 576, foot-note Clark’s ed.), thus refers to Rev. 20: “Chaps. 18 and 19 (Apoc.) depict the victory achieved over this Kingdom by Christ at His Coming. Then follows the first awakening, namely, of those who have died in the Lord, and now in glorified bodies live upon the earth, and maintain a spiritual rule over so much of humanity as is not yet glorified (just as Christ after His res. lived for forty days upon the earth in a glorified body). Then, after this last offer of salvation, follows the second resurrection to judgment.” Hagenbach (His. of Doc., vol. 1, s. 139) pertinently says respecting the spiritual interpretation: “The first res. (Rev. 20:5) is explained by Augustine as the deliverance of the soul from the dominion of sin in this life; as, in general, an orthodoxy which maintains the authority of the Apoc., and yet will not allow Millenarianism, can only escape from its difficulties by an arbitrary exegesis, like that of Augustine on this passage.”*

Obs. 12. We have already referred to the astounding opinion entertained by Prof. Bush, Gipps, Waldegrave, and others, that this res. and Millennium is a portraiture of suffering and martyrdom in behalf of the truth. To indicate the amazing perversions of the

passage, Rev. 20:1–6, by our opponents in their efforts to wrest it from us, attention is called e.g. to Waldegrave's statements (New Test. Millenarianism), and we select him purposely, because he has been eulogized (The Bib. Rep.) as a model of an interpreter and as a triumphant opponent. The binding and restraint of Satan as well as the little season, both "set before us the working of Satan, for it is his working especially which is here exhibited to view during two distinct periods in the history of Christendom. The first—the longer period—said to last a thousand years, is one in which Satan, forbidden to launch forth into the world any fresh impostures, does, notwithstanding, prevail, with the aid of the civil power, to persecute even unto death those faithful souls who, being risen with Christ, are made kings and priests unto God and His Father. The second—the shorter period—said to last but a little season, is one in which, the number of God's living saints being marvellously increased, and martyrdom being no longer the rule, Satan attempts by other means, even by the multiplication of religious delusions, to compass the destruction of the Church." The res. of the martyrs, therefore, is simply a revival of the martyr spirit, made necessary by Satan's reigning, and this too while the saints are reigning: "They are also sufferers at the hands of men—sufferers even to the extent of laying down their lives for Christ's sake—sufferers, I say, even unto death, and that at one and the same time with their reigning." "The thousand years will prove to be a period in which Christ's witnesses are witnesses even unto death—a period, in short, of martyrdom, not of triumph—a period in which Satan (being precluded, indeed, from the invention of fresh delusions), is able, notwithstanding, to wield those already in existence with such effect as to make the Church of God to prophesy in sackcloth and ashes." This caricature of the Millennium and the reign of the saints is presented by one largely eulogized as the champion against Chiliasm. No Chiliast ever produced anything so flatly contradictory to all testimony of Scripture, to all analogy on the subject; so plainly antagonistic to numerous predictions, that the large majority of our opponents recoil from it as unworthy of credence, because it actually reverses the blessed teaching of prophecy. It is utterly unworthy of serious refutation, and affords a sad illustration how good men, in their eagerness to wrest the passage from us, can fall into the most absurd interpretation.*

Obs. 13. Sufficient has been said to vindicate our usage of the word "souls" to denote the person (Obs. 3), and yet in view of certain statements, it will be in place to add a few remarks. Fairbairn says that "it is quite frivolous to insist upon the term souls being often used to denote persons; no one doubts that it is; but the question is, can it be so taken here?" Now, the frivolity arises from the fact that a large class on his side—in fact nearly every work against us—gravely insist that because "souls" are mentioned it cannot mean persons. Of course, to meet such an objection, "frivolous" as it may be, we are forced in self-defence to show that the term is used to denote persons. Thus e.g. Barnes (Com. loci) lays great stress on the word "souls," as if it alone denoted the spiritual nature, and carefully conceals from the reader this meaning, but when not controverting us, he in another place (Com., Acts 3:20, on the phrase "every soul") admits this usage, thus: "Every person or individual soul is often put for the whole man by the Hebrews, Acts 7:14; Josh. 10:28" (with which compare his remarks on Acts 2:27, where he makes the term "soul" equivalent to "me," and applies it to the corporeal res. of Jesus, thus flatly contradicting his comment on Rev. 20:4–6). Indeed, our opponents contradict themselves in the same comment on this point, when e.g. they admit that "he" (v. 6) and "they," and "the rest of the dead" are declarative of persons and not simply of disembodied spirits, and speak of them as such. We insist that the reason why the Spirit, through human agency, gives us the term "souls" in preference to any other, is this: it is most in accord with scriptural usage, for not only is the resurrection of Jesus thus predicted and declared to be the res. of a "soul," but it is predicted of, and promised to, individual believers, as e.g. Ps. 99:9, "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave." Now then, when the res. is actually described, it is reasonable, it is strengthening, to find the same term employed, thus making prediction and fulfilment, promise and realization to correspond (comp. Obs. 3, note).

PROPOSITION 128. The language of the Gospels and Epistles is in strict accord with the requirements of a Pre-Millennial resurrection.

A doctrine to be consistent must preserve its unity in all the inspired writings. Having seen how the Old Test. and the conclusion of the New Test. coincide, it will be important to notice how the Gospels and Epistles corroborate the Jewish views of the resurrection based on covenant promises.

Obs. 1. The resurrection of 1 Cor. 15:52 declares that "at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound (1 Thess. 4:16), and the dead (i.e. those deceased) shall be raised incorruptible," etc. Now, the fair inference (for the Jews, as commentaries inform us, used this very language) is, that this denotes a resurrection identified with the bodies of dead saints. This is almost the universal opinion among critics. This same res. of the dead is mentioned in Apoc. 11:18, also under a last trumpet, and immediately in connection with "the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." Our opponents generally concede both of these to be literal, and the exact correspondence that they sustain to Jewish expectations has been noticed by able writers (and that these, with this language added, was perpetuated generally in the early Church). But attention is called to the fact that just as the Jews believed, when "the Kingdom (sovereignty) of this world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Christ" (so MSS., S. and A. Tischendorf's N. T., and comp. Titman, Hahn, etc.) at that very time a resurrection takes place. When the sovereignty of the world is seized, when a Kingdom commences which is never to end, when events occur which commentators connect only with the Sec. Advent, then at that very

period, “at the last trump” (“for the trumpet shall sound,” Rev. 11:15), the pious dead are raised to receive their reward. Surely this is amply sufficient to identify a Pre-Millennial resurrection, seeing that 1 Cor. 15:52; Rev. 11:18; and Rev. 20:3–6, are all under the same last Pre-Millennial trumpet. If one is literal, all then are literal, because taking place at the same time and for the same purpose.*

Obs. 2. Attention is directed to 1 Cor. 15:22–24. “For, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ first, afterward they that are Christ’s, at His Coming. Then cometh the end,” etc. We are not concerned in adopting any particular rendering (as e.g. making “order” to mean “band,” and “the end” equivalent to “the last band,” etc.), for whatever version is adopted, two things are self-evident in the passage enforcing the general analogy on the subject. After the universality of death is announced, then follows the positive declaration that the recovery from death—being made alive—is not a simultaneous occurrence, “but every man in his own order.” We leave an opponent give the meaning of this phrase. Barnes (Com. loci) says: “But every man—every one, including Christ as well as others. In his own order—in his proper order, rank, place, time. The word *tagma* usually relates to military order or array; to the arrangement of a cohort or band of troops, to their being properly marshalled with the officers at the head, and every man in his proper place in the ranks. Here it means that there was a proper order to be observed in the res. of the dead.” This declaration of an eclectic res. is confirmatory of the Jewish view, and could not possibly have been thus used, if the design were not to corroborate its truthfulness. The dead are to be marshalled in separate, distinctive divisions, according to their character or works. Next follows a statement of such a division: “Christ the first-fruits,” the first in time, the beginning, the first in order, “who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence” (and with him ought, perhaps, to be associated the “many” that arose at His resurrection); then, “afterward they that are Christ’s at His coming,” which evidently describes another division portrayed e.g. in 1 Thess. 4 and 1 Cor. 15, exclusively of the righteous; “then cometh the end.” Now, here we have (1) separate bands of resurrected ones asserted, and (2) these bands or orders separated by an extent of time (nearly two thousand years). This is all that our line of argument requires in order to support our position.*

Obs. 3. In 1 Thess. 4:13–17, we have distinctive marks that “the dead in Christ shall rise first.” Our opponents, to avoid the force of this expression, inform us that it is used relatively to those that are translated, meaning that the dead arise before the living are translated. Allowing such an interpretation, yet the eclectic nature of the res. and its time is clearly manifested (1) by its exclusive reference to the righteous, and (2) by its precedence of the translation. The res. of the wicked is not mentioned, and the reason must be found in other Scriptures. The simple fact that we have extended passages devoted only to the res. of the righteous is in perfect agreement with our doctrine and utterly opposed to the theory of a simultaneous res. of all the dead. The association of this res. of the righteous with the personal Sec. Advent of Jesus is an additional reason sustaining our view.*

Obs. 4. Luke 20:34–36 (see its connection with covenant promise, Props. 49 and 137) is remarkable for its distinctness: “The children of this world (or age) marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world (or age) and the resurrection from the dead (or the res. that out of dead ones—see the emphasis in the original) neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.” Here we have the following particulars specified: (1) Some shall gain the future age by a res. from among the dead; (2) it is implied that others not worthy shall not gain it by such a resurrection; (3) this resurrection of the saints is distinctively referred to as the pre-eminent res., and one out of dead ones; (4) such, as indicative of its eclectic nature, are designated as “the children of the resurrection;” (5) and being thus born from the dead, through God’s power, they “are the children of God.”*

Obs. 5. Phil. 3:11, “If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,” certainly does not give the force of the original, and it places Paul in the attitude of striving for something which is inevitable. But taking the emendation demanded by the preposition *ek*, and given by numerous critics and commentators (and admitted by some of our opponents, as Prof. Stuart), we have a reading which vindicates Paul’s effort to obtain a prize, viz., a distinguishing eclectic resurrection. For many read it: “If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection from among (or out of) the dead (or dead ones.)” The force of this rendering is sustained by the res. of Jesus which was (e.g. 1 Pet. 1:3) one from among the dead, and by the usage of the preposition.*

Obs. 6. This discrimination of resurrection is delicately referred to, and implied in passages. Thus 1 Cor. 6:14, “And God hath both raised up (*ēgeire*) the Lord, and will also raise up us (*exegerei*, out-raise or pre-eminently raise you).” The change of the verb by the addition of a word, significant of something peculiar and distinguishing, is worthy of notice (comp. Rom. 9:27, Greek). So take Mark 9:9, 10, and we have it asserted that the Son of Man should rise (*ek nekrōn*) out of or from among dead ones (as in fact transpired), and then the disciples (who had no difficulty with the already received—e.g. John 11:24—doctrine of a res. of the dead) questioned, one with another, what this rising from among or out of dead ones should mean relating to Jesus. As His res. being an eclectic one is designated a res. *ek nekrōn*, so do we find that of his believers designated.*

Obs. 7. Our argument is abundantly sustained by other Scriptures, which, to avoid repetition, we can but briefly refer to, as Acts 3:19–21, for not only “the times of restitution” (described in Mill. predictions) necessitate an included res. (so understood by the Jews), but “the times of refreshing” are “the times of reanimation” (see the proof given in detail under Prop. 144, and the reader will notice that “the times of reanimation” confirm the order of the resurrection as advocated by us). Then Matt. 19:28, “the regeneration”

(see the details given under Prop. 145), with the Jewish views of the res. being a birth (which was adopted by the early Christians, and used even by Eusebius as expressive of a res.), corroborates the doctrine of an eclectic res., both as to character and time. The views given in a previous Prop. respecting the res. being a birth, and allied to a birth preceding the Millennium, is strengthened by its usage in the New Test., where believers are designated "the children of God being the children of the res.;" where "the adoption" is connected with "the redemption of the body;" when the begetting of Jesus (Acts 13:33) is tendered as proof of the res. of Jesus, and He is represented as "the first-born" from the dead, etc.*

Obs. 8. The res. of the saints being a distinctive one, belonging exclusively to them and no others, this feature of separation as to character and time is always preserved. Thus (1) where a res. of the just and of the unjust is mentioned together, that of the just has precedence; (2) expressions such as "the Son quickeneth whom He will," "they that hear shall live," etc., imply that not all shall be made alive; (3) the promise of raising up His own at the last day specifically given to believers, implies that unbelievers shall not be raised at the same time; (4) the res. of the righteous described alone, without any reference whatever to the wicked (as John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 1 Cor. 15, and 1 Thess. 4), implies a separate and distinctive one; (5) the titles given to the res. of the righteous imply the same, as "the better resurrection," "the res. of the just," "the res. unto life."*

Obs. 9. Our opponents, as Dr. Brown (Ch. Sec. Coming), Barnes (Com. Apoc.), and others adduce the following proof texts to substantiate their view of a universal and simultaneous res. of all the dead, both just and unjust, viz., Dan. 12:2; John 5:28, 29; Rev. 20:11–15; 1 Cor. 15:20–23; John 6:39, 40, and 17:9, 24; 2 Tim. 4:1. The reader may compare these with our references to the same, and then observe that no interpretation and application of these passages can possibly be valid, which introduces an antagonism—most direct—between Scripture statements. Indeed, he will find more, viz., that several of the texts assigned as proof (e.g. Dan. 12:2; 1 Cor. 15:20–23; Rev. 20:11–15) fully sustain our position, being sufficiently decisive of an eclectic res. The others are equally so, for observe that John 5:28 describes two resurrections, one "the res. of life," and the other "the res. of damnation," while the order must be decided by passages descriptive of the same. The word "hour," upon which our opposers lay so much uncritical stress, simply means, as able critics inform us "a time," so that a time is coming when all shall be raised, but as other Scriptures tell us, "every man in his own order" (even Augustine, Epis. 197, 2; Ambrose, Epis. 199:17, and many others make "hour" simply equivalent to "time," and thus used e.g. 1 John 2:18; Matt. 9:22; John 4:23; Mark 13:11; Luke 10:21, etc.). The remaining passages need no explanation, following, as they do, the general analogy.*

Obs. 10. In a subject so varied as that of the resurrection it becomes us to heed the caution given in the investigation of any doctrine, viz., to collate the passages referring to it, and explain the more concise by those which give the order, time, and manner of occurrence. In such a comparison it is impossible to find a specific account of the resurrection of the wicked taking place at the same time with that of the righteous. Their standing together, under the general affirmation of a resurrection of both, would be an argument against us if it were not that in other places the Spirit, when circumstantially describing the res., separates them by an interval of time. It is wisdom to accept of the Spirit's explanations. The intelligent reader will appreciate this rule of careful comparison before deciding.*

Obs. 11. It is impossible to comprehend the order of events bearing on this subject as presented by our opponents, owing to the contradictions involved. To illustrate: take that large class of commentators and others who correctly unite the res. with the personal Advent, and consistently declare that before the Millennial age is introduced Antichrist will be destroyed. Now turn to 2 Thess. 2, and (as Barnes, etc.) they advocate the destruction of the man of sin by the personal Coming of Christ, and, according to their own admissions, this, in the very nature of their concessions, must be a Pre-Millennial Advent; and, of course, with their identifying the literal res. with precisely such a Coming, there should be no difficulty in receiving a Pre-Millennial res. Simple consistency demands it. Again, here and there in various authors, we find unexplained contradictions that, at least, show that order in these events is sadly neglected. Take an excellent and highly esteemed writer for an example: Van Oosterzee (Theol. of N. T., s. 42), speaking of the res. of the righteous truthfully says: "This is the first resurrection," and in a footnote appends 1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:16; Luke 14:14; Rev. 20:15, declaring that this will take place at the end of the age. He thus adopts the Millenarian view, and if this were all it would be eminently satisfactory, but the admission is marred by afterward placing at the same time, as the teaching of Paul, "the general res. of the just and the unjust." Whether the author designed it or not, it flatly contradicts his previous statement. Passing to a lower grade of writers, it would only be a thankless office and a caricature of the Word of God to point out the strange utterances based on "the second death," etc.*

Obs. 12. The notion advanced by Priest (View of Mill., p. 254), placing the last trump after the thousand years, and the "remaining" of 2 Thess. 3:16 to mean a remaining until the thousand years are ended, scarcely deserves refutation. It is alluded to here because some parties are trying to revive it, and because of its connection with the doctrine of the res. This view arises from a neglect to compare Scripture with Scripture, seeing that there are only seven trumpets (marking epochs of time), and the last is expressly asserted (Rev. 11) to be in immediate connection with the res., rewarding of the righteous, and the Millennial Kingdom. Besides, as all critics write, "the remaining" refers simply to the precedence of the res., and the very ones that "remain" are also changed and associated with those favored with the res.*

Obs. 13. These first begotten of the dead sustain a peculiar and distinctive relationship to Christ, belonging, as the first-born anciently, in an especial manner to the Lord. This will be noticed hereafter (Props. 118 and 154). Now it may be said that as Christ comes to reign as David's immortal Son, prepared to fulfil the covenant promises by virtue of the power of the resurrection and the Divine united with Him, so it is suitable, yea, necessary, that those who are accounted worthy to be associated with Him in His reign (which is asserted to take place at the Millennial period) should also experience the power of the resurrection and become like unto their Head. Hence the propriety of representing the res. taking place at this very time. Without it, the saints would not be qualified; with it, the promises of God can be abundantly realized.*

Obs. 14. How frequently our attention is directed to this Pre-Millennial res., and owing to its peculiarity and rank this is reasonable. Christ appeals to this frequency when (John 6:45) He says: "No man can come to me except the Father draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day." Then it is added: "It is written in the Prophets," etc., Christ knowing the Jewish opinions based on these prophets, confirms the res. as something well known and contained in the Prophets. Now, where do the Prophets teach this res., if not in the passages adduced? How comes it that so many critics deny Christ's assertion, and can find no such res. in them? The answer to the last may, perhaps, be found in the fact that if a literal res. is admitted, then it must also be acknowledged as Pre-Millennial, and rather than accept the detested Jewish, Chiliastic notions "of folly and ignorance," these predictions of David, Isaiah, Ezekiel, etc., must denote national deliverance or anything else but a literal res., and this is "wisdom and true enlightenment." So far too does this proceed that while no such res., excepting perhaps the faintest of allusions, can be found in the Old Test., acknowledgments freely come from all sides that the very language of the Prophets indicates that the doctrine of a res. must have been "a common belief," or else the figures drawn from it could not exist. But why was it so much believed in that Prophets freely employed language derived from it? Let the Jews tell us, let the Prophets inform us themselves. Surely their testimony is worth far more than that of modern critics, who learnedly speak of outside influences. Now, the first Millenarian has yet to be produced who professes to receive his faith outside of the Divine Record, or from any other source than that derived from God. More than this: it does not require critical acumen or special learning to see that the very Covenant itself, the foundation of following revelation, necessitates such a belief, and that from this basis arises the numerous allusions and predictions bearing on the subject. The reader is referred to the Covenant, and, as we have shown (Prop. 49), its fulfilment is utterly impossible without a resurrection. This then forms the shaping of God's promises, and the longings, faith, hope of believers, if we allow language its usual, customary meaning.*

Obs. 15. The reader may have noticed that this Pre-Millennial res. in several places is directly identified with a restoration (Props. 111-114) of the Jewish nation to Palestine. This, additionally, serves as proof of the correctness of our position. For, our argument drawn from the Davidic Covenant, makes such a restoration a necessity in order that the throne and Kingdom of David may be re-established. If Christ and His saints are to reign as predicted over this restored people, etc., then, as a matter of course, this res. must take precedence, just as the Prophets locate it. Hence, it is eminently proper that the resurrection of "the whole house of Israel," including the Gentiles grafted in by faith, previous to their entrance into the promised inheritance, should be delineated as Ezekiel gives it in connection with a national restoration of the Jews under the reign of David's Son. The res. and the throne and Kingdom of David are inseparable, and the former must, to meet the Divine Plan as revealed, precede the latter; and in this the Prophets agree (Prop. 126).

Obs. 16. The doctrine of such a first res. presents motives such as no other can, explanatory of Paul's desire to attain unto it. The reign with Christ, and distinguishing honor and blessedness are connected with it. It gives us an explanation of the martyr spirit of the early Church, and the earnest desires expressed to experience its power. Besides, it indicates how untrue and uncharitable are the deductions of infidels, and even others, that they were sustained and strengthened by a false belief.*

Obs. 17. This res. is so linked in with other subjects that additional proof is advanced confirmatory under various Propositions; and these, to do us ample justice, the reader must also take into consideration in forming a decisive opinion. Thus e.g. if we are correct in establishing a personal Pre-Millennial Advent, or the inheriting of the earth, or the Millenarian view of the judgment day, the judgship of Christ and of the saints, or the period of regeneration, day of Christ, the morning of that day, etc., this adds materially to our argument in locating this res.

Obs. 18. The believer can meet death without fear. While death is an enemy, while feeling and acknowledging his penal power, yet with the assurance thus given of a speedy, complete victory over him, they can receive him as one over whom they are destined to triumph. He can well use the language of Micah 7:7, 8, "Therefore I will look unto the Lord; I will wait (comp. Isa. 25:9) for the God of my salvation; my God will hear me. Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy (death); when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me. I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against Him, until He plead my cause and execute judgment for me; He will bring me forth to the light (like David, Ps. 17:15), and I shall behold His righteousness." The believer has "hope in his death," and "his flesh shall rest in hope."*

Obs. 19. This first resurrection being an eclectic one, separate and pertaining to those accounted worthy of attaining to the privileges of "the first-born," it indicates a previous judgment. To insure a first res. (or a translation) there must be a corresponding fitness, and therefore this res. itself is evidence of the Divine acceptance of the person experiencing its power. An antecedent estimate of

character and worthiness must, of necessity, exist. This is based on justifying faith which releases from condemnation and insures eternal life through Jesus; while the position and honor of the saint after resurrection is graduated by the works done in his life of faith.*

Obs. 20. Out of the multitude of testimonies we select a few, illustrative of the men (most eminent for ability) who hold to our view. Rothe (Dogmatic, 2 P., p. 70) advocates a bodily resurrection, etc., as follows: "The Redeemer asserts distinctly the future res. of the body. And still His utterances so sound as to separate that of the righteous from that of the wicked, both as to fact and time. So in Luke 20:35, where the discourse is not of the res. in general, but distinctly of a res. to the earthly Kingdom of the Redeemer, the so-called First Resurrection. So it sounds (es klingt) when He calls Himself the 'Resurrection and the Life,' when He says, 'All that the Father gives Him shall come to Him, and He will raise them up at the last day,' 'all who believe in Him,' 'all who eat His flesh and blood,' where the clear implication is that the rest of the dead awake not at the same time. Such a distinction He makes in Luke 14:14, a resurrection for the pious, a res. for the wicked. So the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 15:23, comp. with Rom. 8:10, contemplates, not a general resurrection, but that of believers, 'they who are Christ's,' 'the sons of God.' The Apoc. distinguishes a first and second res. The first res., which ensues at the same time with the Advent, Rev. 19:11–21, is expressly described as the 'First,' Rev. 20:4–6. In it only the martyrs and they who have remained pure from the contamination of the world-power, have a share. These and only these reign with Christ 1000 years, while the 'rest of the dead' awake not to life. After the expiration of these years, and victory over Satan let loose, then the rest of the dead arise for judgment, Rev. 20:11–15." Such indorsements come from men who are fully persuaded that the Plan of Redemption, as covenanted and confirmed in Jesus the Christ, positively demands such a res. in order to insure a complete realization of promise. So Dörner (Person of Christ, vol. 1, p. 412) says: "Complete victor Christianity never can be until nature has become an organ in its service, a willing instrument of the perfect man, that is, of the righteous who are raised from the dead."*

Obs. 21. The reader is requested to observe that in our line of argument in behalf of a literal Pre-Millennial resurrection we are amply supported by the general analogy of Scripture on the subject. Whatever may be thought of the interpretation and application of particular passages, yet the following connected chain of divine teaching is apparent. First, we have the Covenant and its promises, which make such a resurrection a necessity in order to their verification. Second, the realization of such Covenant promises is based directly upon a resurrection from the dead, and such a distinguishing res. pertaining to the righteous is taught in numerous places in the Old Test. Third, this teaching of a peculiar, eclectic res. (so clearly taught that the Jews had received it) is repeated in varied expressions and declared hope in the Gospels and Epistles. Fourth, it is specially treated of in the Apocalypse, a work particularly devoted to eschatology. So decisive is this chain of evidence that the early Church, planted by the Apostles and the elders appointed by them, was universally under its influence and guidance. We gladly and hopefully remain under the same. But in addition to all this, we have a series of connected doctrines taught, which are essential to a Pre-Mill. resurrection, such e.g. as the Pre-Mill. Advent, the judgment day, the day of the Lord Jesus, the morning of the day, the reign of Christ and the saints, and various others. Nothing requisite to sustain our view of the res. is lacking, and, therefore, this union and harmony of doctrine greatly confirms our faith and hope.*

Obs. 22. Freely admitting that no doctrine is to be simply received on human authority, yet we confess to a gratification that our faith is that of the Primitive Church on this point. It is a satisfaction to know that we understand God's Word on this subject just as the immediate disciples and followers of the Apostles comprehended it. For, such a union of view does not make us liable to the suspicion which might justly arise if it was a doctrine that only originated in the fourth century, or in the tenth, or even later. Besides this, it is a doctrine which, if true, it would be reasonable to expect men to teach, who were so nearly related to the Apostles in time, and who had, more or less, the benefit of their previous instruction.*

Obs. 23. Lastly, we may be allowed to congratulate ourselves on the fact that our system of interpretation opens no door of entrance to the many conflicting and dangerous errors respecting the resurrection. Many, taking the weapons ready forged to hand by a spiritualizing interpretation of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John, turn them against a literal resurrection of the dead. Work after work could be mentioned which has done this, jubilantly quoting from the orthodox the arguments for a figurative, moral, or ecclesiastical resurrection. This is only the legitimate developing of the Origenistic system of interpretation, an almost impregnable refuge for all forms of error. Now, in all those systems, which reduce the res. to an incompleting redemption of the body, or which refine it away into a mystical conception, etc., not one of them can, or does, appeal to us for deductions or aid, since in no shape or form do we give them the slightest countenance. Hence probably arises the extreme hostility manifested toward our system by various authors, because it is a standing rebuke to their own efforts at spiritualizing.*

PROPOSITION 129. The Jewish view of a Pre-Mill. resurrection requisite for the introduction of the Messianic Kingdom is fully sustained by the grammatical sense of the New Test.

Attention is thus prominently called to the fact, that the agreement existing between Jewish belief and the language of the New Test. most effectually supports our doctrinal position.

Obs. 1. To avoid repeating, the reader is requested to notice how under the preceding Props. relating to the res. taught in the Old Test., the Apoc., and the Gospels and Epistles, the constant reference was made to the Jewish belief prevailing, and quotations were given fully sustaining the same from critics, historians, commentators, etc. Now, we ask the reader to consider how it was possible for Jesus and the inspired writers to employ language, in view of such an existing belief, fully corroborating it, unless the belief was a correct one, in strict accord with the Divine Purpose. Writers of all shades of opinion, opposers to Chiliasm included, tell us that the Jews did not expect a fulfilment of the Messianic predictions, of the Abrahamic Covenant and the promises based upon it, without a resurrection, eclectic in its nature, accessory and initiatory to their realization. The student, if honest and sincere, must, before rejecting our doctrine, give a satisfactory reason why the statements of the New Test. in their plain grammatical sense (for this sense is admitted, but a spiritual one is substituted) teach the same kind of an eclectic res., associated with a future reign of the Messiah. He must also, if considerate, show why this Jewish belief, thus corroborated by a sense of the New Test., was universally held by the Churches established under Apostolic guidance, if an error. This no one can do, without impeaching the Divine instruction of the New Test. and the Divine guidance manifested in the establishment of the Ch. Church. The conclusion, inevitable, to which we are forced is this: that the doctrine is truth, founded on Divine utterances and assurances, and committed to the Church to stimulate faith and hope.*

Obs. 2. Again, there is no question concerning the grammatical sense, for that is admitted even by our opponents, many of whom we have quoted. But we are assured that that sense is not the one intended; that a typical or spiritual meaning is the one to be received. Hence the doctrine of a literal Pre-Mill. res. is derided as “antiquated,” “Jewish,” etc., and utterly unfitted for the advanced thought of the age. A question, however, arises, which we will do well to ponder, viz., which is the safest to accept of, a God-given sense, or of one which is at the option of the interpreter? If a Pre-Mill. res. is an error, then it is one contained in the letter of the Word, and given by inspired men under the guidance of God Himself, and we are justifiable in entertaining it; but, on the other hand, if it be a truth, thus plainly declared, we are inexcusable in its rejection.

Obs. 3. Infidels object to the New Test. on the ground that it unmistakably teaches this previous existing Jewish view (so Strauss, Bauer, Renan, etc.), and reject the whole as evidence of superstition and ignorance. Apologists lamely strive, by the application of spiritualistic interpretation, to avoid such a conclusion, while admitting (1) the Jewish view as existing at the First Advent, and (2) the grammatical sense expressing it, but which is, they say, merely an accommodation to existing prejudice, and must be understood in a higher and nobler sense. No wonder that many apologies only confirm the unbeliever in his state of unbelief, seeing that they are utterly unfair to the Record and derogatory to the divine teaching of the Master and the Apostles. We, on the other hand, fully admit the infidel’s objection grounded on Jewish belief and corroborative New Test. teaching, and, instead of apologizing for the same and explaining it away, we account for it as a matter grounded in God’s Redemptive Plan, contained in the covenants and predictions, and which simple consistency and unity requires to be taught in the New Test.

Obs. 4. Judge Jones (Notes, p. 284) remarks of the Jewish opinion: “They understood that the promises (in covenants) which God made to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob were absolute; and they believed that He would surely perform them, even to those of former generations, who had part in them; and on this ground, mainly, they taught the resurrection of the dead, Acts 24:15.” “Three opinions touching the res. prevailed to a greater or less extent among the Jews. (1) Some maintained that only the just or righteous of their nation would be raised; (2) others maintained that the whole of their race (all Israelites) would be raised; (3) and some maintained that all Israelites and some Gentiles would be raised. It is evident from Acts 24:14, 15, that the Jews of Paul’s day did not adopt the first of these opinions, but they appear to have limited the res. to their nation. In Rom. 9:2–5, Paul teaches that the adoption, by which he meant the resurrection, Rom. 8:23, pertained to Israelites; and hence it would seem that the res., as a term of the original covenant, was limited to Israel. Rabbi Bechai says, God granted four special honors, to Israel, viz., (1) the land of Canaan; (2) the law; (3) prophecy; (4) the resurrection of the dead. Josephus, though obscure, evidently did not believe the res. would be universal.”*

PROPOSITION 130. This Kingdom is preceded by a translation of the living saints.

This is a prerequisite, in order that those accounted worthy to inherit the Kingdom, and rule the nations with Christ, may be gathered. In reference to the dead saints, a Pre-Mill. resurrection (Props. 125–129) is promised by which to attain this object; and with such a resurrection (i.e. at that time) a translation of the living saints is also connected in 1 Thess. 4:17, “the dead in Christ shall rise first (or away); then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds (or, in clouds) to meet the Lord in the air,” etc. The same is repeated in 1 Cor. 15:51, 52, in union only with the resurrection of believers: “Behold, I shew you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,” etc.

Obs. 1. While all writers on prophecy insist upon the translation of living saints at the Advent of Jesus, and the Millenarian authors direct especial attention to it; while it was a special object of hope and desire to the early believers and to succeeding ones, it is only more recently, since eschatology has received remarkable study and investigation, that important additions (resulting from comparing Scripture with Scripture) have been made to our knowledge respecting it. Our work would be incomplete without noticing this feature, and adding something to a subject imperfectly comprehended by many. A few preliminary remarks are necessary in order to appreciate some things pertaining to it. Thus e.g. the common view that the resurrection will be a public affair, to be witnessed by the world, is now discarded as untenable in the light of Christ's (also pertaining to "the first-fruits") resurrection, which was strictly private. It is now held, and properly, that the members will be raised like the Head was (for if a public resurrection, humanly speaking, is desirable, then surely it ought to have been that of Christ's), in order that the preparatory events for the coming judgment of the world may be introduced in such a manner (privately) as to establish "the snare" and "the net" intended for the unbelieving and wicked. Leading prophetic writers justly have no hesitancy in asserting that no mortal eye of unbelief shall behold the resurrection. This at once places the translation of the saints in a new aspect, and indicates, as it accompanies the resurrection, that it also is unseen (like Enoch's and Elijah's) by the world. Again, careful students of the Word felt satisfied that the resurrection of the saints in Rev. 20:4–6 was specifically that of those who passed through the great tribulation under the culminated Antichrist, and was preceded by that of others, as implied in Rev. 14:1–5, etc. This is corroborated by the fact already presented (Prop. 127), that the word "first" applied to the resurrection has reference not to its being first in time (which would be incorrect, seeing that Christ's res. and that of saints, Matt. 27:52, 53, preceded), but of its being a resurrection which also brings those who participated in it within the privileges of "the first-born," viz., a double portion, Deut. 21:17; priesthood, Num. 3:13; and government or dominion, Gen. 27:29. The subject of the resurrection, for a long time, was not clear to the writer until he observed the real scriptural application of the word "first," as just given. The first resurrection, viz., that resurrection pertaining to "the first-born," "the first-fruits," commenced with the resurrection of Jesus, and it receives its accessions as stated e.g. in 1 Thess. 4:16, 17, and in Rev. 20:4–6. This also serves to illustrate the translation, preparing us, in view of several resurrections (belonging to that of the just), to appreciate references, allusions, and implications which indicate more than one translation. Again, prophetic writers are also agreed that what is called the Sec. Advent (the Advent itself as distinguished from the reign and Kingdom that follows) is not to be regarded as simply one act, but embracing a series of acts connected with the one Coming (for when Jesus comes again He remains upon earth). That is, the Sec. Advent is to be considered more in the light of the First Advent (which latter embraced not less than thirty-three years, and numerous acts predicted as related to His Coming), as something which, owing to a variety of things prophesied concerning it, cannot possibly be limited to a few years. Comparing all the events that are included in the Sec. Advent, it is simply impossible, without great violation of order, etc., to crowd them all together as the instantaneous resultants of such a Coming. This, then, impresses caution in not compressing what is intimated concerning the translation or removal of saints necessarily to one transaction or day. Again, admitting the requirement of not confining the Advent to a single act, or day, or brief period, previous to the establishment of the Kingdom in all its glory, writers now generally attribute to this introductory manifestation a period of seven years, of forty years, and of (thirty and forty conjoined) seventy years. (Considering the events to follow the Advent before the overthrow of Antichrist, such as the development of the confederation, the return of a portion of the Jews to Palestine, the doom of the harlot, etc., the longer periods are preferable.) This at once enables us to see how such resurrections and translations harmonize with the specific introductory period, in which God's power and love is manifested at the time when the power of His enemies shall be also formidably exhibited and broken. Again, analogy favors the removal of the righteous in a time of severe and terrible judgment intended for the wicked, as in the case of Noah, Lot, the early believers at Jerusalem, etc., while previous translations are not lacking, as in the case of Enoch and Elijah. The Second Advent inaugurates a series of most tremendous judgments, both upon the Church and the world—so terrific that they are constantly pointed out as the culmination of God's wrath—and it is reasonable to suppose, judging from God's past dealings, that He again will grant special deliverance to those who are devoted to Him. At this time also, the removal being designed not only to save out of tribulation, but to prepare the saints, deemed worthy of it, for promised rulership then to be instituted, and for joint participation in the administration of judgments upon the nations, a translation accompanied by the same transforming change, glorification, which the resurrected saints experience, is precisely that which we ought to anticipate. Again, it is universally admitted by Millenarians that "the day of the Lord Jesus" is preceded not only by "a morning," but that it virtually begins in "the night;" Christ representing His Coming to be when it is yet "night," He being "the morning star," which ushers in "the morning" of the glorious day. This refers the resurrection and translation of a chosen body to "the night," i.e. to the close of this dispensation, as preparatory to the introduction of an incoming one. Or, in other words, it warns us that, as the past shows, dispensations may overlap each other to some extent, in that certain initiatory movements of the incoming one commence and are in progress before the other entirely closes. This prepares us then to accept of the wonderful things which are predicted to occur at the winding up of this dispensation, and to regard them in their relationship to the One to come. Again, critical writers in investigating 2 Thess. 2:2 have shown that the word translated "is at hand" (in the phrase "the day of Christ (or Lord) is at hand") means, correctly rendered, "is come," or "has come," i.e. is something already present, and not something still future. This correctly explains the trouble and alarm of the Thessalonian brethren, who were certainly not afraid of "the blessed hope," which Paul says they waited for (1 Thess. 1:10), and for which they were prepared (1 Thess. 2:19 and 3:13, and 5:4, 5), but apprehending that "the day of Christ" had already come, and they not having experienced the promised translation, and

their pious dead being still with them without an experienced resurrection, they were troubled and distressed at the thought. Those brethren with hearts full of love for the Saviour were not so fearful that they would desire and pray (as multitudes now) that the blessed Lord should delay His Coming, but, in some way misapprehending the real state of affairs, they believed that the initiatory proceedings belonging to the day of Christ had already commenced, and that they and their pious dead were left without realizing the exceeding precious promises given to them. This simple change in a single word, supported too by the strongest of evidence, explains not only the cause of the Thessalonians' trouble (which Paul proceeds to remove by showing that an apostasy must first come to develop into the predicted Antichrist, implying that such an apostasy with its result necessarily required time, still in the future, before "the day of Christ" came), but throws much light, corroborative, on the subject of the resurrection and the translation of the saints. For, to cause such trouble they must have believed that "the day of Christ" would be inaugurated by preliminaries unseen by the world, and that the resurrection and translation would both be invisible, and they, not participating were doomed to terrible tribulation, or that the predictions were false. We say nothing respecting the source from whence they derived such thoughts, but one thing is impressive, viz., that the Apostle does not correct such impressions, but rather by his silence confirms them in them. Yea, more, in beseeching them "by our gathering together unto Him," he virtually indorses the views entertained by them respecting this gathering.

Obs. 2. But some other things, also introductory to the subject, must be attentively considered before we come to a decisive conclusion. Thus, as has been pointed out by many writers, the Scriptures describe a Coming of Jesus for or in behalf of His saints (as e.g. 1 Thess. 3:13; 1 Cor. 15:51, 52), and then again another with all His saints (as e.g. Zech. 14:5; Rev. 19:14; 1 Thess. 3:13; Jude 14, 15), and these two, differing thus in an important particular, indicate separate stages or manifestations pertaining to the same Second Advent. Without allowing something of this kind, several acts pertaining to the one great Coming to this earth, it is impossible to reconcile such passages. For they are sustained in their difference not only by the simple act of coming for and with the saints, but in the design of such a Coming, viz., as to the former, for the purpose of salvation and glorification, and as to the latter, for the direct overthrow of the enemies of God, the restoration of the Jewish nation, and the glory (thereby promoted) of the saints. This is still more confirmed by the conclusive statements which the Spirit gives of this one Second Advent, when it is represented to us under two aspects, viz., one, a coming when men are at peace, buying, selling, marrying, etc., and anticipating no evil, but only "peace and safety," all things apparently promising continued prosperity and happiness (so e.g. Luke 17:26–30; Matt. 24:36–39; 1 Thess. 5:3, etc.); the other, a coming in a time of war, of great distress and suffering (as e.g. Zech. 14, Rev. 19, Joel 3, Luke 21:27, etc.); the one, a coming in a concealed, thief-like manner, i.e. unobserved, unnoticed, unheralded (1 Thess. 5:2; Matt. 24:43, 44; Luke 12:37–40; Rev. 3:3, etc.); the other, a coming so open, conspicuous, that all shall witness it (as e.g. Matt. 24:30; Rev. 19; Matt. 25:31, etc.). The more students come to weigh and compare Scripture referring to this period, the more are they convinced that it would be presumptuous for us to limit all these varied utterances to one single act, and that we must allow a series of events to be comprehended under this Coming; the Spirit directing us now to one and then to another of them; the order of which is only to be attained by a careful comparison. It also is a fact that these "first-born," to whom the honor of aiding in the execution of God's judgments (and the translated belong to them) are given (e.g. Ps. 149:9, comp. Prop. 154), must be both resurrected (and remember that the translation is connected with the resurrection) and translated before they can participate in inflicting "the judgment written" upon the nations (as Dan. 7:22; Rev. 2:26, 27, etc.). Besides this, the significance of "the first-fruits" (which embrace not merely resurrected saints, but, as we have seen, translated ones, as both are cojoined by the Spirit) would be entirely lost, i.e. as something preceding a general harvest which is to follow, if we did not allow that the one necessarily goes before the other, leaving an interval between them, although "the first-fruits" and "the harvest" are both included under the same general Advent, thus again showing that just as at the First Advent Jesus was only manifested to a few favored ones, and an interval of years elapsed before His final public manifestation, so at His Sec. Advent He will only be exhibited to those accounted worthy, and after a set interval ultimately to the world. It is by observing this characteristic of the Sec. Advent that the true force of the injunction to constantly look and watch for the Coming of Jesus can be appreciated. Not distinguishing that several aspects of this Coming, including separate acts, etc., are given, has led eminent writers to lay down certain things (such as a partial restoration of the Jews, a covenant with the Jews, etc.) as prerequisites to such an Advent, and they are correct, but only in reference to one aspect of it, viz., the visible Coming or manifestation of the Son of Man with His saints, as e.g. Zech. 14. On the other hand, we have assurances given to us not to interpose any event whatever between us and such an Advent, but to regard it as an event that may occur at any moment without any notification of its approach (excepting only such as are given by approximative signs), and these two representations of the same Advent are only reconcilable by noticing what a comparison of Scripture inculcates, that the first aspect of this Coming refers to a concealed, hidden Coming for specific purposes (viz., to raise, translate, and glorify His saints, to inaugurate the preliminaries of his Kingdom, etc.), which takes place before the events predicted as pertaining to His visible manifestation.

Obs. 3. We now come to a passage which directly teaches a translation, viz., Luke 17:34–37, "I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken and the other left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken and the other left. And they answered and said unto Him, Where, Lord? And He said unto them: Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together" (see Matt. 24:28). The context shows (1) that this relates to the personal Sec. Advent, and (2) occurs in a time of peace and apparent prosperity, precisely similar to that of the Antediluvian era just before the flood, and to that of

Sodom before Lot's removal. The passage itself teaches (1) that this translation is to be expected "in that night," as if purposely to conceal it from the eye of unbelief; (2) that this is no gathering of nations, but of individuals, one here and one there; (3) that it is a separation of parties, one being taken and another being left; (4) this taking of one party and leaving of another indicates a previous judgment (just as the sudden taking and changing "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," 1 Cor. 15:52, also evidences), and not such an one as is recorded e.g. in Matt. 25:31–46; (5) that the removal of the one party is designed as a particular blessing in averting incoming evil, and the leaving of the other must be in order that they may experience it. Next follows the much disputed verse respecting the eagles, and before discussing its meaning it is necessary to decide its location in point of time. It is very easy, as some do, to refer it to the Romans in Matt. 24, but it is rather difficult to apply this verse in Luke the same way, because in the context there is no allusion, even the most distant, to the Romans. On the other hand, Jesus pointedly links it with His own personal Advent (comp. Prop. 114), as the context plainly (vs. 22–30) proclaims. This effectually disposes of the Roman theory, but still leaves the verse subject to a variety of conflicting opinions. Without assuming that the explanation following is infallibly the correct one; yet we give it as commending itself as reasonably the one containing the sense intended. And first: "the eagles" mentioned we must make, with numerous writers, to denote the saints. Saints are represented by "eagles" in Isa. 40:31; Deut. 32:11, 12; Ps. 103:5, even as God Himself is likened to an eagle (Ex. 19:4; Deut. 32:11) and Christ to a hen (Matt. 23:37). Such comparisons are not to be rejected because of any supposed incongruity (as e.g. being birds of prey), seeing that it is applied to messengers of the Divine procedure in Rev. 4:7; in Rev. 8:13 (the leading MSS. and critics reading "eagle" instead of "angel"), and that similar comparisons are applied to Christ, as Rev. 5:5. Scripture usage sustains such an interpretation, and even if the idea is made prominent that eagles prey, this itself would only confirm the application, because the saints accounted worthy of resurrection and glorification are to assist Christ in His judgments upon the nations (when Zeph. 3:8, the Lord "riseth up to the prey"). It may be that Jesus had in mind Isa. 40:31 (Delitzsch's transl.), "They who wait for Jehovah gain fresh strength, lift up their wings as eagles, run and are not weary, go forward and do not faint," as applicable to the saints at this period. In the next place, what are we to understand by "the carcass" of Matthew and "the body" of Luke? One thing is self-evident, that they refer to the same thing—the passages being parallel—and hence all interpretations, no matter how plausibly presented, which makes "the carcass" one thing and "the body" quite another, must be avoided. The passage in Matthew is related to the Coming of the Son of Man; that in Luke to the Coming and a predicted translation or removal, and both make out a gathering of the saints to a certain place. Now, if we leave Scripture describe this gathering at the time of the end, we find that the saints or eagles are gathered (Zech. 14, Rev. 19, Joel 3, etc.) to execute vengeance upon the confederation of wickedness. That this great confederation of the mighty of the earth is intended by "the carcass" and "the body" is apparent from two things: (1) such a manifestation of the saints really answers the question in Luke, for after the announcement of the removal of some the question was asked, "Where, Lord?" (i.e. when shall this be witnessed or be made known?) and the answer comes that as this is done "in the night," not visible, the evidence of such a removal will be openly shown when these very ones shall be gathered together at the overthrow of Antichrist. (2) This is confirmed by the meaning of the word rendered "carcass" (although even the word "carcass" might be retained as indicative of both contempt and doom); the primary significations denoting "a fall, or fallen thing, or failure," and thus directly referring to the fearful fall and overthrow of Antichrist which the saints are not only gathered to witness, but exultantly to participate in. The "body" of Luke refers to the same confederation, because, as Scripture informs us, "the body" of it, its congregated armies under the leadership of Antichrist, the vast bulk of it will be assembled together in Palestine or the East, where the Word assures us Christ and these eagles will come, Zech. 14:5. It only remains to say that, considering the promise to these translated or removed ones to participate in the gathering of the saints at the overthrow or fall of Antichrist (and his "body," Dan. 7:11, is "destroyed"), it follows that such a removal must necessarily precede, by some interval of time, the formation of this confederacy, viz., in a time of peace, etc. The reader may, for himself, consider what power and ministrations may be included under this comparison of "eagles," and whether, during the interval, it may not become an exceeding precious promise to suffering believers.

Obs. 4. Other passages either directly teach such a translation or removal, or else strongly imply it as a resultant or prerequisite. Take Rev. 14, and the order of events is in the highest degree corroborative of our position. Without discussing the relation that this chapter sustains to previous predictions, it is sufficient for our present purpose to notice that a time arrives before the final end when a certain specified number of saints, viz., the 144,000 (a symbolic number?) mentioned, are separated from among men, forming a chosen body called "the first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb." These "first-fruits" go before the incoming harvest, an interval of time (which includes (1) the proclamation of the particular message that God's judgments are to be poured out, and insisting upon the worship of God in view of the Antichristian worship that will be required; (2) the downfall of Babylon, and (3) the fearful persecution and martyrdom of believers) being placed between the two, at the close of which the harvest comes, and the dreadful vintage follows. This teaches us then to expect that a gathering of saints before the harvest is indeed one of the Divine procedures pertaining to the last things of this dispensation. The Parable of the Ten Virgins (Prop. 181) confirms this, for it instructs (aside from other particulars) us to anticipate at the Coming of Jesus that a certain class of persons (called the Wise Virgins in contradistinction to another class pronounced the Foolish), living at the time of the Sec. Advent, shall be so fortunate, owing to preparedness, as to be received by Jesus Christ at His Coming, while others shall be left. The adverb of time, "then," binds this parable to the preceding context, and forces us to interpret it as a representation of the condition of the Church at some distinctive point of the Sec. Advent. Without insisting upon the explanation given by Olshausen, Alford, Stier, Seiss, etc., that the foolish virgins are even persons of

some piety, who, neglecting to look for the Bridegroom, are left to endure the incoming tribulation, it is amply sufficient to say that the persons left are, at least, professing members of the Church, and that, as the announcement of the marriage (Rev. 19) precedes the overthrow of the Antichristian powers, those left behind must necessarily endure the trials incident to the arrogance, etc., of those powers. Those going in to the marriage—living saints taken away, translated, for this purpose—precede the time of sore tribulation. Passages which imply it relate to the promised participation of the saints in acts of judgment upon the living nations, to the married wife as distinguished from the barren woman, to the coming with the saints for purposes of salvation, etc. But others of a still stronger tenor are embraced in the promises that when the last great tribulation is to burst upon the Gentile nations, then certain believing ones shall escape. Thus e.g. Luke 21:36, "Watch ye therefore and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass and to stand before the Son of Man;" the escaping and being favored with nearness to Christ are united. In Rev. 3:10, of a class it is said: "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation (or trial) which shall come upon the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." The 144,000 described above are taken from this "the hour of trial," comp. Rev. 14:7. It is a joyful fact that when the most fearful time of trial, the flood of great waters, comes, then God interposes in behalf of His own people and saves them out of it (to which even such passages as Ps. 32:6, 7; Prov. 3:25, 26; Ps. 37:38–40, etc., may refer), while another class are left to endure its terrific force and come up out of it as blood-stained martyrs, Rev. 14:9–13; Rev. 20:4, 5, etc. It is significant also that in Rev. 7 we have first a distinct, separate number of chosen ones forming the same number, 144,000 (called Jews, because engrafted by faith and thus incorporated with the commonwealth), and then afterward a great multitude who come "out of the great tribulation," thus again pointing out a distinction existing between certain of God's people. Such are not given without adequate causes, and it is well to heed them.

Obs. 5. This distinction in point of favor is marked by still another set of passages which describe the hiding of the saints when this time of trouble, this storm of persecution and fury bursts upon the Church and world. Keeping in view that these outpourings of judgments at the time of the end are always represented as special manifestations of God's wrath, we can appreciate the principle given in the language of Zeph. 2:2, 3, in which it is promised to the meek that when "the day of the Lord's anger" comes, by the seeking of righteousness and meekness, "it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger. That this will be realized is apparent from various predictions, such as Ps. 31:19, 20, "Thou shalt hide them in the secret of Thy presence from the pride of man; Thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues" (or, Sep., "Thou wilt screen them in a tabernacle from the contradiction of tongues" (comp. also Ps. 27:5; Mal. 3:16–18). How this removal and hiding, which the Spirit states as a mark of "great goodness," is to be accomplished may be seen under the Props. following; for at this period it will be especially true (2 Pet. 2:9) that "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation." Isaiah (ch. 26:20, 21) prophesies that at the very time of a resurrection of saints, and when "the Lord cometh" to "punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity," and to cause the earth to uncover her "slain," then God's people are to be protected "until the indignation be overpast." David (Ps. 45) portrays the exultant language that such translated or removed saints can well employ in view of their entire safety when the vast flood of evil shall shake the kingdoms of the earth. Indeed, there are peculiar predictions which alone stand out with clearness in the light of such a translation of the saints, as e.g. in Ps. 111:1, where it is said (so Clarke, Com. loci) that God shall be praised both "in the secret assembly of the upright" (or, as others, Lange, etc., "select assembly," i.e. special), and also in the congregation, i.e. the general or public, which is thus verified. In Ps. 94, at the time when God shall show Himself for "vengeance" against the wicked, of some it is said, vs. 12, 13, that they are so guided and instructed "that Thou mayest give him rest from the days of adversity, until the pit he digged for the wicked"—i.e. they shall not experience the days of adversity which the same Ps. informs us culminates into a "gathering themselves together against the soul of the righteous and to condemn the innocent blood" (comp. Rev. 14, 16, and 19, etc.). From the removal of these righteous to the final overthrow of the wicked, the interval with the efforts of unbelief is expressively called the digging of a pit for the wicked, i.e. preparing the way for the fearful manifestation of vengeance upon them. All such predictions, supported by the analogy taken from Enoch, Noah, Lot, etc., however inconclusive they might be when taken isolated, obtain significance as they stand related to other Scripture.*

Obs. 6. Intimations also are given that such a translation or removal of the class of righteous, while unwitnessed, will be known to the nations. This can well be imagined, for the sudden disappearance of men and women, one here and another there, will excite general inquiry and be the subject of varied comment. It will inevitably lead to what the Spirit describes in Ps. 83:3, for let these resurrected and translated ones be taken by the Lord and conveyed to a place of safety (comp. Prop. 166); let it be partially comprehended for what purpose even this removal is effected, then will be fulfilled what is written, that the enemies of God not only confederate together, but that "they take crafty counsel against Thy people, and consult against Thy hidden ones," and this consultation is "with one consent or heart." The same "hidden ones" are, probably, presented to us in Isa. 16:3, 4, 5 (comp. Prop. 166), In view of its connection with the establishment of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, unless it be applied to a portion of the Church during the tribulation who shall fly or be brought to the wilderness for safety (and if the latter, may not this be a hint to the Church when under the last extended persecution, where safety only will be found, viz., in the wilderness near Mt. Sinai, where, as Prop. 166, the Lord Christ and His saints will be assembled? We cannot, as yet, fully determine; time must show its meaning).* The fact that the wicked shall know something concerning those hid ones, and shall take what they deem prudent measures (viz., to form a general confederation. etc.), is hinted at in passages like Ps. 17:7–9; Ps. 64:2, etc., and still more plainly revealed in Ps. 143:7–9.

The saints are “hid in the time of trouble,” and “in the secret (place) of Thy Presence” (verifying the Spirit of Ps. 91), until the period arrives for their open manifestation in supernatural power. It is likely, however, from the consultation of the wicked against them, that while the removal is allowed it will be attributed to natural causes, or to a concerted movement, and that all reference to its supernatural occurrence will be stoutly denied. In all probability, “the sign of the Son of Man” (Matt. 24:30) will be something connected with this translation (for events belonging to one period of time are grouped together without giving in every particular the exact order, as e.g. Isa. 25:6–9, etc.). The sign is one thing and the open visible Coming is another, and yet being a sign directly pertaining to the Son of Man, it relates to Him as in something connected with the Theocratic (see Prop. 81) ordering. Now, let this removal of the saints take place as described by Paul, John, etc., in the night, accompanied by a shout and trump (i.e. events may be denoted—see Obs. below); let the Son of Man be “in the air” to receive His risen and translated ones, and as the night advances around the earth, so let Him proceed around this globe in the process of gathering—such will be the accompaniments and the appearance in the sky, that, however explained by the world as electrical, meteorical, etc., it will constitute a sign, and a most impressive one, of the Son of Man. Invisible Himself, sheltered behind the curtains of the bright enveloping clouds, yet His Presence in the air may be exhibited by tokens never before witnessed.*

Obs. 7. The effect that this translation will have upon the Church is remarkably corroborative of our position. If we turn to Rev. 14 it is stated that immediately after the removal of “the first-fruits” there will be a most powerful renewed preaching of the Word of God, deriving its force from a proclamation of the now certain coming judgments of God and tribulation under the Antichrist. What causes such a change in the style of the preaching, which will result in the conversion, as parallel passages show, of very many, preparing them to pass through the great tribulation, and to suffer death rather than to worship the Beast and his image? Nothing less than this astonishing removal of certain chosen ones, accounted worthy, owing to their distinctive faith in God’s promises, to escape. Let this event occur just as it is described; let here one and there one of the believing and watching be taken, and surely those who believe in God’s Word and are left behind will be most wonderfully affected by the event. By one sudden and startling event, coming home to the heart and directly appealing to the warmest affections, the prevailing spiritualizing systems and theories of progressive advancement and perfection will be overthrown, and the Millenarian doctrine, once derided and sneered at as “carnal,” etc., will be most eagerly embraced and proclaimed. (The writer has often, often felt that it is specially for this period that he is laboring, when his work will be appreciated, etc.) The Church, then starting up with Abrahamic faith will recognize its chronological position, will see what is before it, and, energetically infused by fear and hope, prepare itself for the fearful ordeal through which it must pass. And we are assured that the Church in this contest, overpowered as she will be, will sustain the persecution with triumphant faith, feeling convinced from the events occurring and the time elapsed, that the Son of Man is even already present, waiting for the moment of direct interference.*

Obs. 8. It has been aptly remarked that the removal of righteous persons has been followed (as e.g. Enoch, Noah, Lot, at Jerusalem, etc.) by the outpourings of God’s judgments, and the principle is taught e.g. in the sealing of the 144,000 (Rev. 7). A comparison of Scripture teaches that when this translation is experienced, then will rapidly arise that culminated head of Antichrist which will overwhelm the Church with terrific persecution. Before this event some restraining power prevents such a dreadful confederation. Attention is called to this in order to correct two prevailing mistakes in the interpretation of 2 Thess. 2:7. One theory makes that which hinders the revelation of the Wicked One, the Man of Sin, to denote the Roman power (Pagan), i.e. the civil power; but this is erroneous, because this Antichrist will arise out of and really be the last head of this same Roman power (Prop. 160), fallen back to its former unchristian (e.g. given to idol worship), paganized condition. Another theory is, that the Hinderer mentioned is the Holy Spirit, and that this Spirit will be withdrawn, resulting in widespread wickedness, etc.; but this again is opposed to fact, viz., that after “the first-fruits” are taken away the Spirit remains, as is evidenced by the proclamation of the message, by the sustaining of the martyrs, and the multitude coming through the tribulation. The obscurity of the prediction and its conciseness is based upon something that was at the time well known, for in the preceding verse the Apostle says positively, “And now ye know what withholdeth” (same word precisely, excepting being in the neuter form, and thus referring to something) “that he might be revealed in his time.” That is, the Thessalonian brethren knew what this restraining influence was which then existed and would continue to exist down to a certain time, when this Antichrist, the fruit of long-continued defection, would arise during the period allotted to him. Rather than accept the modern views given by prophetic writers on this point, we would fall back to Theodoret’s opinion (Bloomfield, G. Test, loci), that that which hindered, restrained, prevented the culmination of this Antichrist is “the decree of God’s Providence,” and this would, at least, be consistent with the grammatical construction, which, as critics inform us, may refer either to a thing or person in verse 7, but only to a thing in verse 6. The solution probably has not yet been found, and in place of a better (which close study and comparison may yet present) we suggest the following: Regarding the fact that the Thessalonians knew what hindered, we turn to the First Epistle, and we find in the first chapter (v. 4) a declaration which covers the ground, viz., in the doctrine of election, that too of which they had knowledge, “Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God.” Let the reader consider our Props. concerning the election, that God in this dispensation is calling out a definite number (incorporated as the seed of Abraham), who are to be associated in the Kingdom as rulers, etc., and then he will see that until this gathering out process has progressed up to a certain point (embracing these “first-fruits”) this Divine purpose of obtaining these chosen ones allows “the times of the Gentiles,” but restrains that fearful predicted outbreak until a determined number of God’s people are secured. When this is

done, however, then, even while God's Spirit is still willing to strive with and aid the faith of men (as seen in the martyrs), human nature will be allowed to riot in its unbelief, and to work out its vain theory of the destiny of the race. Then, during a brief period, human nature will be permitted to exhibit its highest departure from the truth, its most bitter scorn and detestation of believers, its most unrelenting hostility and cruelty to the followers of Christ (comp. Props. 160, 161, 162, 163, 164).*

Obs. 9. While embracing the doctrine of a Pre-Mill. translation, and of more than one translation, even (as e.g. in that pertaining to "the first-fruits," and that relating to the harvest), yet, with our present light and understanding of the Scriptures, we cannot accept of so many as given e.g. by Baxter (Louis Napoleon III., ch. 4) and others, simply on the ground that a more careful comparison will synchronize and thus identify the sameness of some of them. Whatever may be the truth in this matter, it can only be presented in a discussion of the order of events as embraced in the entire Apocalypse (a labor which is foreign to our present work, and performed by other writers), and therefore we have only availed ourselves of the references to such a translation, without in every instance determining the relative order, confining ourselves, as sufficient for our purpose, to a twofold translation, one to precede and the other to follow (as the resurrections) the great tribulation—one pertaining to "the first-fruits" and the other to "the harvest."

Obs. 10. Let us briefly consider the objections that can be alleged, not against a translation itself (for that is too plainly taught), but a Pre-Mill. one as presented. Some writers have incautiously made out that these "first-fruits," by being thus favored, etc., are not only a chosen body (which is true, and within another), but infer from it that it only composes "the married wife," i.e. only embraces the rulers with Christ, etc., thus excluding the harvest or those coming out of the tribulation. This has caused serious objections, and justly too, to be urged against the view as thus presented, for it is a fact, whatever distinctions may exist within the orderings and stations of the Kingship and priesthood, that the very last saints of this dispensation, even those who pass through the tribulation and fall under Antichrist's power, are distinctively promised (Rev. 20:4, 6) to also reign with Jesus Christ; so that the "first-fruits and the "harvest" combined form that triumphant body of rulers who reign. Any interpretation, however plausible, which would debar the martyred saints, etc., under the last persecution from a direct co-heirship with the other saints in the Kingdom, is most certainly defective. The Scripture too usually presented as favoring it, viz., Ps. 45, does not apply to such a distinction between saints gathered during this and former dispensations (i.e. in the various women mentioned as related to the King), but rather between such saints thus gathered and the Jewish and Gentile nations, etc., as they shall exist (as e.g. the Jewish nation being likened to "a barren woman," also again united to God, and other nations may well be thus represented as virgins, etc., acknowledging His reign, etc.) in the Millennial age. While distinctions are to be found in the body of saints, and while it is true that the first saints gathered down to the re-establishment of the Kingdom in its glory enjoy a distinction beyond all others that follow, it seems unscriptural to discriminate so far as to debar those to whom is specially promised a participation in reigning gloriously with Christ. A degree of caution is here required in order to avoid prejudice. Some good thing, that we may well leave undefined, will be given to these "first-fruits," but the unbelieving, unguarded Church will so atone by its faithful witnessing, even unto death, for its past delinquency and unwatchfulness that it too "inherits the Kingdom" with the others. Another objection is brought from 2 Thess. 2, viz., that the coming of Jesus and the destruction of Antichrist are united together, and hence forbids any such a previous translation. The objector, however, forgets two things: (1) that the Apostle only argues logically that "the day of Christ" cannot come without the visible appearing and destruction of Antichrist (just as our argument demands), without specifying all the particulars antecedent, either to this visible Advent of Christ, or this Antichrist, and (2) that the saints participate both in the Coming of Jesus and destruction of the Wicked One, neither of which are mentioned. The Apostle does not contradict himself, as is apparent, if due notice is taken that the Thessalonians believed "the day of Christ" to be already present, and his reasoning proceeds to show, not that saints are not to be raised and translated before that day (which is implied), but that before the day itself is ushered in as predicted, a visible Coming and the destruction of Antichrist must precede. Again, it is objected that the gathering of the elect by the messengers described Matt. 24:31, is a gathering of all saints after the tribulation. But this, while after the tribulation, does not affirm that all the saints that ever lived are thus included, but simply refers to the elect then living at the period designated, and may denote, as some believe, believers in general scattered over the earth; or rather, as others hold, the members of the still elect Jewish nation, which, as many prophecies predict, shall at this very time be again gathered to Palestine. Besides this, all the passages relating to the gatherings of this intently interesting period must be collated and compared, when several, without contradicting each other, will appear pertaining to "the first-fruits" and to "the harvest," to the Church and to the Jewish nation. Again, it is alleged that the multitude of Rev. 7 all came out of the great tribulation, and that this evidences that the entire Church of this dispensation living at the time must enter and pass through it. Aside from other reasons in reply, it is sufficient to direct attention to the 144,000 mentioned in the same chapter, a body separate from all others, who were sealed in order to their complete safety before the incoming storm. Some object on the ground that "the shout and trump" accompanying the resurrection and translation show it to be a visible occurrence, seen by the world. But such forget that while there will be a sufficiency of manifestation to excite attention and startle the world, yet the shout, etc., may be like Daniel's "man clothed in linen" (10:5-7), whose voice was "like the voice of a multitude," and yet the men with him, strangely affected even to quaking, "saw not the vision;" or like the voice from heaven (John 12:28-29), which distinctly spoke, but the people that "stood by and heard it, said, that it thundered;" or like the voice speaking to Saul, which his fearful companions heard not. The voice, the shout, the trump (indicative of events ushering in) is for a chosen class of persons, and if it is God's good pleasure, the same may only be heard by them, even if others stood by, just as Stephen in the crowd only saw the glorious vision,

or Elisha's eyes were only opened to behold the horses and chariots of fire. Other objections have been so fully met in previous remarks, that it is unnecessary to reproduce them, unless we except one, owing to its practical importance. It is said that such an order of events, privately accomplished, is opposed to the publicity, not only of the Sec. Advent, but of intervening events, viz., that before such a Coming, resurrection, and translation transpires the partial restoration of the Jews, the culminated Antichrist, the gathering of the nations, etc., must be first witnessed. But as Cunninghame, Cox, and many others have shown, this is not to distinguish His visible Coming with the saints, at which time all these things are manifested, from that of His Coming for them, preparatory to the former. Several stages of the same Advent, leaving a sufficient interval for the development of those things between them, is, as the ablest prophetic writers have asserted and proven, the only possible way in which to reconcile the condition attached to the Sec. Advent (as e.g. coming in a time of peace and coming in a time of war, etc.), and places it at the same time in the position given to it by the Spirit, viz., as something that may occur at any moment, and for which we are constantly to watch without looking first for the fulfilment of intervening things.*

Obs. 11. The question may be asked, Why such a distinction? The reply is, because such is God's pleasure in the matter. It is not for us to assert with any degree of positiveness who shall thus be favored with a translation, and escape the great tribulation. We can only point out the general affirmation (as e.g. "them that honor me, I will honor," etc.) upon the subject, and leave each one draw his own conclusions. There is a difference between mere salvation and the special honor, station, dignity, etc., that God in addition may be pleased to bestow upon certain ones. There were other pious ones when Enoch and Elijah were translated, and yet they only were favored; and we doubt not that many who ultimately will be saved with great glory (because of their faithful witnessing during the last severe trial) will be left at this translation. While we cannot confine, as some do, this preference to mere belief in and watching for the Advent (for in connection with this stands the purity and proper development of Christian character, which, alas, some who thus believe and watch do not manifest to the extent required, or even to the degree that some honest and sincere disbelievers in our doctrine exhibit), yet such faith and watching is eminently set forth as a characteristic of those translated ones. Because they thus believe, showing due respect unto God's Word, and permit such faith to have its practical effect in heart and life, we are assured that they shall thus be favored, as e.g. the general announcement in Mal. 2:17, which the New Test. more fully explains in some of its particular aspects, as in Luke 21:36; Matt. 24:36-51, etc. At the same time we deeply feel that without a special preparedness, devoted piety (as exemplified in the translated Enoch and Elijah), which evinces itself in opposing the torrent of worldliness and wickedness encroaching upon the Church, Millenarianism, however upheld and ably defended, is unable of itself to secure such a distinguishing benefit and honor. A personal, individual acceptance of the truth combined with a happy experience of its sanctifying influence, together with testifying in its behalf before others, is imperatively needed. It is not simply those who "watch" that shall "escape," but those, Luke 21:36, who "watch and pray always," avoiding the corrupting influences around them. The number of translated ones may not be very large (for the number of translated ones given as (so Baumgarten, etc.) types in comparison with the number of those not translated, and with that of the resurrected saints is small), so that Dr. Seiss, with whom many concur, is undoubtedly correct in saying: "I have no idea that a very large portion of mankind, or even of the professing Church, will be thus taken. The first translation, if I may so speak, will embrace only the select few who watch and pray always," etc. The fact that Enoch was the seventh from Adam may, for aught we know, be suggestive (as Bengel, owing to seven being a sacred number, also comp. Prop. 143) of the occurrence of this translation when the seventh milliad arrives, and Enoch's specific prediction (Jude) of the Lord's Coming by those accounted worthy of translation; while Elijah's pertains simply to exalted, eminent piety, without any special reference to such testimony. Yet, let it be said, whatever the doctrinal position of the persons translated, and whatever may be the personal attitude respecting the nearness of the Advent, etc., that one distinguishing characteristic will be exhibited by all, viz., that they "love the appearing" of Christ (2 Tim. 4:8), that they earnestly desire it, and regard it as the highest possible blessing, "the blessed hope" (Tit. 2:13). There may be also a deeper meaning than is generally assigned to the phrase "them that look for Him" in Heb. 9:28—a meaning derived from an existing fact at the time of the Advent. Still another reason applies why this resurrection and translation of saints should take place at this particular crisis; this will be noticed in the following Props., viz., that as Christ comes to make the preliminary arrangements for the setting up of the Theocratic Davidic Kingdom, it is eminently suitable, that all the saints down to that period should be gathered in order to receive their instructions, to have their positions, etc., assigned, so that they can act with Him as executors in the Divine administrations that follow. This (Prop. 166) measured by the creatures capacity requires time, and such time will be given to this particular purpose in the place predicted. Hence this distinction grows out of the Divine purpose; which such saints are designed to aid in executing and establishing.*

Obs. 12. The reader may, for himself, estimate the greatness and value of such a translation, embracing (1) exemption from death, (2) deliverance from a terrible incoming tribulation, (3) a special exaltation to the Presence of Christ, (4) the bestowal of glorification, joint rulership with the mighty King, etc. Richard Baxter (Works, vol. 16, p. 555) may express these blessings in his ardent prayer and longings that Christ may speedily come in order that death might not be experienced, etc., saying: "The thoughts of the Coming of the Lord are most sweet and joyful to me, so that if I were but sure I should live to see it, and that the trumpet should sound and the dead should rise, and the Lord appear, before the period of my age, it would be the joyfulest tidings to me in the world," etc. A multitude of writers, italicizing the promises of God in Christ Jesus, delineate these blessings, and hold them up as worthy of consideration and contemplation. Happy, blessed beyond description, the man or the woman thus honored!*

Obs. 13. The reader, too, will for himself imagine the influence that such a translation must have, whenever it occurs, upon families, communities, churches, etc. The sudden disappearance of husband or wife, parent or child, sister or brother, pastor or member, etc., will be startling in the extreme. Such a separation "in that night," when in the bed, or the social gathering, or on the journey, will result in an outburst of grief, in a wonderful heart searching, and in a renewed, most diligent study of God's Word. But only (excepting the first, e.g. grief) in those who fear God and desire to be obedient unto Him. We thus return to this thought, only to direct attention to the fact that for a number of years various prophetic writers, and quite a number of periodicals, have warned the Church and the world that such was the Divine procedure, and have given proper prominence to this order of events. This answers a twofold purpose, viz., it vindicates God's mode of working, which is (in case of great events involving tremendous issues) to make His procedure previously known (Amos 3:7, etc.), and when it thus comes to pass it not only establishes His truth, but serves to guide those who are willing to receive His Word into a proper apprehension of the same. If such an event is to occur it is most reasonable to anticipate that believers in the Word, Just previous to its occurrence, will proclaim it, so that when it has taken place others may recognize it at once as a part of God's own divine and gracious ordering. This, then, will alleviate the grief of believers when a beloved one is thus suddenly taken away, because they will rejoice in their having been thus favored, and will strive to prepare themselves and others for the coming struggle, that they too may be accounted worthy of a glorious reunion with resurrected and translated ones.*

Obs. 14. It is reasonable to expect that this doctrine of a translation will be ridiculed both before and after the occurrence of it. Indeed, the parallel existing in the days of Noah, just before the deluge, and that just before the Advent would fail in an important particular if ridicule and scorn were not added to the objections urged against belief in a speedy Advent and its inevitable results. Among these results that of the special honoring of some living saints by a translation without seeing death is already made the subject of derision and sport. The abuse of the doctrine by some evidently sincere but misguided persons (who confidently, against most express Scripture, fix the day and hour of its occurrence, and who, against the testimony of the Spirit, that it is not to be anticipated by a gathering of saints and most foolish provision of ascension robes, meet at the designated time to experience it) greatly tends to such levity; just as if the vagaries and foolishness of men in perverting a doctrine necessarily led to its entire rejection—a principle so palpably erroneous that if applied to truth in general would leave but little for us to accept. Scoffers are to arise in the last days, who will express their contempt of God's promises, and pronounce those, who Noah-like trust in them, to be, if not "mad" or possessed of a "devil," at least "exceedingly soft and foolish." This naturally is to be expected of the world, but unfortunately some of the scoffers are professed believers in that Word of God, which expressly teaches a still future translation to come suddenly, as a snare, upon the Church and the world, which gives us typical, real illustrations of such translations in two noted cases, and which urges us constantly to look and watch for that which is to effect it. It is saddening that men cannot at least treat such subjects with soberness, and discuss them without sneers. This is before the translation; the same will be true of multitudes immediately after it. Acts 13:41 will be repeated; and those who are arrested by its occurrence and take it to heart will be unsparingly ridiculed. Human nature will be true to itself, and the doctrine will be particularly detestable to it, since it evinces a species of favoritism—a contrast—condemnatory to its own Naturalistic and Humanitarian position. The Spirit predicts—and His Word is truth—that ridicule, sneers, etc., shall give finally place to so positive a dislike and hatred to all pertaining to it that those who are left and are believing shall experience, not merely a wordy reviling persecution, but the stroke of the descending, beheading sword and axe.

Obs. 15. To the critical student it is proper in this place to make some remarks on the phrase "Time of the End" and "Last Days." These terms have been in the past sadly appropriated, and conveniently dated from some period antecedent to the writer and thus represented as present; under its shelter (Dan. 12:8–10), with the plea that "the wise shall understand," men have confidently given us predictions relating to the future, which, to say the least, are simply conjectures and inferences suggested by minds strongly impressed by the alleged fact that they were already in "the time of the end." Many writers could be quoted illustrative of this, and several bodies of believers seem, if we are to judge by the usage of this phrase, to make it essential to their system. Books, tracts, sermons, essays are written to show, without proof excepting an array of signs and the declarations of others, that we are now, and have been for some years, in "the Time of the End." Over against all such deductions, the simple fact, as a more careful examination of the Scriptures indicate, is, that "the Time of the End" is still future. It is to be applied to this interval between the two stages of the Advent, a period which may embrace, for aught we know (considering the events that are to take place in it, and that the last week of Daniel does not include the whole time of interval, but only the time when the Covenant is made with the restored Jewish nation, the breaking of the same, and Antichrist's persecution of the Jews), from 35 to 75 years, more or less.

Let the reasons for such a reference be briefly assigned. This interval forms "the end" spoken of by Daniel, i.e. the time when the series of events predicted by himself should terminate; it is the culmination of prophecy, relating to Antichristian powers, the Jewish nation, and the Messianic triumph; it is the time when the end has come and God's judgments are to be poured out upon the nations, resulting in a great deliverance, and thus vindicating the Divine Purpose. When the first stage of the Advent occurs it is evidence that the end of the dispensation has arrived, and from the res. and translation of the believers down to the open Advent, we have literally "the time of the end." The overlapping of the two dispensations by this secret Parousia, instead of proving adverse to our view is corroborative of it, since such in the case of the Jewish and Christian is called "the ends of the world" (1 Cor. 10:11) by

Paul. The end itself is not an abrupt, sudden end, but embraces time or years in its termination. A series of gigantic events are included in the winding up of this dispensation of so remarkable a nature that no one with the least faith in the Scriptures can doubt respecting the closing period of the age. But to particularize still more, every one can see for himself that this “time of the end (Dan. 11:35) follows (comp. Prop. 160) a long continued and indefinite period of trial to the Church, such as the Church has experienced in the past. Then (Dan. 12:6–10) the end is associated with the restoration of the Jews to their own land, which is still future; with (Dan. 12:13, comp. Prop. 126) the resurrection of Daniel at the first stage of the Advent; with “the end of these wonders” (v. 6), i.e. with their termination, when they are about to be completed; with (v. 7) the time when “these things (the wonders predicted) shall be finished,” i.e. shall approach their termination. Thus a comparison shows that the end commences with the resurrection of the saints, and the time of this end embraces within it God’s controversy with the nations and the deliverance of the Jewish nation. For it seems that for purposes of salvation and vengeance, to manifest in an extraordinary degree the supernatural power of God in behalf of His people and in crushing His enemies, this interval between the two stages is (Dan. 8:19) not merely “the latter end of the indignation,” but “the appointed time of the end”—a time specifically measured off by these stages, and the events connected therewith, composing the end or completion of the combined series of predictions—the culmination. This “time of the end” includes “the times” or “days” of Dan. 12, which, as a dispassionate examination proves (comp. Prop. 173), are contained in this interval, and have special reference to the climax of Jewish tribulation and Antichristian opposition. The “end” itself, or “the end of the days,” is the full completion, witnessed in the overthrow of Antichrist and the establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom at the open Parousia. In addition, at “the time of the end” these prophecies will be “unsealed” (Dan. 12:9), i.e. they will be completely opened or understood in their unity and culmination. This unsealing is still future, for the simple reason that whatever advancement and knowledge may have been obtained by study, and whatever unity of view may have been secured in grand outlines, no two interpreters of Daniel can be found who perfectly agree with each other, in details at least. But we do know that between these two stages there is a complete unsealing, because the secret Advent with the resurrection and translation stamps at once the chronological status, the method and application of interpretation, the proper reception and place for the Apocalyptic visions, etc. The messages (Rev. 14) following the withdrawal of “the first-fruits” is sufficiently indicative that no lack of knowledge respecting the present and future is then prevailing, but that a correct apprehension of the predicted things is universal among believers.

St. John (1 John 2:18) uses the phrase “the last time” declaratively respecting this entire Christian dispensation, because Antichristian spirit and principles characterize it during the whole period, while Jude (v. 18), connecting it with the Advent, seems to limit (comp. 2 Pet. 3:3) it more to the concluding period of the same. It has been observed (e.g. Faber, Diss. on Proph., p. 87) that the expressions “latter days” or “times,” and “last days,” do not precisely denote the same period of time. While the former may include the latter to some extent, yet the one is significant of an indefinite termination of this dispensation, i.e. in contrast with the past history of the world or past duration; the other is expressive of “the last days” or “the end,” or “time of the end.” The chief characteristic of “the latter days” is that of superstition and apostatizing, and the main feature of “the last days” is that of blasphemous infidelity and direct opposition to God. The one is the forerunner of the other; the one culminates in the other; the one, Antichristian, paves the way for the other, the fully developed Antichrist, who denies both Father and Son.

“The latter days” usher in “the last days.” But this view can only be sustained by noticing that this distinction only holds good where they are used in prophetic sense, i.e. in a prediction relating to the future. The student will observe that the phrases “latter days” and “last days” in the Old Test. are the comparative and superlative of the one expression in the original, “the end of days” (comp. Faber’s Diss. on Proph., ch. 3). This refers to this very time of the end and its grand resultant, as seen e.g. in Isa. 2:2; Mic. 4:1 (with which comp. Acts 2:16, 17), seeing that the Millennial Kingdom is only introduced in connection with this closing period. The same is noticeable in Hos. 3:5, where “the latter days” or “the end of days” is united with the future restoration of the Jews and the Messianic reign. In these “latter days” (Ezek. 38:16) Antichrist—still future—is to enter Palestine and meet his doom, which only takes place in this interval. The declaration (Dan. 2:28) that God maketh known “what shall be in the latter days” or “at the end of days,” does not simply mean futurity in general, but that God really and truly represents to the King not merely what is “hereafter” (as afterward stated), but especially things which pertain to this culmination of events, this concluding period containing so many pregnant issues concerning Gentile domination, Jewish supremacy, and the Messianic reign. Indeed, a slight acquaintance with the predictions shows plainly that the greatest stress and detail is expended on this very period, to which the eye of faith and hope turns. “The latter times” of 1 Tim. 4:1 admits of a wider scope, and indicates, as the context and warning shows, that the spirit to be developed in them is one gradually formed and extending itself, becoming more and more intensive, through a series of times. The phrase “these last times,” in 1 Pet. 1:20, if not used declaratively, then refers (as is also true of “the last days” in Heb. 1:1, 2) to the fact that Jesus, the Messiah, was manifested during the closing period of the Mosaic economy, which removal was signally verified by the events befalling the nation and capital. However any of these phrases may be employed in a general sense, it is also true, as a careful comparison of the same evidences, that the Spirit employs them to express the closing period of this dispensation, ushering in the interval between the two stages, and then specifically the interval itself, with its result.*

Compare Props. 81, 82, 83. The idea of a Theocracy as involved in the Theocratic-Davidic arrangement, God ruling in and through David's Son; the covenant and the promises based on it relating to David's throne and Kingdom (Props. 49, 111, 114, 116, 117, 122); in brief, the entire analogy of prediction demands a visible reign.

Obs. 1. So distinctly is this taught that no Jew, no Christian believer, no one who read the Scriptures doubted this, until the Alexandrian system evolved a series of doctrines, under the notion of exalting the truth and the Son, in which the throne promised to David's Son was transformed into a throne in the third heaven. What influence the heathen mythology had at first in shaping and urging such views cannot be fully determined, but that it exerted some is self-evident in the similarity of views on various points, as witnessed e.g. in the introduction of Platonic ideas and doctrines. Eccl. His., His. of Religions, Treatises on Dog. Theol. and Sys. Div., etc., clearly indicate not only the change but also the motives which led to it. When the change, however, was once made from the ancient simplicity, it rapidly intrenched itself in the Church as more in accord with the rising Papacy and an alleged advanced improvement.*

Obs. 2. Having in previous Propositions shown with sufficient distinctness that David's Son, Jesus in His humanity, must, if the prophecies are fulfilled, appear in a visible reign; that He does thus manifest Himself to the sight of all, it is unnecessary (as coming Propositions will materially add reasons for our doctrine to those already given) to enter into a detailed argument, since it is nowhere asserted that the visibility thus exhibited shall ever be withdrawn, and since the denial of such a visible reign is one of pure inference. No one, that we are aware of, has ever yet presented a passage of Scripture to prove the invisibility of the reign in the future. It is wrongfully inferred that the Divine Sovereignty (Props. 79 and 80) embraces this Kingdom, and upon this inference alone is based the opposition to our view, thus overlooking that this specially predicted Theocratic reign on David's throne is promised to "the Son of Man," see Prop. 81. Seeing the foundation of the denial of our doctrine, which has been examined in detail and refuted, it is only requisite to notice the peculiar ideas which originate from a forgetting or ignoring of this covenanted Kingdom. The following illustrations will suffice.

Obs. 3. To indicate how persons in their eagerness to deny a visible, personal reign on earth of Christ allow themselves to use unwarranted language (even to deny the personal return to the earth), language which they themselves contradict, we refer e.g. to Barnes, Com. on 1 Thess. 4:16, where in his remarks he says: "There is no intimation here of 'a personal reign' of Christ upon earth. Indeed, there is no evidence that He will return to the earth at all," and then he proceeds to place Christ, the saints, the wicked, the living, and the dead in "the regions of the air." This sounds very much like one of the old monkish legends, and is unworthy of so able a man. We need not in reply direct attention to Zech. 14:4, where it is said that Christ's feet shall touch the Mt. of Olives, etc., for his own commentary contains an abundant refutation of his words. Thus e.g. in his Com. on Acts 3:21, he says: "Until; this word implies that He should then return to the earth;" and then to guard his theory after such an admission adds: "but it does not imply that He would not again ascend to heaven." Precisely so, and it does not imply that He will, alter His return, leave again. This is added to the Bible by our opponents, because the Scriptures close with the personal Advent, His dwelling with man, etc., and leave Jesus the Christ here on the earth. Neither Barnes nor any other writer has been able to adduce a single passage to support their theory of Christ's Sec. Advent and immediate return to heaven. Yea, more than this, Barnes and others like him, forgetting their objections to our doctrine, do, when adverting to the renewed earth, admit that Christ may personally be present, as e.g. Barnes, Com. on Rev., ch. 21:3, "It is not said that this would be on the earth, although that may be, for it is possible that the earth, as well as other worlds, may yet become the abode of the Redeemed," comp. his remarks on chs. 21 and 22, and 2 Pet. 3:13, etc., which, in his usual style, may denote this or that, or may not denote it. The concessions, such as they are, unwillingly forced from him, are all that are required to prove a looseness and vagueness very different from the consistent, logical interpretation of the early Church.*

Obs. 4. In the discussion of this personal return and reign it is saddening to find good persons placing themselves on the judgment seat, and dogmatically deciding what it is possible or impossible for God to perform. This characteristic is even exhibited in the title-page of some books, as e.g. we read: "The personal reign of Christ during the Millennium proved to be impossible, by James C. L. Carson." This title-page is sufficiently indicative of the spirit of the work, and, we doubt not, if the writer had lived previous to the First Advent, he could with equal propriety, greater force, and with many of the same arguments, have proved it impossible for the Son of God to come, as He did, in humiliation, suffering, and death. The fact is, that the leading objection urged against our doctrine, viz., that it is a lowering, etc., of the majesty of Christ, is precisely the same urged by the ancient Celsus against the First Advent of Jesus, viz., that it could not be credited that a divine Being should assume humanity, suffer, etc., because all this would be a virtual degradation. The old apologists replied that the work He performed, the precious characteristics manifested, the results that followed, etc.—these exalted and glorified such an Advent. So when we are attacked by the same unbelieving argument, fortified by the vivid and glorious predictions, believing in the blessed design and results of this reign, we point to the faithful sayings of God and their fulfilment, thus simply accepting of the Divine utterances without attempting to alter them or to apologize in their behalf. Precisely the same objection, in another form, is levelled by infidels against the Incarnation and Life of Jesus Christ, on the ground that such a Creator and Lord of the universe—including unnumbered worlds—could not possibly degrade Himself to make this, so small a planet, the scene of His special manifestations, etc. It is well known how our opponents meet such an objection, but the identical reasoning thus produced by them favors our own view, and is fatal to their objections against us (comp. Props. 203 and

Obs. 5. It becomes painful to notice, in the objections levelled against us, the serious and unfounded change of “carnal,” “fleshly,” etc. Having already warned brethren how careful they ought to be in the use of such phraseology in designating the personal reign of Christ, lest they be finally found guilty of accusing God’s arrangements, the Divine Purpose itself, of carnality, attention may be briefly called to the manner in which this is done. Most excellent writers, such as Rev. Philip (Devot. Guides, vol. 2, p. 287), as well as a host of inferior ones, speak of it as “carnal and vulgar,” under the assumption of superior piety, humility, sanctity, and honoring of Christ, and claim that, under the influence of love, etc., they wish for no such reign, but only a spiritual reign, etc. Without detracting from these brethren, or calling their honesty or piety into question, it may be well to examine this assumption, which is well calculated to beguile and mislead the inquiring. It may be in place to ask what piety, humility, etc., includes. Does it consist in rejecting holy covenanted promises, in denying to Christ what the Spirit ascribes to Him? Without attempting to institute a comparison, we may point to that long line of eminent worthies, whose praise is in the churches, who reverently and humbly receive the Divine Record on the subject just as we do, and exhibited in their lives and deaths as true piety, devotedness (many of them martyrs for the truth) as any of their opponents, and in view of all this, ought such a plea to be instituted? It is simply an evasion of argument, and, if employed by any one, is a sure indication of weakness. The question between us is not the personal piety, etc. of the adherents of one or another theory or doctrine (for as we see in all denominations, the Spirit of God can, notwithstanding error more or less entertained, produce His fruits in various classes on the common ground of faith in Jesus), but it consists in an appeal to the Word of God to ascertain what the Spirit has recorded. Hence all such reasoning is not only irrelevant but painful to a man of candor. This subject will be continued under Prop. 177, so that, for the present, it may be suggested that if the Mill. descriptions are verified as they read; if the personal presence of Christ and His associated rulers is vouchsafed; if the reign is not merely an external civil and religious one, but includes righteousness, wisdom, love, etc., in all their aspects; if the design of it is to fill the earth with God’s glory, etc., then the charge of carnality fails, for the reign and Kingdom is materially different from that exhibited in the efforts of Gentile domination.

Obs. 6. Briefly, the feeble efforts at presenting proof against us drawn from Scripture may be dismissed with a few words. Thus e.g. Ralston (On the Apoc., p. 164 and 165) gives two reasons for rejecting the personal reign of Christ. The first is, that we walk by faith and not by sight (2 Cor. 5:7), and the Apostle said, 2 Cor. 5:16, “Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.” But if we are to understand the passage in the line intimated, then it proves too much, and would make out that there will be no Sec. Advent, and that the angels and the Apostles were mistaken in their announcements. To press the passage in this direction is far worse than despised “literalism.” The second is, that the Saviour is at God’s right hand “forever,” and will not interfere with the work of the Spirit in applying the atonement, quoting John 16:7–11; Heb. 10:12, 13; 1 Cor. 15:24–26; Acts 2:34, 35; Acts 3:21. To this we reply—(1) by comparing Scripture with Scripture we ascertain the Spirit’s meaning of this “forever;” (2) if thus unduly pressed, it is hostile to the Sec. Advent itself; (3) the Scriptures quoted do not sustain his theory, limiting the stay until His return; (4) and the work of the Spirit is not limited but increased by this Personal Coming and reign. Dr. Brown, Christ’s Sec. Coming, ch. 5, introduces the same, and urges that our view calls for another dispensation. Exactly so, as we shall show (Props. 137, 138, 140, 167, etc.) farther on, for if the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom are re-established as predicted, if the Abrahamic-Davidic Covenant is ever fulfilled as written, there must be, in the very nature of the case, a new dispensation or ordering of things. The rest of the objections presented by Brown are met under various Propositions, so that they need no mention here. One of the most recent writers, Fairbairn (On Proph., p. 467, etc.) gives the following reasons against it: 1. Because it is not mentioned in Rev. 20:1–6. Reply: If it had been specifically mentioned, such mention, just as that of the resurrection, would have met with the same treatment of spiritualistic interpretation as the preceding immediate context (ch. 19) of the Advent did at his hands. But, it is stated in the promise of the reign of Christ and His saints, for the reign evidently is to be understood of the same that is specially promised to and predicted of Jesus as David’s Son. Therefore, to ascertain what that reign is, a comparison of prophecy and covenant is necessary, and the question can only be decided in the light thus afforded. Thus e.g. a comparison of Covenant, Zech. 14, Dan. 7, Isa. 25, and Rev. 20:1–6, is alone sufficient to decide the kind of reign intended. Whoever can spiritualize Zech. 14 away will, of course, find Rev. 20:1–6 undecisive. 2. The Advent of Christ, Rev. 19, is an ideal representation—a visionary spectacle, representing a certain agency, etc. Suppose it is symbolic, which we grant, the question still returns, Whom does it represent—ideal personages or agencies, or real personages or agencies? The vision of the beast, prophet, etc., represents real actors, etc.—this he admits. So this vision of Christ and of His saints must also; this, too, he is willing to concede to a certain extent, viz., that it is illustrative of the agency of the Church and of Christ’s agency invisibly through the Church, claiming that the horse, attendants, splendor, sharp sword is indicative of the ideal. He therefore mixes up in confusion the ideal and the real, and entirely overlooks the main, leading fact that it is a vision of an Advent, a Coming from heaven. Under this vision, like that of the other visions, a real, actual occurrence is represented, and that is the Coming of an irresistible, conquering Christ, and with Him the Coming of the saints. This is the simple construction put upon the passage by the early Church, and it is one that must commend itself to the reflecting mind. For, how comes it that one portion of the vision, under the spiritualistic interpretation, viz., that of the armies of heaven, is made to refer visibly to the saints or Church, and the chief personage in the vision is made only to appear invisibly? By what rule of interpretation is one party, as the beast, and another party, as the Church, made to be present visibly, and

the third party, spoken of in the same connection, without the least intimation of a change of condition, etc., is made to appear an actor invisibly? The answer is, solely to save a theory from a fatal objection. 3. That such a personal Coming would assume "an incongruous mixture of the two states of humiliation and glory." Reply: To make out such a mixture he presumes to judge what is right and proper for the Lord to do, overlooking both that this Advent in no shape or form intimates humiliation, but triumph, exaltation, and glory; and that he himself previously spoke of the Mill. age in the most elevated terms of eulogy. It is simply presumptuous for believers to pen a sentence like the following: "When Jesus entered on His state of glory He could no longer dwell on earth and make Himself visible to men." Why not? Perhaps Fairbairn knows, or has heard the reason of His absence to be that He awaits the period of His manifestation, a work having in the mean time to be accomplished, and that when He comes this work will be perfected, etc. The objection is based on the same noticed, Obs. 2 and 3, above. The admission, however, that he makes, as we will prove hereafter, is alone sufficient to overthrow his theory, viz., that Christ will come "only when He comes to make all things new, and stamps them with the perfection of His Divine work, then will the world be prepared as the house of the glory of the Lord." As our argument all along shows, we also hold that when Christ comes the renewing, transforming, recreating power lodged in Him will be exhibited, and logically—without calling into question a single passage in its naked, plain, grammatical meaning—prove that this will be witnessed in the Millennium, seeing also that nothing short of this power can possibly affect it. 4. Fairbairn's next objection is, that the acts specially associated with the Sec. Advent belong to an age subsequent to the Millennium. Among these he specifies the general resurrection, the final judgment, and the Bride's marriage with the Lamb. But this remains unproven, and he assumes them to be thus future. See e.g. Props. 120, 121, 132, 133, 134, 137, 140, etc., for our scriptural evidence to the contrary. The reference to the Bride's marriage will be answered in Props. 169, 150, 146, etc. But we may well put against Fairbairn's unwarranted postponement for one thousand years of the Marriage announced in Rev. 19, the simple Pre-Millennial announcement of the Spirit, Rev. 19:7, "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to Him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come." This to us is authoritative, and we reverently receive it as crushing to all such theorizing built on a specious spiritualizing of Scripture. Our reasons, as the reader must have observed, lie deeper than mere inferences from isolated passages, or mere deductions from a portion of Scripture stripped of its grammatical meaning; they are founded in the solemnly, oath-attested Covenant, in the plain, grammatical meaning of the Word, in the general analogy of the Scriptures, and in the accredited faith of the apostolic churches.*

Obs. 7. Some (esteemed brethren) who frankly admit and earnestly advocate the Pre-Millennial Personal Advent, still express themselves timidly, illogically, and unscripturally in reference to the personal reign of Christ here on the earth. Some few advocating, after His Sec. Advent, His withdrawal to the third heaven, from whence He reigns (some stating that He may occasionally visit the earth and appear to men); others have a withdrawal into the air or upper regions, or into the New Jerusalem, also located in the air or above the earth. This is done by some under a misapprehension of the Covenant, and to whom the Kingdom is specially promised, and with the idea of honoring the God in Christ; while others do it under the supposition that such a view will make our doctrine more palatable to others—that such a concession is harmless and will induce others the more readily to embrace a Pre-Mill. Coming. But allow us here to enter our earnest, solemn protest against all such diluting processes which only weaken our doctrine; all such adulteration of truth to render it more acceptable to others, which only are hailed as evidences of weakness and illogical connection. This subject is too sacred, too precious, too intimately related to the honor of Christ to be either lightly esteemed or made the sport of mere conjecture. Every position assigned to Jesus in this Kingdom ought to have a "thus saith the Lord" for its support, and not the play of human fancy about the propriety of this and that spoken concerning it. We esteem this continued personal presence of Christ the crowning glory of our system, an essential element of its strength. If the reader has carefully noticed the Covenant promises over which we have passed he must have arrived at the conclusion that, if the grammatical meaning is retained, the promises of God require that the reign of Christ and of His saints should be a continued visible one. Bickersteth and many writers assign, as reasons for our belief, passages of Scripture which, if ever fulfilled, demand such a personal presence. These indeed apply forcibly, but with the Apostolic Fathers we ground our belief even on, if possible, a surer, stronger foundation (because plainer), when we say that the utterances of the Covenant are all based on the idea of a personal presence. The central point of the Davidic Covenant is this: that Christ, as David's Son, the promised seed, shall reign on David's throne and in David's Kingdom; and therefore the very language on the face of it conveys the important notion, that in consequence of this, He, as David's Son and Lord, must be and is visibly present. Such a presence is even taken for granted, is assumed as a self-evident fact, needing no special demonstration. For how else is Abraham's seed to inherit the land, or David's seed to inherit his throne? To transfer David's throne or Christ's inheritance to the air or to the third heaven is simply to make the Covenant and promises null and void, seeing that that inheritance, throne, and Kingdom is here on the earth, and not in the air or the third heaven. And when the Bible represents this Inheritor and King to come to this earth to claim His covenanted right, and leaves Him here in possession of it, that man certainly takes a great liberty who places David's Son elsewhere than in His inheritance and Kingdom. No one, that we have thus far read, pretends even to give a single passage to prove such a return, but simply infers it from considerations of his own. How could such a return to heaven, or withdrawal from the earth, possibly be a fulfilment of the Covenant to David that His Son should reign on His throne forever? And would this fulfil the Prophets, who, with one voice, declare that David's Son shall reign gloriously in Jerusalem, the seat of David's throne, in the midst of the Jewish nation, over the nations of the earth? No! we dare not thus neutralize the precious promises of God. This perversion of Covenant and promise arises from not clearly apprehending what Kingdom is promised to Jesus as Son of Man, as David's Son, and that the humanity of Jesus is to sustain this Kingship, the Divine

being united with Him in this Theocratic relationship (see Props. 81, 82, 83, 200, etc.). The Divine in Christ, whatever it may perform in the exercise of Divine Sovereignty in the universe, is associated with "the man ordained" to exhibit a perfect, visible Theocratic government. Let us repeat: Christ is not to come again simply as the Son of God (that relationship to the Father is indeed indispensably requisite to make provision for salvation, to perfect it, and to establish the Theocracy in a permanent form), but pre-eminently and significantly (as the repeated promises to and name of Son of Man fully indicate) as the Son of Man, for the latter is the relationship specifically demanded in the Covenant to be visibly shown and acknowledged to be such by all. Does the Covenant and its promises remain satisfied by a mere visit, as it were, to the predicted inheritance? Such theories, refined to suit the taste of unbelief or weak faith, were utterly unknown to the early Church, whose strong faith firmly grasped and clung to the Covenant in this particular, believing that the underlying idea in it embraced a continual personal presence. We confess an admiration of the men, who, now the objects of witticisms and ridicule from infidels and even professed believers, thus accepted, with Abrahamic and Davidic faith, of the Covenant as it reads, and received the voice of the Prophets as they also read, and boldly and unequivocally avowed their belief in such a precious presence; enforcing it by the predictions that Christ should return and dwell and reign in Jerusalem, having rebuilt the ruined tabernacle of David in majesty; that He shall rule in it gloriously, making it the place of His throne; that the restored Jewish nation, as well as the saints, shall see Him in His glory; that all nations shall at Jerusalem acknowledge His supremacy, etc. In all this, no matter what man may say, there is, at least, a regular and consistent fulfilment of the Word of God. With them we regard this very presence as a necessary adjunct to redemption, inasmuch as redemption is to be perfected by the Second Adam in this Theocratic relation. While He is carrying on the Divine Purpose intended by this Theocratic-Davidic government, viz., to redeem the race as a race from the curse, He should also, at the same time and in the same place where man fell, exhibit in Himself, as the Head and in a corporate body of His brethren, perfected salvation. By Christ's salvation is not meant that He is to be saved from sin (for He was without sin, otherwise the sacrifice of Himself would have been imperfect and unavailing, and death also would have had dominion over Him), but that as Abraham's seed, assuming flesh for our sakes, with its weakness, imperfections (i e. natural, subject to disease, sleep, etc.), liability to the corruption of death, He now exhibits in Himself as man a complete deliverance from all those evils voluntarily assumed, and thus a triumph over our enemies, an impressive representation of the power of holiness united with the love of the Father, a Second Adam, in whose person incarnation is glorified. For we must ever keep in mind that Christ is not only "the Second Adam," because a similarity is implied between Christ and the redeemed, resembling that between Adam and his descendants, in that, as death is transmitted by the first Adam, so life is bestowed through the Second Adam ("As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," etc.), but He is also designated such because in Himself, as man, is to be exhibited "the image of God," defaced by the fall of the first Adam; and hence, as a necessary connection with that image, the dominion originally granted to the first Adam is also in Him restored. Theologians, of almost every class, concede such a restoration. Therefore, it is eminently proper and requisite that in the person of Christ, through whom the race is to be redeemed, should be shown, as that Second Adam, the complete restoration of all that the first Adam forfeited; among others, including the restoration and retention of the forfeited inheritance (which led to those covenant promises that Christ should inherit the land, etc.), the restoration and retention of the dominion or kingly power, which was forfeited as well as moral rectitude, the immortality of man, and the perpetuation of the race in a state of innocence and purity. However, to do and manifest this requires the personal presence of the Second Adam in His restored inheritance and dominion, in order that not only the promises may be verified, but that the most ample, actual, experimental proof may thus be afforded in the person of the Redeemer, the Head of the body, that in Him, our second living Head, we have attained unto all (not a part) that the first Adam (and we through him) forfeited by sin. This Second Adam thus stands forth in our system a revealed representative of God, such as the first Adam was designed to become had he not fallen. This David's Son, crowned with greater glory because of His unbroken union with the Divine, occupies, as Restorer, Adam's place; and if so, how can we, how dare we separate His presence from the place thus restored? This is shadowed forth in Ps. 8 and Heb. 2, and is justly claimed by us as the crowning feature in redemption. For without a personal Second Adam present, redemption itself is incomplete, imperfect.*

Obs. 8. Our argument is cumulative, and to avoid undue repeating we pass by the prophetic reasoning to be drawn from Dan., chs. 2, 7, etc., that the outward, external, visible world-dominion which the Chaldean monarch contemplated was to be realized fully in the Messiah. We also leave unnoticed the numerous predictions which emphatically declare the visible reign of Jesus here on earth, for they will all be brought forth under various following Propositions. It is in the very nature of a manifested Theocracy that there should be (as already foreshown in the past Theocratic arrangement), not simply faith, but sight. Dr. Brown (Christ's Sec. Com., P. 2, ch. 5) emphatically declares that there is "no Millennial mixture of faith and sight." He takes to task Brookes's saying, that "in the Millennial state there will be an open vision of Christ," and that "it will be a dispensation in which the saints will continually have personal access to Christ." He censures Elliott for teaching a "visibly manifested" conjunction of the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem; he condemns Lord for saying that the nations have access to the glorified (symbolized by the open gates, etc.), and that "they are never to be without the visible presence of God; that its gates are never shut, and that the nations are to enjoy uninterrupted access to the glorified." He ridicules Birks, McNeile, Bickersteth, and Maitland for teaching such a visible revelation and such an access to the city, such a "seeing the Lord of Hosts manifested in the human nature of Jesus reigning in Mt. Zion," such a visible manifestation of glory that impresses the nations, and such a change in dispensation that sight shall also be introduced. Of course any one who denies that the sight of Jesus (Zech. 12:10; Ezek. 20:35) will influence the future conversion of the Jews; who

rejects the seeing of Matt. 23:39; Zech. 14:1, etc.; who finds no place in his system of theology for the everlasting Covenant of David; who spiritualizes Jerusalem, Mt. Zion, etc., and denies a future incoming dispensational change—can find nothing of sight, no matter how plainly presented.*

PROPOSITION 132. This view of the Kingdom confirmed by the Judgeship of Christ.

The Judgeship of Jesus establishes our doctrine of the Kingdom, the Pre-Mill. Advent, and His continued personal presence as the King. Intending to show that Judgeship and Kingship are in Scripture equivalent terms, it follows that if they are such, then, since the Kingship is specifically promised to Jesus Christ as the Son of Man, made thus necessary by the covenant, so also the Judgeship ought to be expressed. This is done. He is the Judge because He is “the man ordained,” Acts 17:31. Some theologians tell us that the reason why the Father thus constituted Jesus the Judge is (Knapp’s Ch. Theol., p. 542) “because He is man and knows from His own experience all the sufferings and infirmities to which our nature is exposed, and can therefore be compassionate and indulgent.” But the reader can see a far deeper reason, grounded on the Covenant. It is said, “The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father,” John 5:22, 23, and in verse 27 it is added: “and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man.” Why the Son of Man? Because to this Son of Man as David’s Son is promised the Kingdom, and Judgeship being included in the promised Theocratic-Davidic government, the Father only judges through this Son. The promises based on the covenant require such authority to be given to and to be manifested through the Covenanted Seed. Hence, as the second Adam recovering the dominion lost by the first Adam; as the woman’s seed who is to crush the serpent’s head; as the promised seed of Abraham who is to inherit the land, possess the gate of His enemies, and make all nations blessed; as the Son of David who is to reign so gloriously over the earth; as the God-man who perfects salvation through a Theocratic ordering—it is indispensably necessary for Him to occupy such a position to meet the predetermined plan of Redemption.

Obs. 1. Before entering into a discussion of this interesting and delightful subject it is proper to say that no single doctrine is perhaps so greatly misapprehended as this one; for which we are indebted to the originators of monkery and to the schoolmen. Multitudes, embracing even talented and able divines, instead of confining themselves to scriptural representations to ascertain the mind of the Spirit, are content to accept of the interpretations drawn from the writings of monks, mystics, etc., or from false systems of philosophy, human imagination, heathen mythology, descriptions of poetry, paintings, modern definitions of Judge, etc. The early Church, and that band of witnesses which taught the Pre-Mill. Advent and the personal reign of Christ here on earth, have assumed the responsibility of explaining the Judgeship of Christ in one way; those who reject that Advent and reign have taken the responsibility of teaching it quite differently. In view of our accountability in handling the Word, we shall endeavor carefully to base every step in our examination of this important matter upon that infallible Guide, and each one is required, as Luther so forcibly taught, to exercise the right of judgment in determining whether the Scriptures contain what we assert.

Obs. 2. It seems to the writer that a simple striking fact, frequently repeated in the Scriptures, ought to be sufficient of itself to cause the student to reject the prevailing Popish notion of the Judgeship, or at least to induce him, if an advocate of it, to a renewed examination. It is this: the Prophets describe this Judgeship—the exercise of it—as a matter of congratulation and rejoicing, and not, as it would be if it only denoted judicial investigation of character, a subject of dread or apprehension. Thus e.g. Ps. 67:4, “O let the nations be glad, and sing for joy; for Thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth.” Comp. Ps. 96:10–13; Ps. 98:5–9, etc. It is represented as a joyful event by the Spirit; one which will cause exultation and happiness, and this only becomes apparent if we understand it to embrace the reign, Kingdom of Jesus.*

Obs. 3. Jesus Christ is the Judge, Acts 17:31; Matt. 24:30; Rom. 14:9, 10; John 5:22; Acts 10:40; Matt. 25:31, etc. The question that we are to propose and answer is this: Are we to understand by this Judgeship that Christ only sits in a judicial capacity to determine cases; that as Judge He only presides in a tribunal of justice to decide respecting the innocence or guilt of men; or, is far more embraced in this term, such as judicial, legislative, and executive action, a supreme power, Kingly rule? If we take the Bible idea of Judge, instead of the restricted, more modern sense engrafted upon it, there is no difficulty in replying that the latter is intended. By reference to the Judges that God raised up to “judge Israel” (such as Gideon, Samson, Jephthah, Eli, Samuel, etc.), it is found that their office consisted in enforcing the Theocratic rule, in executing the laws, subduing enemies, punishing evildoers, and promoting the prosperity of the nation. They were rulers, ruling over the nation in order to advance its Interests (Judges 2:16–19, etc.). When Moses judged the people he acted as a Ruler, making known and executing the laws of God; and when he followed Jethro’s advice to make other Judges, it is expressly said that he “made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens, and they judged the people,” etc. (Ex. 18:14–26). Dr. Clarke, Com. Pref. to Judges, says: “The persons called Judges, ‘shophetim,’ were the heads or chiefs of the Israelites who governed the Hebrew Republic (Theocracy) from the days of Moses and Joshua till the time of Saul. The word Judge is not to be taken here in its usual signification, i.e. one who determines controversies and denounces the judgment of the law in criminal cases, but one who directs and rules a state or nation with

Sovereign power, administers justice, makes peace or war, and leads the armies of the people over whom he presides. Horne (Introd., vol. 2, p. 42) says: "The authority of the Judges was not inferior to that which was afterward exercised by the Kings; it extended to peace and war. They decided causes without appeal, but they had no power to enact new laws or to impose new burdens upon the people. They were protectors of the laws, defenders of religion, and avengers of crimes." The same idea is noticeable when the Jews requested a King, they called his ruling a judging. In 1 Sam. 8:5, 6, 20, "all the elders of Israel" said "make us a King to judge us." "We will have a king over us, that we also may be like other nations, and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles." Judgeship was therefore regarded as the equivalent of rulership, of kingly rule; and how largely this idea is incorporated with Scripture will appear in the quotations that will follow. From the use of the word already stated, it is a just conclusion, drawn by the early Church and many eminent writers,³ that when Jesus is represented to be revealed as the Judge, we are not to understand that He only presides as a Jurist to pronounce innocent or guilty, as the case may be, but that He rules in a princely manner, exercises a kingly office, is revealed as King of kings, Sovereign of the world, and that His Judgeship, being Theocratic, consists in exercising all the powers of a Supreme Governor, legislative and executive as well as judicial, so that the acts of His Judgeship shall be manifested in issuing His decrees, executing His laws, punishing offenders, rewarding the faithful, and carrying on the Divine Theocratic ordering of His Kingdom. In other words, the Judgeship is identical with the predicted reign of Christ, commencing with the Millennial era—an age inaugurated and carried on by the most astonishing manifestations of Sovereign power, judicial, legislative, and executive.

Obs. 4. To confirm this position there are numerous converging arguments. 1. It is linked with His Advent and His Kingdom, as in 2 Tim. 4:1, "who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His Kingdom." After His appearing is His Kingdom, and judging is connected with both. 2. The Coming of the Lord to judge is united with the Covenant and made synonymous with reigning, as in 1 Chron. 16:14–19 and 31–33. 3. The "judgment seat" of 2 Cor. 5:10, upon which Christ sits, is translated, Acts 12:21, "throne." And in comparing Scripture, it is found that when the Son of Man does this judging, He is represented as seated, not on the Father's throne, but His own throne—that is, the one He inherits in virtue of being David's Son. To indicate how the Spirit so accurately distinguishes between those thrones it is only necessary to consider Matt. 25:31, "He shall sit upon the throne of His glory," compared with Rev. 3:21, where the Father's throne in heaven is distinguished from "my throne"—a distinction made requisite by the Covenant to David. Whatever of Sovereignty may be displayed by the Divine on the Father's throne, we must bear in mind, as constantly essential, that as the throne covenanted to Jesus Christ belongs to Him as the Son of Man, those allusions to "My throne," "His throne," etc., have undoubted reference to His humanity, and therefore must be, in the nature of the case, understood as separate and distinct from the throne in the third heaven. The references must correspond with the covenant and predictions of the prophets. 4. Many prophetic passages unite this Judgeship with the general one of government, as Ps. 9:7, 8; Ps. 96:10, 13; Ps. 82:8, etc. So that, as a multitude of predictions of this kind evidence, reigning, ruling, governing, and judging are regarded as synonymes, so that all our concordances give as one of its distinctive meanings, "to rule, govern, or reign." 5. This judging, as our argument demands, is united with predictions of Christ's sitting upon David's throne. Thus e.g. Isa. 9:6, 7; Isa. 16:5; Jer. 33:15. The prophets plainly declare that when the revealed King, David's Son and Lord, re-establishes the covenanted throne and Kingdom, He is manifested as the Judge of Israel and of the nations. 6. This Judgeship is also united with the restoration of the Jewish nation, with which the Davidic throne is united, as e.g. Jer. 23:5–8, etc. 7. Saints are co-heirs with Jesus in this Judgeship, for they are to judge with Him on earth. But the passages explanatory of this Judgeship (comp. Prop. 154) represent it as equivalent to the possession of authority, rulership, or kingship. 8. There is no act ascribed to this Kingly office of Christ, but what is also identified with this Judgeship, both in Coming and Kingdom. In the delineation of the Mill. era, the latter forms a prominent feature of it. We give a few illustrations: When the majesty of God in Zion is declared, the gathering of His saints, and the issuing forth of a tempestuous fire is announced, Ps. 50, it is added: "He shall call to the heavens from above and to the earth, that He may judge His people"—i.e. re-enter that Theocratical predicted relationship—"and the heavens shall declare His righteousness, for God is Judge Himself." That this refers to Christ is evident from Micah 5:1, where Jesus is designated "the Judge of Israel," from the delegating of this judging to Him by the Father, from the Oneness of Father and Son, and from the same things being pointedly ascribed to the Son. In the light of this, many passages present a forcible meaning, as in Ps. 94, "O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth; O God, to whom vengeance belongeth, show Thyself. Lift up Thyself, Thou Judge of the earth." Reading on, we ascertain that this revelation of this Judge is desired, that the wicked may not triumph, that the righteous and the inheritance may be delivered, and that the throne of iniquity may be overthrown and His own be substituted. So in Ps. 7, where prayer is offered for deliverance from enemies, and a firm trust is expressed that God will arise and save the upright and punish the wicked, it is said: "the Lord shall judge the people," "God judgeth the righteous." And what this denotes is apparent from Ps. 9, for, after evincing the desire to praise and rejoice in God, the reason is assigned: "when mine enemies are turned back, they shall fall and perish at thy presence. For Thou hast maintained my right and my cause (i.e. the covenanted); Thou satest in the throne judging right." Notice, too, that this is done when the Psalmist is "lifted up from the gates of death (res.), that I may show forth all thy praise in the gates of the daughter of Zion," etc. The student can readily find an abundance of such allusions, a rich golden vein in the prophetic mine. As e.g. in that class of Psalms (96, 97, 98, etc.) which begin with "the Lord reigneth," and then describe the exaltation of the saints, the utter removal of wickedness, etc., and generally incorporate or conclude with expressions referring to the Coming of the Lord "to judge the earth; with righteousness shall He judge the world, and the people with equity," etc. The same strain is found in Jer. 23:5–8; Isa. 30:18, 19,

etc., so that, as ancient and modern writers have correctly observed, the Millennial descriptions either contain or are preceded or followed by representations of this Judgeship. His judicial power shall be especially exercised, when this age is to be ushered in, against the nations of the earth; His legislative, executive, and judicial power in the restoration of His own people and establishment of His Kingdom, in the complete subjugation of all nations to His supremacy, and in the binding of Satan; all the attributes of Judgeship will be exhibited in the administrations of His government in that era, so that all the righteous shall, as the Psalmist predicts, rejoice and be glad in His Judgeship; and at the close of this age the Judge's power will, in a striking manner, be manifested in the raising of the wicked dead, the confirming of their sentence, the final and eternal overthrow of all wickedness, and the continued everlasting security and blessedness of His people. 9. The word "judgment" is employed, as concordances show, to designate "the governing power of Christ," and in this light many passages become significant of the future rule of Christ, as e.g. Isa. 42:4; Ps. 76:9; Ps. 94:15, etc. This arises from the fact that "judgment" itself is derived from "determined"—this kingly office of Christ being covenanted, predetermined. 10. Christ is revealed as King and as Judge, the terms being convertible, at the time of the Pre-Millennial harvest. Compare the parable of Tares and Wheat with Rev. 14, Joel 3, Rev. 19, etc. 11. In Rev. 11, at the time (under last trumpet) the Sovereignty of the world is given to Christ, as part of His Kingly office, judging is announced. 12. A variety of additional reasons will be given under the judging of the saints, the Judgment Day, the Day of Christ, etc., so that we must conclude that the phrase "the Judge of Israel" is equivalent to "the king of Israel;" "the righteous Judge," to that of "the righteous King," or "a King shall reign in righteousness," to that of "He shall judge the world in righteousness."

Obs. 5. The modern usage of the words "Judge" and "Judgment" have misled many in comprehending this subject, so that some assert, as Priest, that they cannot see how the Millennial period and judgment can be blended. A reference to any concordance would explain the matter, for those words are used in a variety of ways, as in trying a cause, discerning, reckoning, as well as in ruling, governing, etc., and the meaning to be attached to the word in any particular case must be determined by the context, general analogy—in brief, by the laws controlling language, giving the preference in all cases to scriptural usage. Because "judge" is employed to designate judicial action, that is no reason for discarding the additional meanings attached to it by the Word of God. In this discussion it is sufficient to notice that Judgeship is ascribed to the Kingly, Sovereign power of God and of His Son, and that whatever of judgment there has been in the past or is going on now, or attends us at death, or at the resurrection, or in the Coming Kingdom, etc., it does not affect our line of argument, but confirms it, because all this is represented as an exertion of Divine Sovereignty. The question that we are to decide is not whether judicial action belongs to the station of a judge—this is admitted by all—but whether, when Christ is revealed as Judge, this Judgeship is not an equivalent to His Kingly rule. This we think is already conclusively proven, and therefore those writers who fail to discriminate in this particular make a serious mistake which materially concerns the interpretation of a large portion of Scripture. The Judgeship of Christ is not only perfectly consistent with the glory and blessedness of the Millennial period, but indispensably necessary to secure it. And in this connection it may be added, that the proof of Christ's Judgeship as given by Paul, viz., Acts 17:31, "whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead," is precisely the identical proof required by the covenant to show that David's Son is to reign as "the man ordained" in the immortal manner predicted. The duration of this Judgeship is of such a nature that it cannot be predicated of mortal man; whereas in His glorified humanity, never more subject to death, He is abundantly able to verify the promises relating to His Judgeship or Kingship.

Obs. 6. The concessions made by writers when not directly opposing us are decidedly in our favor. Thus, to illustrate from a popular Commentator: Barnes, Com., is unwilling to admit that Christ's ruling with a rod of iron (judging), Rev. 19, denotes His Sovereign power exerted at His personal Coming. He refers it rather to providential movements, spiritual power, by which all things shall be subdued, etc. In Rev. 2:27, however, when coming to the same promise given to the saints, a difficulty presents itself, viz., that it would be unreasonable and against fact to ascribe such power now to the saints. He therefore correctly applies this ruling with a rod of iron to the period of the judgment. After showing that the phraseology denotes "a power that is firm and invincible," that "no power can oppose His rule," and that "the enemies of His government would be destroyed," he adds: "the speaker does not intimate when this will be, but all that is said here would be applicable to that time when the Son of God will come to judge the world, and when His saints will be associated with Him in His triumphs." Taking this admission given by an opponent, it follows that the Son of Man and the saints enter upon this ruling with a rod of iron personally at the beginning of the Millennium, for at that period the Spirit locates it in Rev. 19, and in Ps. 2 it is also associated with the manifestation of "the King" in Zion.

Obs. 7. This judging is connected with the casting out of Satan. This might be argued from Rev. 19 with the following context, and the general tenor of Millennial descriptions indicating freedom from evil, etc., but we confine ourselves briefly to John 12:31. When Christ came to suffer and die under the provisions made for Redemption, He did not assume the character of Judge or King. Yet He says: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the Prince of this world be cast out," and this is stated in connection with His death, by which this would be brought about, and He (as David's Son), by the accompanying resurrection, would become the one of whom "we have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever." Here the future is spoken of as present (Prop. 65, Obs. 9), His death being merely provisionary, for Jesus expressly declares in the same chapter that He came not to judge the world; down to the present time there has been no such judgment, and Satan has not yet been cast out. That a meaning is not forced out of the passage is evident from what Barnes, loci, says of it: he referring its fulfilment to the Future Day of Judgment and explaining its

reference to the death as follows: “Now is approaching the decisive scene, the eventful period—the crisis—when it shall be determined who shall rule this world.” The reader, however, is reminded that this judgment and this casting out of Satan thus linked together, the Spirit informs us, is fulfilled at a Pre-Mill. Advent, when Satan himself is bound and confined. Then the Sovereignty, justly claimed by the Son in virtue of covenanted relationship and obedience unto a triumphant death, is publicly assumed. What the Spirit has thus joined together and located in fulfilment, it is daring for us to separate.

Obs. 8. It is no wonder that infidels treat this subject with scorn when it is handled, wildly and outrageously, by otherwise able Christian writers, such as e.g. Reuss. In Reuss’s His. Ch. Theol. of the Apos. Age, he frankly admits that the Evangelists clearly teach the views that we entertain, such as the personal Coming of Christ, the idea of judging, saying of the latter, “the Apostles especially, as a recompense of their devotedness, shall sit as judges judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and then the Kingdom shall commence,” etc. He emphatically declares that “these representations are clear and simple; they have nothing equivocal about them,” etc. “It is evident that the narrators, who serve as our guides, took every word literally, and had not a shadow of doubt in reference to the matter.” Then Reuss adds that, because of their Judaistic, Rabbinical correspondence, “grave doubts arise, and it seems impossible that Jesus should have repeated that which the most ordinary Rabbi had long preached in the synagogue.” The result to which Reuss comes, after traducing the faith of the Evangelists and the sense grammatically expressed by Jesus, is to reject the plain “unequivocal” teaching, and search out and fasten upon it “a meaning different from that which at first suggests itself.” This meaning he finds in death, resurrection, etc., opening a wide door for mystical applications, thus manufacturing a pliant mortar to daub over the promises; for he remarks under this meaning: “the seats of honor may well be dismissed from the dogmatic explanation of the Gospel prophecy,” etc. In this total misapprehension of judgment he places Jesus above “the delusive imagination of the prophet,” etc., not seeing that he is actually pulling down most precious material with one hand while endeavoring to build up inferior stuff with the other; that he is engaged in destroying the credibility of the narrators; in making Christ’s language, knowing their views, an accommodation, deception, etc. If we understand the utterances of Jesus in their true grammatical relation, then, according to Reuss, He “seems here suddenly to give expression to the most visionary hopes as to the immediate future—hopes based not upon an estimate of the natural progress of events, but upon the wildest dreams of fanatic patriots among his countrymen. Do we really find, side by side, with predictions ratified by the event and signally proving the exactness of His knowledge of the future, an error so monstrous that the lie direct is given by history to the most solemn promise of the Saviour?” The “lie” is all in Reuss’s imagination, and arises from his basing all fulfilment upon his own “estimate of the natural progress of events,” and overlooking the postponement of the Kingdom. Leaving the discussion of the particular promise alluded to by him to the Prop. (154) on the Reign of the Saints, we may say that Christ will take care of the fulfilment of His promises respecting judging, and that His promises are not to be measured by past fulfilment, but left to the period indicated by the Spirit. Alas! how painful to meet such unbelief in such men—unbelief which, perhaps honestly intends to exalt Christ, but virtually condemns His language and belittles the faith of His followers. The whole theory of this class is this: we are not to understand the Word as it reads—if we do it leads to “Judaistic” notions—but we must “spiritualize the letter” and “idealize the picture of the coming age.” Spiritualizing even covenants, it causes no surprise to see the mystical results.*

PROPOSITION 133. This view of the Kingdom is confirmed by “the Day of Judgment.”

If the monkish view of the day of judgment, now so prevalent even among Protestants, is correct, then it follows that, it being deemed the period of the winding up, or ending, of all sublunary things, no place can be found for such a Kingdom after it. But, on the other hand, if it can be conclusively shown that this day of judgment is connected with, enters into, and follows through the Millennial era, then it materially aids in supporting our view of the Covenanted Kingdom. That it does this is already evidenced by preceding Propositions, but the Spirit affords us in the Word additional reasons to sustain our belief.

Obs. 1. Again the reader is reminded that the Jewish and Early Church doctrine of the Judgment Day is something very different from the Popish doctrine now so generally entertained. The notion of an assize, a universal gathering of dead and living, pious and wicked, before a tribunal at which character is to be tested, etc., was developed in the Church several centuries later, in the form now held by many writers. On all sides are to be found utterances concerning the judgment utterly unknown, and completely antagonistic to the doctrine once held by the Church. The modern writers, with here and there an exception, express the same hostility to the ancient view. Take a recent author, Dr. Bascom, in his Sermons, 1 series, sec. 11, “The Judgment,” most eloquently indorses the Popish view, calling it “a day concluding the world’s existence” “a day which shall wrap the universe of man in writhing distortions and dash to pieces the structure of nature,” etc., and adding: “This day terminates alike the dispensations and dealings of heaven in relation to our fallen planet.” Such quotations might almost be indefinitely multiplied, as evidence of the widespread and falsely extravagant representations of the Word of God on this point; but they are not needed, as every reader must be more or less acquainted with their sad existence.

Obs. 2. Our views (Millenarian) respecting judgment are almost invariably misrepresented (with some honorable exceptions, as

Barnes, Brown, Fairbairn) by our opposers; and in no work specially written against us is exhibited a candid statement of our scriptural position. Some writers, as one in *Presby. Quarterly Review*, 1853, so pervert our doctrine as to make it imply that we hold Rev. 20:11–15 to precede the Mill. age, which no one does. In a recent commentary, only so much, and that incidental, of our argument is given that the writer felt able to refute, while the leading reasons presented by us were totally ignored. Even so ignorant (will not say designedly) are some writers that our doctrine of the Judgment is classed with that of the Millerites, when the fact is that the Millerite doctrine on the subject is identical with their own, and bears no resemblance whatever to ours. Another class of writers, more insidious, attack our doctrine under a professed harmony, which is a mere jumbling together of passages, without discriminating between the time of their fulfilment. The truth is, that in looking over a large number of works opposed to us, not one (unless Dr. Brown's of Glasgow can be called an exception, which it is not) takes up our Scriptural reasons given and endeavors to show that these Scriptures are to be understood differently, as e.g. that our view of the Judgeship of Christ, of the Judgment Day, and of their connection with the Millennium, is erroneous. Instead of a comparison of Scripture, and founding an opinion on the mind of the Spirit as thus presented, the proof alleged is entirely inferential and indirect. Thus, to illustrate: Steele (*Essay on Ch. Kingdom*, Bib. Sac. Nov. 1849), Brown (*Ch. Sec. Coming*), Beattie (*Dis. on Mill. State*), Waldegrave (*Lec. on N. T. Mill.*), Barnes (*Com.*), etc., all without exception take it for granted (without meeting and answering our arguments concerning the passages quoted), that e.g. Matt. 25 (and Scriptures which simply allege the Coming of Christ to judgment and which affirm that all men shall be judged without assigning the order or time), must necessarily mean to judicially judge "all mankind," "the entire race," at the same time, so that "the whole number of the saved and the whole number of the lost, in two vast assemblies, meets our eyes," "the generations of men cease," etc. Leaving the reader to consult Mill. authors who have reviewed those works in detail (as Lord's *Lit. and Theol. Journal*, etc.), for a minute consideration of each passage assigned, it is only requisite to give an illustration of this mode of handling the Word of God, seeing that the main objection urged by them (viz., that all the righteous and all the wicked will be judged together at the same time) is fully answered by our adopted line of argument. In illustration we select 2 Cor. 5:9–21: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one," etc. Now it is affirmed that this teaching, that "all appear," etc., it includes all at the same time. But this is not contained in the passage; and this Scripture itself must be interpreted in the light of others. To put on the words "all" "every one" an emphasis to include the time, if applied to other Scripture, would be absurd, as e.g. 1 Cor. 15:22, etc.* All shall appear before His Throne (judgment seat is translated throne, Acts 12:21), but at different periods, as e.g. before the Mill. age and at its close—(we leave the proof in our regular order of argument). Without discussing what critics tell us the words here denote, implying not merely a standing, etc., before the throne, but a being manifested to receive the stations, positions, rewards, proportionate to their deeds, etc., the attention of our opponents is called to a certain weakness in their argument. They frequently censure us for bringing the saints back before this very throne to receive stations of honor, kingship, and priesthood, that they may reign, pronouncing it derogatory, degrading, etc., after the honor, bliss, and glory enjoyed. They evidently forget this objection, when they bring those same saints before this same throne to undergo a judicial investigation. Our view surely entails nothing so derogatory upon them, for the very fact of the resurrection of the saints, thus counted worthy of it, and the non-resurrection of the wicked at the time of the first resurrection, counted unworthy of it, proves to us a pre-existing judgment. Our opponents have much to say, and truthfully, that the condition of the individual is determined, in some way even at death, and that his future destiny is shaped by the moral character then sustained, and that this must be the result of judgment exercised. If so, the question arises, Why subject these same parties—especially taking Brown's, Barnes's, etc. idea that the saints have been, many of them for centuries upon centuries, in the third heaven enjoying a development of glory indescribable, etc.—to be brought before a tribunal to undergo a scrutiny of character? This difficulty and others vanish only if we allow the legitimate meaning given to the original by commentators, which involves our idea, that the saints are manifested before that throne to be assigned their position as rulers in the Kingdom, which apportionment is only done at the manifestation of the Kingdom itself, and is proportioned to the deeds done in the body. Such a manifestation is one that we are led to expect. If the objection is raised that Paul included in the word "all" also the wicked, it can be readily granted, for they too at a certain period shall have their final condition awarded by Him who sits on that throne. If it can be shown that all are judged, whether at one time or at different times, the affirmation of the passage is amply sustained. All are raised from the dead, but each in his own order; so also all shall stand before His throne, but each in his order.

Obs. 3. The Judgment Day is inseparably linked with the personal presence of the Judge, and therefore, as we proceed, it is unnecessary to repeat what all admit. It is very essential to our doctrine to find the judgment united with the Coming of the Son of Man. Mede (*Works*, B. 3, p. 762) long ago observed that Dan. 7 contains "The mother text of Scripture, whence the Jews grounded the name and expectation of the Great Day of Judgment." In following Propositions the Jewish view of "the Day of Judgment" and "the Day of the Great Judgment," will be given, including and associated with the personal coming of the Messiah and of "His day." Is it not singular, to say the least, that if the Jews were mistaken in identifying the Day of Judgment with the Coming of the Son of Man in Daniel, and with the reign of the Messiah, that Jesus and the Apostles, by adopting and using the very phraseology current among the Jews, should thus confirm the Jewish usage of the phrases? Our opposers, as Stuart, Barnes, etc., concede that in the N. T. the phrases "the Day of Judgment," "the Judgment of the Great Day," embraces this personal Coming of the Messiah; and this concession, as far as it goes, is important, and may well cause us to ask, Does it not include much more, even the association with the reign of David's Son during the blessed Mill. period described by the prophets and believed in by the Jews? The facts (1) that the phrases originated with Jewish believers, and (2) that they are employed without the least intimation that they are to be understood

differently, certainly ought to have some weight with the student.

Obs. 4. The Judgment Day is designated, Acts 17:31, "He hath appointed a day wherein He will judge the world in righteousness," etc. By this is evidently meant that a fixed, determined time has been set apart, which, by way of eminence, is called "the Day of Judgment," in which Christ shall be revealed as the Judge. It is variously presented, as in Rom. 2:16; 1 Thess. 5; 2; 1 Cor. 1:8, etc. It is called "a day," which in the largeness of prophecy does not indicate an ordinary day, or even a brief period of time, but may include a long, extended time. The word is employed to denote time indefinitely, as "the day of trouble," "the day of adversity," "the day of prosperity," etc. Again, it is used to designate definite periods, either short or long, as e.g. the six days of creation are called "day" Gen. 2:4; the forty years in the wilderness are named, Heb. 3:8; Ps. 95:8, "the day of temptation;" the times of the Messiah are called by the prophets "that day," "the day of the Lord," as Isa. 24:21, 23; Zech. 14, etc.; "the day of salvation" 2 Cor. 6:2, "the day," Heb. 3:7, 13; Ps. 118:24, etc., are admitted to embrace an entire dispensation. It is well known that prophecy speaks of events occurring "in that day," which the fulfilment snows occupied hundreds of years in fulfilling. Reference might be made to other passages, such as John 8:56; 1 Cor. 5:5; Deut. 33:12, etc., all showing this usage by the Spirit Therefore, in approaching a subject like this, the student's attention should at once be directed to the applicability of this feature to the Day of Judgment, especially since it was thus understood by the pious Jews.

Obs. 5. The scholastic or eccles. terms "the Last Judgment," Dr. Knapp (Ch. Theol., p. 542) frankly says is not employed in the New Test., and that the phrases "the last day" or "last days" are not "used exclusively with reference to the end of the world. They often designate merely the future, coming days—e.g. 2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 3:3. They sometimes also denote the last period of the world, or, the times of the Messiah, e.g. Heb. 1:2; 1 Pet. 1:20," etc. Such concessions could be multiplied, but are unnecessary. The Jewish and Early Church view is abundantly sustained by the opinions of eminent writers of various classes. To illustrate: John Wesley, Ser. on Rom. 14:10 (Works), says: "The time termed by the Prophet 'the great and terrible day' is usually in Scripture styled the Day of the Lord. The space from the creation of man upon the earth, to the end of all things, is the day of the sons of men; the time that is now passing over us is properly our day; when this is ended, the day of the Lord will begin. But who can say how long it will continue? 'With the Lord one day is a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,' 2 Pet. 3:8. And from this very expression, some of the ancient fathers drew that inference, that, what is commonly called the Day of Judgment would indeed be a thousand years; and it seems they did not go beyond the truth; nay, probably they did not come up to it," etc. He affirms that what is done at the Judgment Day could not possibly be confined to less than a thousand years. Bh. Newton (Diss. on Proph., vol. 2, p. 377), speaking of the Seventh Millenary, remarks: "According to tradition too, these thousand years of the reign of Christ and the saints are 'the great Day of Judgment;' in the morning or beginning whereof shall be the coming of Christ in flaming fire, and the particular judgment of Antichrist and the first resurrection; and in the evening or conclusion whereof shall be the general resurrection of the dead." Now let us proceed to ascertain the correctness of such inferences, and see whether they are not abundantly sustained by the direct testimony of the Word.

Obs. 6. Peter certainly knew the Jewish view of the Messiah's Judgeship, the Day of Judgment, etc., and yet he in the plainest possible manner confirms the truthfulness of it. In 2 Pet. 3:7, 8 he introduces the Coming of the Saviour and the reservation of the heavens and earth unto fire "against the Day of Judgment and the perdition of ungodly men," and then adds: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day." Having just mentioned "the Day of Judgment," he guards the expression by the words following, lest it should be limited to a short period, or even to a literal day. Foreseeing, by the Spirit, this very error into which multitudes have fallen, he cautions us that this "day" of which he writes, may include, at least, a thousand years. The expression quoted, in its twofold application to time, certainly conveys the idea that we are not to limit its duration to a brief period; and when the same Spirit includes, in what the Prophets call "the day," the thousand years of Rev. 20, then the amplitude of "the day" is verified. In accord with this, in Heb. 4:1–11, the great Sabbatism, the Rest or Sabbath day remaining for God's children, is called "a day." And in Rom. 13:12 it is said, "the night is far spent, the day is at hand," in which the nature of the two ages is described, the one of trial and the other of light and glory; and the duration of time is embraced, the night being this dispensation, and the day the coming age or dispensation. Now if we turn to the Prophets they with one accord term "the day," "His day," "that day," etc., the very period of time in which the Lord comes to judge or reign—to inflict judgments on the nations as well as to sit as "the Judge of Israel"—the entire Millennial era being thus designated. From all this, we are fully warranted to conclude that "the Day of Judgment" simply denotes a time of judgment, and embraces within its limits the Millennium, a long period of time. This is corroborated by the Judgeship of Christ being equivalent to His Kingly rule; by the Millennial era being frequently designated "the day" in which the Judgeship of Christ is to be manifested; by the acts of the King at the commencement, duration, and close of the period, and by the reasons assigned in the Propositions following.

Obs. 7. A few additional illustrations may be in place to strengthen our position, and to show the general analogy of Scripture. In Zech. 14, in "the day" that the Lord and His saints come, when His judgments are poured out upon the nations, and Christ is "King over all the earth," the phrase "in that day" includes not only the entire age, but the acts of Christ preceding and during its continuance, the overthrow of His enemies, the deliverance of His people, and the reign with its results. Joel 3 informs us that "in the day of the Lord" the nations shall be gathered, the mighty ones come down, the nations are to be judged, the people of God to be

delivered, Jerusalem to be exalted, etc. The revelation of Christ as Judge embraces both wrath and mercy—wrath to His enemies, mercy to His saints and Jewish nation, and through them to the spared of the nations. This period of time, called “the day of the Lord,” which the Spirit afterward (as we shall show) more specifically names “the day of the Lord Jesus Christ,” embraces this Judgeship, exhibiting in its acts not merely the exercise of judicial power, but all the attributes of a Sovereign. Zeph. 3 designates “the day” when the Lord shall “rise up to the prey,” when He shall “gather the nations” to pour upon them His anger. “In that day” His “holy mountain” shall be established; “the remnant of Israel” shall be restored and become holy; “the King of Israel, even the Lord, shall be in the midst of thee;” and blessedness and glory are promised “at that time” and “in that day,” such as we find alone in Millennial predictions. Thus the Spirit joins together the Judging and the Day; and we do not feel at liberty to disconnect what is thus united. Finding Jesus revealed as the Judge at the period of the harvest (which is proven to be Pre-Mill.); at the time the last (seventh) trumpet sounds (which is also Pre-Mill.); at the time His Kingdom also comes; at the time His enemies are to be destroyed and His people enjoy a glorious deliverance, etc.; and when we find that to this Judgeship is ascribed the blessedness of that Kingdom and dominion which is to follow; that that Judgeship is described as continuously exercised; that the period of time in which it is exerted is designated according to prophetic usage “the day,” etc.—it is simply to be incredulous and illogical to ascribe to “the Day of Judgment” the ordinary Popish view. We are forbidden to limit and degrade it in this manner, seeing that the results of a continued judging are witnessed in the glory of the Millennium; that the most triumphant (however terrible to the wicked) declarations respecting it, as the means by which all evil shall be rooted out and happiness be restored, are given; that it is the instrumentality by which all the events, so tremendous to the ungodly and so blessed to the righteous, shall be accomplished. This imparts to it a higher, nobler aspect, befitting the descriptions of it, than that of the opposite, prevailing view. In this day the kingly power of Christ is exerted, not in a day of assize, apprehension, terror, awful solemnity arising from mere judicial investigation of character, but in behalf of His own people. This is the testimony of the Prophets, that this day comes for deliverance, for glorious redemption. It is true, that in it the enemies of God shall perish (hence fearful to them), but it is equally true that in it God’s people shall be delivered from those enemies, and be rewarded with peace, joy, etc. In brief, this judgment day or period manifests the Divine Rule of David’s Son and Lord, on David’s throne, and the judgment or rule bestowed upon the saints of the Most High. The Spirit thus gives a sublimity to the administrations of the Judge and of the Judgment Day, making it an object of desire and hope to the righteous, meeting and verifying the predictions concerning it, and binding the promises of God identified with it in a consistent, harmonious union. Our faith accepts of the simple fact that the government in this Coming Kingdom of King Jesus and His saints, which is to subject all to the predicted Theocratic rule and dominion, is designated as “the judgment,” and the period of its exercise is called “the day,” the time, etc. Our faith too receives the additional fact, that it is a covenanted, “appointed” period in which David’s Son is to exhibit both His majesty and power. It is promised to Him as David’s Son, as Son of Man, and if we desire to know when it will occur, what events will transpire, what results will be worked out, what its duration is, etc., we have only to open the Prophets who predict and describe it, without largely drawing on monkish imagination or old paintings to make out a picture of it. The announcement comes to us in the simplest form, that a period of time is appointed in which Jesus will be revealed as the Judge, the King, assume the visible Judgeship or Rulership of the World, and the events connected therewith, such as the resurrection of the saints, the overthrow of enemies, the restoration of the Jewish nation, the subjugation of all people, the binding of Satan, the rewarding of the righteous, the fulfilment of Mill. predictions, etc., indicate a lengthy period. To this opinion the Early Church, which received its interpretation of the prophets from inspired men, bowed, and we find abundant reasons for doing the same, and thus remaining in “the old paths.” It is a precious truth that Christ judges for purposes of Redemption, and that the Judgment Day embraces Redemption in its highest form.*

PROPOSITION 134. Our view of Judgment (and as a consequence that also of the Kingdom) is fully sustained by the passage of Scripture, Matt. 25:31–46.

This passage, employed by our opponents to prove a general, universal assize (the Popish view), is supposed to be the strongest, and wholly incontrovertible. Our argument, therefore, would be incomplete, if we did not bestow upon it special attention, and conclusively show that it forms an irresistible evidence in our favor. Let us take this very Scripture (so much relied on, as hostile to our doctrine) and compare it with other passages referring to God’s revealed purposes at the same period of time, and it will be found in complete harmony with our teaching. To avoid misapprehension, it may be proper to repeat that our doctrine firmly accepts of the truth that all men are to be judged, and that their eternal condition (saving that of the heathen) will depend on their acceptance or rejection of the commands of God in Christ (and their personal application), but we reassert that such a judgment is not necessarily simultaneous, for part of it is Pre-Millennial, part Millennial, and part Post-Millennial. Pre-Millennial, as it affects the righteous, the overthrow of the living wicked, and the carrying into postponement the non-resurrection of the wicked dead until the close of the one thousand years; Millennial, as it affects the establishment of the Kingdom, the restoration of the Jews, the apportioning of positions, the execution and progress of the divine government; Post-Millennial, when “the rest of the dead,” and Satan himself, are judged.*

Obs. 1. Those who apply this passage to a general assize can only do so by taking for granted two suppositions, which are, in order to make out their sense, engrafted upon it. (1) It is supposed that the “all nations” mean “all the generations of men that ever existed;” but this is a mere inference, and, being unproven, is a mere begging of the question. (2) In order to sustain the first supposition, it is conjectured that this necessarily implies a previous resurrection of all the dead; but this also is mere inference, unsupported by a particle of proof.*

Obs. 2. Observe the various particulars of the passage, and its harmony with our position.

1. The context. The intimate connections with the preceding statements of chs. 24 and 25 must be noticed, embracing a series of events from the tribulation of the Jews during the times of the Gentiles down to the Sec. Advent, without giving the slightest hint of a Millennial era prior to the Advent. The shading of trial, the continued and culminated wickedness, the waiting, the probation, the mixed condition of the Church, the prolonged absence of the King, the Advent at a time of unbelief as in the days of Noah—all in this epitome of history is opposed to the notion of a previous existing Millennium. Hence the interpretation given to this Scripture must correspond with the context.

2. The interpretation must naturally connect itself with the preceding thought, for a glance will show that v. 31 is closely allied with it. Now what is that leading idea with which this passage stands associated? It is that of rulership, kingship, an inheriting of a Kingdom; the position in the same being dependent on the use of talents committed to us, bringing more or less of station or complete rejection. Now this kingship, as the analogy of Scripture shows, is Millennial, and therefore any application to Post-Millennial times is certainly erroneous.

3. This Coming of the “Son of Man,” all (excepting a few) admit, refers to His personal Coming (comp. Props. 82 to 84, and 121 to 130). There is only one future Advent of Jesus delineated in the Scriptures, and that is Pre-Millennial.

4. This “Son of Man” shall come in His “glory” (with which compare e.g. Matt. 16:27 and 26:64; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26). This “glory” is asserted in Mill. descriptions, as e.g. Isa. 60:1, 2, 19; 2:19, 21; 35:2; 40:5; 62:2, etc., and therefore fully accords.

5. At this Coming “then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory,” or “upon His glorious throne.” The stress of “then” is indicative that He then—now, at that time—assumes His throne. In the consideration of this throne, then occupied, certainly the covenanted throne belonging to Him as the Son of Man should be regarded. Having passed over this in detail (Props. 49, 81–83, 122, etc.), it is amply sufficient to direct attention to such passages as Matt. 19:28; Rev. 3:21, and to the Millennial predictions which declare that David’s Son shall reign on David’s throne, etc. We only now desire to show that the language is in harmony with our position on covenanted ground.

6. At this Coming, a Kingdom is also exhibited for, v. 34, the righteous inherit a Kingdom (comp. 2 Tim. 4:1; 2 Thess. 1:5; 2 Pet. 1:11). After the delineations of this Kingdom in the Millennial period (demanding the Supernatural to be directly exercised in order to secure its establishment and blessings), and such references as Luke 22:28–30, there should be no difficulty, provided the general tenor of the passage admits, to identify the period indicated.

7. At this Advent, “before Him shall be gathered all nations.” The question before us is this: Does the “all nations” include “the dead,” or only living nations? In deciding this point we have the following: (1). Nothing is said of “the dead.” To say that they are denoted is inferred from the fact that this passage is made—wrongfully—to synchronize with Rev. 20:11–15. (2) The word translated “nations” is never, according to the uniform testimony of critics and scholars, used to designate “the dead,” unless this be a solitary exception. This fact, certainly, ought to influence the student to hesitate in accepting such an alleged exception, without the most positive proof that it really forms one. (3) The word is employed to denote living, existing nations, and almost exclusively “Gentile” nations. (4) The Spirit gives us abundant testimony that precisely such a gathering of living nations shall take place just before the Mill. age commences, and that there shall be both an Advent and judging. Let the reader compare “the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies” of Rev. 19:17–20, “the kings of the earth and of the whole world” gathered of Rev. 16:13–16, the “all flesh” of Isa. 66:15–21, “the nations gathered and kingdoms assembled” of Zeph. 3:8–20, “the mighty men, all the men of war, the Gentiles, all ye heathen gathered” of Joel 3:9–21, etc., and he will find this identical period of time fully presented. (6) National judgments are only poured out upon living, existing nations, and not upon the dead who are devoid of any organization belonging to the idea of nation or state. Nations are punished or rewarded here on the earth Pre-Millennial, as seen e.g. Zech. 14. (7) As there is no statement that any of these nations arose from the dead, so there is none that any part of them descended from heaven to be judged; the language, provided no previous theory is made to influence it, simply describing nations here on the earth, in some way, gathered together at the Sec. Advent. (8) The phrase “all nations” does not by any means include every individual, much less the generations past deceased, as is seen by the usage of Scripture, as e.g. Matt. 28:19; Luke 21:24; Matt. 24:9–14, etc. (9) The test itself, as applied, certainly does not include “all flesh,” much less “all the past dead,” because it only is applicable to adults and not to children, to nations having access to the truth and to believers, and not to barbarous and ignorant nations.

8. The separation, as of sheep from goats, is the same figure used in connection with Millennial predictions, as can be seen in Ezek.

34:17, etc.; Zech. 10:3. That the Mill. era is ushered in by a previous distinguishing between parties and a final parting of them is abundantly shown. (Comp, e.g. Props. 65, 86, 90, 115, 123, etc.).

9. The time of inheriting the Kingdom gives us another decided reason for its Pre-Millennial interpretation. It has been shown in detail, under various Props. (90, 121, 154, etc.), that when the Son of Man comes according to Daniel and others (which is Pre-Mill.), that then the actual possession—the inheritance—of a Kingdom is given to the righteous. We read of no inheriting the Kingdom after the 1000 years, and for the simple reason that the inheritors of a Kingdom have all been previously secured. (Comp. Props. 86, 118, 130, 142, 153, etc.)

10. The inheriting of a “Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world” again favors our position (comp. Prop. 2). For, if it refers to a Kingdom designed for them in the beginning, it must correspond with the covenant and the promises based thereon; or if it applies, that this world when formed was designed and appointed for this Kingdom, then the Second Adamic reign is introduced by this overthrow of wickedness and elevation of the righteous here on the earth. In either case it is a Kingdom over living nations, after a restoration of the Jews, etc., making it a Kingdom just the reverse of that portrayed by those who insist upon a general assize. (Comp. Props. 81–105.)

11. He judges as a King, as a Shepherd; and these things are asserted of the Mill. reign, as e.g. Zech. 14, Ezek. 34:23, etc. (Comp. Prop. 132.)

12. The Pre-Mill. judgment, as we have shown, is not one of barbarous, heathen nations who have not heard the Gospel, as is seen e.g. in Isa. 66:19. If this passage teaches the same judgment, it must correspond with it. This is decisively given in the test of worthiness, for it can only apply to those who had an opportunity to know Christ, and manifest their regard for Him practically through His members. Now all this most accurately corresponds with the condition of the persecuted church, and the character and position of the nations represented to be confederated against Christ, just previous to the Millenium.

13. The test itself is irresistibly in favor of a Pre-Millennial judgment, and under the circumstances advocated by us. Observe the following particulars:

(1) The connection (see preceding 2), with the parable of the talents is obvious, and, without a change, we have a continued illustration of the assignment of rewards in rulership in the future Kingdom. Now the apportionment of stations, rank, authority, is not dependent on appropriating Christ by faith, but as a resultant of such faith, faithfulness in the use of the talents committed to us—every one being judged according to his deeds (comp. Prop. 135). The Saviour, therefore, in accord with the general analogy of the Scripture on the subject, declares that when He comes with His saints in glory to set up His Kingdom, out of the nations those who exhibited a living faith by active deeds of sympathy and assistance shall—with those that preceded them (for the time here delineated is not connected with the first or secret stage of the Advent, but with the last or open Parousia)—inherit (i.e. be kings in) a Kingdom. It is a direct lesson of encouragement to those who live during the period of Antichrist in the persecution of the Church, to exercise charity, for which they shall be rewarded. Hence it follows that the test presented is precisely the one needed to ascertain, not who would be saved (for that is not the train of thought, although connected with it), but who would inherit a Kingdom or gain an actual, real rulership in it. (2) He tells us who at that time, viz., the living “righteous” (for those who died in the tribulation under Antichrist as martyrs, also obtain Kingship or inherit, Rev. 20:4–6), shall thus inherit (not unbelievers, but “sheep” and “righteous,” expressions employed only in behalf of believers). And this inheriting results from their believing in His promises and appropriating them in practical obedience, as e.g. Matt. 10:40–42; Mark 9:41, etc. (3) The “my brethren” (whether it apply to living and dead, i.e. those who survived, or perished in the persecution) shows that saints were ministered unto by fellow-believers, as enjoined e.g. Heb. 6:10. “For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have showed toward His name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.” (4) This exhibition of practical charity is obligatory upon the believer, and the entire absence of it, as evidenced in mere professors and unbelievers, results not merely in loss of rulership, but in sad punishment and the cutting off from “eternal life,” because it forms the most positive proof that a living faith in Jesus, which produces “the mind,” etc., which was in Him, is lacking. (5) This divine utterance being designed for instruction and to urge to deeds of charity, the idea is prominently and forcibly set forth that anything thus done to a believer is done to Christ Himself. The manner of presenting this only enforces His previous teaching, Matt. 10:40–42. (6) The saints, true believers, who bring forth good deeds, are the only ones who inherit this Kingdom. Outside of this passage this is uniformly taught (as e.g. Rom. 8:17; James 2:5; Col. 3:24; 1 Thess. 2:12; 2 Thess. 1:5; 2 Pet. 1:11; 1 Cor. 6:9, etc.), and, therefore, we must interpret to maintain a proper unity—viz., that those who inherit are saints. This inheriting is true of the past saints, the martyr saints, the living saints, who shall be accounted worthy of it. (7) We are not at liberty, in order to remove supposed difficulties, to make a variety of classes or introduce other parties than those expressly mentioned. The passage brings before us the living nations, and these (Gentile nations) are divided into two parties by the divine test. The “brethren” referred to, as the usage (e.g. John 20:17; Heb. 2:11, etc.) of the word uniformly teaches, with the additional emphasis on “My” (Luke 8:21; Matt. 12:50, etc.), are, not the Jews (as Kelly, etc.), but Christians, believers in Jesus, and may refer to martyrs, deceased saints, and living believers before Him.

14. Our position is confirmed by the condition in which the children of God are found just previous to, and at, this open Parousia,

viz., one of sore trial and severe persecution (comp. Props. 160, 161, and 162). It will indeed be a time in which “the righteous,” “the sheep,” the “brethren” of Christ, shall, under the terrible pressure of Antichrist, be “a hungered,” “thirsty,” “strangers,” “naked,” “sick,” and “in prison.” This is a judgment of believers under trial and of their persecutors (as other passages when compared unmistakably show), and Jesus selects it as a salient illustration how the principle in the Parable of the Talents will be evidenced at that period. Many of our opponents freely admit this Pre-Mill. persecution of the Church, with which we, however, link the personal Sec. Advent, and thus introduce the requisite harmony between the predictions.

15. The wicked are removed (“depart from me”) from the presence of the King. This accords with Pre-Mill. predictions, that the wicked shall thus be rooted out, etc. (thus e.g. Rev. chs. 14 and 19, Mal. 4, Ps. 37, etc.). Besides this, although Edwards, and others, have Jesus only to appear in the air, and not on the earth (with which only compare Zech. 14:4, etc.), and are very positive in asserting that the King immediately after this general assize returns to the third heaven, yet we find nothing in the passage (and nowhere else in the Bible) of such a return. The Scriptures leave, at His Sec. Advent, David’s Son here, just as the covenant demands, removing the wicked from Him.

16. The wicked are represented as cast into “a fire.” Now precisely this will occur at the Pre-Mill. Advent of Jesus. The reader is urged to compare e.g. on this point, Rev. 19:20; Dan. 7:10, 11; Isa. 66:15, 16, 24; Mal. 4:1–3, etc. Fire, as indicating the vengeance of God, is frequently predicted as belonging to the introduction of the Kingdom or the Mill. blessedness.

17. The student will especially notice, what inevitably decides this Scripture to be an irresistible argument on our side, viz., that this fire is “prepared for the devil and his angels.” At this Advent of the King, the fire is only “prepared” for them, and while some others are cast in, they (the devil and his angels) are not then cast into it. This extremely and intentionally guarded expression of the Saviour most fully corroborates our Pre-Mill. application, since in Rev. 20:10 Satan is cast into this very fire (thus “prepared” for Him), in which the wicked were placed before the one thousand years; for attention is called to the fact that it is the same fire by adding, “where the beast and the false prophet are.” With which period (Pre-or Post-Mill.) does the language of Jesus correspond? The only consistent answer is, certainly, that the Pre-Mill. one must be denoted; for after the Millennium only does Satan and his angels bear company with those accounted worthy of being cast into “the lake of fire” a thousand years previously.

18. The destiny is unalterable. At the close of the Mill. era, these representatives of wickedness continue in “the fire” (under the vengeance of God) into which they were cast, as is seen by comparing Rev. 19:20 with Rev. 20:10. The non-inheriting of the Kingdom, their doom, is irrevocably fixed.

19. The reward of “the righteous” is eternal. Thus, in the Mill. predictions, immortality, perpetual freedom from evil, continued Kingship, never-ending glory and blessedness, are predicated of the saints.

Thus in every particular a remarkable correspondence is found between this passage and the Pre-Mill. prophecies, so that, on the strength of analogy, perfect accordance with all the utterances of the Spirit, we can justly claim it as corroborative of our doctrine—essential, in fact, for the introduction of the Kingdom. The saints that come with Jesus, as other passages show, participate in this judgment, for they have obtained a priority of rulership or Judgeship, and the intended dealing of King Jesus with the nations, as preparatory to the establishment of His Kingdom, is thus briefly and powerfully stated in the line of thought suggested by the manner in which rulership is secured in it.

Obs. 3. If it be thought that the Parable of Tares and Wheat teach otherwise (a general, universal judgment), the reply is ready, that the time of the harvest (which we show to be Pre-Mill.) fixes the period of fulfilment, while the separation is not predicated of the dead tares or the past ripened wheat. Dr. Brown finds a defect in the parable because it is unable to express the idea of a universal judgment including the past dead; we, on the other hand, find no defect, but accurate correspondence with the predicted realization. The parable informs us nothing of the tares and wheat of former dispensations, nothing respecting the heathen, nothing concerning the separation of righteous and wicked at death, but refers us to the operation of the truth presented during the period between the two Advents, to a continuous intermingling of tares and wheat which shall be manifested when the harvest comes, and to the separation of the then existing tares and wheat at the time of the harvest. Neither Hades nor Heaven is harvested, but this world, as it shall exist at the open Advent of the great Reaper. There is no intimation that either former tares or wheat are raised up to be mixed and then separated, while the burning of existing “tares” and the elevation of then living “wheat” coincides with abundant Pre-Mill. prophecy. The consistency of our doctrine is seen in this: that after the one thousand years are ended the dead tares—“the rest of the dead,” who “lived not again until the thousand years were finished,” are also raised up and their destiny awarded.*

Obs. 4. Having thus a judgment of living nations, if the dead generally are to be also judged, we should have, to give completeness, a portraiture of such a judgment of the dead. Now the judgment of Rev. 20:11–15, after the one thousand years, is not one of living nations, but pre-eminently of “the dead.” The dead only are mentioned, and who ever adds “living nations” to it (in order to make out a universal judgment) is most certainly adding to the prophecy. Precisely such a judgment is required to fill out in due proportions what otherwise would be lacking, the order of the Divine procedure in the administration of justice. For, if we had no such direct prophecy of the judgment of “the dead” at the ending of the Mill. era, it would justly be regarded as a grave defect in our system of

faith. With it, we have a consonant whole.*

Obs. 5. The disciples to whom this passage was addressed, preachers of the Kingdom and specially instructed, held to the Jewish views of the Judgment at the Coming of the Messiah, to be followed by a glorious Messianic reign under the restored Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom. The modern Popish view of judgment, followed by a winding up of all sublunary affairs, was something that they did not believe, and, impelled by covenant and prophecy, could not possibly credit. Now the language of Jesus—corresponding with the language of the prophets respecting the gathering of the nations and judgment at the Coming of the Lord—is admirably adapted to confirm them in their Jewish views, being in strict accordance therewith, introducing no element to discredit the same, or to render it doubtful. That it put no hindrance to their belief, but confirmed it; that it only strengthened them in the hope of a following Messianic Kingdom, is self-evident from their expressed faith (as e.g. Acts 1:6). Surely if the prediction is such as many moderns contend for, it ought to have had an opposite tendency. Then again, if the modern prevailing view (which we oppose) is the correct one, and is so easily adducible (as affirmed) from the passage, how comes it that all the early churches. East and West (Props. 75, 76), entertained our doctrine and rejected this one? Surely the Popish notion ought to have had very early advocates, if it be the correct one, seeing that the doctrine of the Judgment was a familiar one with the Primitive Christians, so that Polycarp (Epis. Phil.) appeals to it: “Who of you are ignorant of the judgment of God? Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?” This question suggests the difficulty to our opponents, which none of them have answered, viz., if all the saints are to assist in judging the world, how can they be judged simultaneously (as they infer from this passage) with the wicked—all men? The Early Church doctrine involved no such glaring inconsistencies.*

Obs. 6. At the conclusion (Props. 132 and 133) of a subject so important, it is proper to suggest what is requisite to neutralize the comparison of Scripture thus instituted, and indisputably prove the position of our opponents. 1. A specific passage, which teaches that there is but one general judgment. 2. A passage which directly affirms that all men, both the dead and living, will be judicially judged at the same time. 3. To show that the Bible statement, that all men will be judged, is not consistently met, if a judgment at various times includes all men. 4. A passage which asserts that the judgment of all men, dead or living, is after the Millennium. 5. To show that the judgment unto eternal life (resulting from faith in Jesus) is identical with a judgment according to works. 6. To prove that a Pre-Mill. resurrection (which some of them, as Prof. Stuart, fully admit, while others affirm a slight precedence in time of the righteous) does not necessarily include a prior judgment. 7. To show that the Jewish and Early Christian view of the Judgeship and of the Judgment Day is erroneous, and inconsistent with the prophets. 8. To indicate how it came to pass, that under the immediate teaching of the Apostles and the teachers appointed by them, the Primitive Church, almost universally, taught our doctrine. 9. To point out the Scriptures which affirm that God has revealed no order of time in the judgment of mankind, as prophecy predicts. 10. To explain how the saints (being included in their “all”) are both judged, and, according to promise, judging others at the same time. 11. That, according to their theory, the righteous are judged and rewarded at death, and then, after a long interval, must again be judicially tried; which requires confirmation from Scripture. 12. How passages simply affirming a judgment, or stating that Christ will deny, be ashamed of, and disown the wicked, or alluding to the rewarding of righteous and wicked at His Coming, or implying the certainty of judgment, or teaching, without expressing the order, the several destinies of the good and bad, are sufficient to invalidate our position, seeing that all these are firmly held by us. Such are some of the things which, we think, have not yet been met in the spirit of fairness and candor; and our opinion is amply confirmed by the record found in books, articles, etc., written against us, which assume their doctrine proven by quoting an abundance of passages relating to the judgment (which we also receive), and containing no manner of specifications how or when they shall be verified.*

PROPOSITION 135. The doctrine of the Kingdom in full accord with the Scriptural doctrine of the judgment of believers.

The Theocratic Kingdom contemplating for its rulers, associated with the Christ, the saints, must necessarily make provision for the same by a present and future judgment of believers. By this method the requisite qualifications for future kingship and priesthood are made manifest.

Obs. 1. It is self-evident that any one accounted worthy of the better resurrection—that pre-eminent res. alone attributed to the righteous—and any one deemed holy enough for a translation at the Sec. Advent, must, in view of such a decided preference shown to them, be the subject of an antecedent judgment. How else can it be known that they possess the qualifications requisite for such honor and blessedness? Both the resurrection and translation are represented as a sudden, instantaneous change, and demand a previous preparedness for the same. The same is true of the saints coming with Jesus at His open Parousia, for “all the saints” (Zech. 14:5) come with Him. To attain this honor, an antecedent estimate of character must have preceded. So also the saints are to be associated with Jesus in the judgment of the world (1 Cor. 6:2), for “this honor have all the saints” (Ps. 149:9). This Judgeship necessarily implies the previous judgment of these saints in order to evidence their fitness for so high and responsible a position.*

Obs. 2. Pre Millenarians firmly hold that all men, both the righteous and wicked, will be judged, not only in this life but in the future.

The passages teaching this are numerous and emphatic, such e.g. as Heb. 9:27; Rom. 2:2–16; Matt. 12:36; 1 Pet. 4:4, 5, etc. But, as already shown, there is an order in this judgment, just as there is an order in the resurrection. Take the expression “As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment,” and we have the universality of judicial action asserted, but nothing as to the order after death, the length of time elapsing, etc. To obtain a correct view of the latter, there must be a careful comparison of all the Scriptures relating to the subject.

Obs. 3. Such a comparison reveals to us a singular statement, which at first thought might be deemed contradictory, but really presents a wonderful harmony, viz., it is said that believers shall not be judged hereafter, and again it is asserted that they will be judged. Now if we comprehend concerning what things they are not judged or are judged, a beautiful consistency runs through the language, deeply impressive. Let us turn first to the declarations that they are not judged. Jesus positively declares, John 5:24, “Verily, verily I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” A multitude of critics and writers point out the fact that the original word rendered “condemnation” is “judgment,” and, therefore, properly translate, “shall not come into judgment.” The context shows that the bestowment of eternal life through the resurrecting power given to the Son, was the immediate subject discussed, and this most emphatic reference to believers then is, that they are not to come into judgment in order to decide whether they are worthy or not of eternal life. That is already decided when they hear and believe, for every believer is at present “justified” (e.g. Rom. 5:1, 2; Acts 13:39; Gal. 2:16, etc.), which term is indicative of judicial action. This, of course, requires a continuing life of faith, evidenced by its fruits (Rom. 2:7, and 6:22; Rev. 2:7, etc.), for perseverance evidences the sincerity of faith and the justification experienced. The resurrection of the sheep belonging to Jesus’ fold unto eternal life is secured (for e.g. John 10:26–29), for they follow Him, He knows them, gives to them eternal life, and they shall never perish, for no one is able to pluck them out of His hand. The power of bestowing eternal life is lodged in Him (John 17:2, 3), “and this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent.” Being justified by faith we are assured of eternal life; the fruits of the Spirit, the work of the spirit, the abiding of the spirit (Rom. 8:11), is a testimony of its bestowal, for in Christ Jesus there is (Rom 8:1) no condemnation. He has said, John 6:37–40, “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of Him who sent me, And this is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise Him up at the last day.” The multitude of assurances respecting the safety and salvation of the believer, the deep self-consciousness of personal religious experience confirmatory of this, and especially the dying grace and hope inspired in the believer at the most solemn and trying crisis of his career—all testify to his justification and his right, through Christ, to eternal life.*

Obs. 4. In reference to the ultimate salvation of the true believer there can be no doubt, for has it not been said, Rom. 8:31–34, “If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, out delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all thing? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?” And this culminates in the positive declarations that nothing can separate us from the love of Christ; that we are “more than conquerors” through Him. Now assuredly this constant abiding in the love of God, in union with His Son, is indicative of a justified state, and becomes thus the most reasonable evidence that such are not to be brought into judgment to ascertain whether they have accepted the terms (e.g. John 3:16, 18, 36) which entitle them to everlasting life. For, Acts 13:39, “By Him, all that believe are justified from all things.” The “Book of Remembrance” (Mal. 3:16, 17) has recorded their names, and God “will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him,” because they are His “jewels” or “special treasure.” Such are written or enrolled in heaven (Heb. 12:23), in “the Lamb’s Book of Life” (Phil. 4:3; Rev. 13:8), and in the consciousness of their “names” being thus inscribed (Luke 10:20), they are to “rejoice.” All this, of course, is based on an antecedent judgment.*

Obs. 5. On the other hand, believers are also represented as judged in the future, not as to their worthiness to receive “eternal life,” not as to their forming a co-heirship with Jesus (for all this, owing to their union with Christ and subsequent justification, has already been decided), but to ascertain the exact position of rulership, Kingship, and priesthood, to which they are justly entitled. No intelligent writer on Eschatology exists that does not fully admit that numerous passages (such e.g. as Luke 19:17, 19; Matt. 25:21, 23; 1 Cor. 15:41, etc.) distinctively teach a gradation of rank, power, authority, etc., even among the saints in the world to come. Aside from the reasonableness and justice of the same, the Theocratic ordering necessarily entails such differences among the redeemed. Now such distinctions are not based upon faith in, and union with, Christ (for all believers possess these, which entitle them to the blessed eternal life), but upon the works, actions, conduct, life brought forth by this faith and union, “knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance,” Col. 3:24. Let the following points be observed: (1) “Every one of us shall give account of himself to God,” Rom. 14:10, 12, “for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat (or throne) of Christ.” This includes, of course, all believers. (2) This scrutiny extends to “every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the Day of Judgment,” Matt. 12:36, and “the secrets of men,” Rom. 2:16, shall be judged, etc. This evidences the real state of heart, for “the judgment of God is according to truth,” Rom. 2:2. (3) The reward shall be proportionate (which is not eternal life, for all attain unto it) to the works. Thus e.g. “God, without respect of persons, judgeth according to every man’s work,” 1 Pet. 1:17; “God will render to every man according to his works,” Rom. 2:6; “Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his

works shall be,” Rev. 22:12 (with which compare Rev. 2:23; Eph. 6:8; Gal. 6:7; 2 Cor. 5:10; Matt. 16:27, etc.). Surely on the common principle of justice, apostles, martyrs, reformers, men eminent for labors and sufferings for Christ, men abounding in good works, should possess a distinction above those who were less fruitful, less devoted, less engaged in service.*

Obs. 6. The judgment then of saints in the future is not one unto eternal life, but one pertaining to the position to be occupied in the Theocratic Kingdom, a distinction which is often implied, as e.g. in Matt. 19:28–30, where we have judgment, already passed concerning the apostles that follow Jesus, when it is said, “ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;” and then, in reference to others, it is asserted that whatever sacrifices are made in behalf of Jesus such shall both “receive a hundredfold and shall inherit eternal life.” So in the next chapter (20:21–28) the general principle is laid down that future greatness in the Kingdom will be proportionate to present labor and suffering for the truth. (Comp. Luke 22:24–30.) Even “a cup of cold water” (Matt. 10:42; Mark 9:41) shall be rewarded. And this view is fully corroborated by the fact that the Sec. Advent, which introduces this judging or assigning of positions in accordance with works, is spoken of as “the blessed hope,” something in which we should rejoice, comfort ourselves (e.g. 1 Pet. 1:7, 13; Tit. 2:13; 1 Pet. 4:13, etc.), which we could not do if a judicial trial, upon which our entire destiny depended, were before us. It is not for those who are accounted “heirs according to the hope of eternal life,” Tit. 3:7, “heirs of salvation,” Heb. 1:14, to be thus judged, excepting as it affects the position of the “heirs” in the inheritance.*

Obs. 7. A passage most decisive and worthy of serious consideration is the one found in 1 Cor. 3:10–15. Here we have the following evidence corroborative of the correctness of our view. (1) This is a judgment exclusively of believers, who build upon the foundation laid, Jesus. (2) All who have this foundation and build upon it are saved. (3) But some, in securing this salvation, “suffer loss,” while others “shall receive a reward.” (4) The reception of reward is conditioned on the fact that they build precious, enduring material on this foundation. (5) The endurance of loss is caused by the worthless material placed on the foundation. (6) “Every man’s work shall be made manifest,” for it will be tested “of what sort it is.” This is only illustrating the principle previously (v. 8) announced, “every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor.” Now, to receive a reward for building “gold, silver, and precious stones” on this foundation is not to attain simply eternal life, for those who also build “wood, hay, and stubble” on it secure the same, but, following the Scripture analogy of faith, it must relate to position in rulership and to a corresponding loss in rank. The only rational, consistent interpretation is that which here finds that one, owing to faithfulness, etc., obtains a more elevated rank, a higher reward than another. All obtain a glorious prize (1 Cor. 9:24), but not all the highest prize (Phil. 3:14); all obtain an entrance into the Kingdom, but one a more “abundant entrance” (1 Pet. 1:11) than others.*

Obs. 8. It is in virtue of this future judgment according to works, that believers are so urgently pressed to good works. God sees how largely their future glory and honor depend upon the character now formed, that repeatedly and perseveringly, yea constantly, this is brought to their attention. Take e.g. Col. 3:4, 5, 8, 9, 24; 1 Thess. 3:12, 13, and 5:4–8; Tit. 2:12, 13; 1 Pet. 1:7–15; 2 Pet. 3:11, 12, and many others, and they show God’s deep interest in our future welfare, that as “little children, we may abide in Christ, that when He shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed at His Coming” (1 John 2:8); that “our love may be made perfect, so that we may have boldness in the Day of Judgment” (1 John 4:17). Good works now glorify God (Matt. 5:16), qualify for usefulness and happiness (2 Tim. 2:21; Tit. 3:8), etc., and they do not lose these essentials in the world to come; for, sanctifying unto honor and making us the more meet for the Master’s use, they contribute to glorify the Father, Son, and Spirit. And no one can plead inability to perform them, since “God is able to make all grace abound toward you, that ye always, having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work” 2 Cor. 9:8 (comp. Phil. 2:12; 2 Thess. 2:17; 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; Heb. 13:20, 21; Eph. 2:10, etc.). We may rest assured that “God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labor of love” (Heb. 6:10), but will abundantly, through His wonderful grace, verify His promises, “glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good” (Rom. 2:10). Therefore, Gal. 6:9, “Let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not;” 2 John 8, “Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought (gained), but that we receive a full reward.”*

Obs. 9. A prominent doctrine of Pre-Millenarianism is the reign of the saints with Jesus when the Millennial Kingdom is set up (Prop. 154). The saints judge with Christ, inherit together with Him, etc., and for this purpose are raised up and translated; then (as will be shown hereafter) the Kingship and priesthood is assigned to them, and afterward they come with Jesus in the open Parousia. They are themselves “Judges” in the great “Day of Judgment” (e.g. 1 Cor. 6:2, 3), and this necessitates a previous, antecedent judgment of themselves. Hence, as already noticed, certain passages of Scripture exclusively refer to the righteous—to a judgment specially relating to the saints. This is not a judgment unto condemnation, but one relating to position, and will be a fulfilment of e.g. 2 Cor. 5:10. And yet, considering such passages as Matt. 22:11–14; Luke 13:23–30; Matt. 7:21–23, it may be true (what many affirm) that also mere professors will at the same time be rejected. But whether this includes professors of former ages or those then living is another question. As the dead in Christ are only raised at the Coming of Jesus (the rest of the dead not until the close of the thousand years), and then also only those accounted worthy, are translated, it is, perhaps, the most prudent and consistent to confine this rejection to living professors, as is fully illustrated e.g. in the warnings given by Jesus respecting the condition of parties at the Second Advent, as realized in the position of the Ten Virgins. We are told that there will be a judgment “of quick and dead,” Acts 10:42, of “the quick and the dead at His appearing and His Kingdom,” 2 Tim. 4:1; 1 Pet. 4:5. The “dead,” as we have seen, follow an order: all the dead are ultimately judged, some preceding the Millennial age, the rest after that age. So with the living or

“quick,” some are judged at His appearing, others in His Kingdom; for we have the Judgment of “the quick” who are translated, of “the quick” under Antichrist, of “the quick” pertaining to the Jewish nation, and of “the quick” embracing the Gentile nations. The general affirmation of a judgment including “the quick and the dead” is thus carried out, and we must not forget that it also comprises the judgment of “the quick” existing in the Church at the time of the Advent. In the judgment of “the dead” there is a discrimination apparent in the order of resurrection, and in the judgment of “the quick” the same discrimination is manifested in the translation of some, in the delivery of the Church and the Jewish nation from the power of Antichrist, in the overthrow of all enemies, in the exaltation of the Jewish nation, etc., running in and through the Millennial age.*

PROPOSITION 136. The doctrine of the Kingdom in agreement with the doctrine of the intermediate state.

The intermediate state between death and the Second Advent is such as to confirm our doctrinal position, because the Scripture statements clearly and unmistakably teach a detention of the saints from the promised inheritance and reward.*

Obs. 1. The Propositions that have preceded show that any view which unduly exalts the intermediate state or condition after death must correspondingly depreciate the Second Advent as “The Blessed Hope,” the resurrection as completed Redemption, the covenant as still to be verified, and the prophecies as realized on earth. The prominence heaped upon the condition of saints after death (so different from the Scriptural position, which says so little respecting it), and the extravagant eulogies attached to it, are practically leading multitudes to make little or nothing of the Advent, the resurrection, the covenant, and the prophecies. If we are to credit the many statements made, then the latter can make no improvement in the condition of believers, for after death such (we are informed) are crowned, rewarded, inherit, etc. Our doctrinal position enters a protest against this perversion, and to sustain such an averment confidently appeals to the Scriptural teaching and that of the Early Church. The postponement of the Kingdom to the Sec. Coming, the inheriting only at its manifestation, the design of the present dispensation, the Pre-Mill. resurrection and its recompense, the rewards connected with a restored glorious Theocratic Kingdom here on the earth, the time for the ample fulfilment of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, and other related points, only find a unity in supporting the same, if the condition of saints during this intermediate period is one in which they are represented as not crowned, as not rewarded, and as not inheriting, but that (whatever their actual state as to conscious happiness) they are still imperfect as to realized Redemption, and waiting for the Advent and resurrection for a completed restoration to forfeited blessings and exaltation to Kingship and priesthood. The reader can readily see that this is an important feature in the argument, and that if the Scriptures sustain us in the affirmation that they are imperfect and waiting, we add another link to our chain of evidence.*

Obs. 2. The Scriptures bearing on this subject are decided. Thus e.g. the glory with Christ is thus expressed: Col. 3:4, “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye appear with Him in glory.” (So “praise, honor, and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ,” 1 Pet. 1:7; “grace that shall be brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ,” 1 Pet. 1:13; “glad also with exceeding joy,” “when His glory shall be revealed,” 1 Pet. 4:13, etc.) The being fashioned like unto Christ is thus declared: “Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doeth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is,” 1 John 3:2 (comp. Phil. 3:21; Rom. 8:17–23, etc.). The time of inheriting is thus specified: Matt. 25:31–34; Col. 3:4, 24; 1 Pet. 1:3–7, 13, when the Son of man is revealed in His glory. The rest is thus given: 2 Thess. 1:7, “God will give you rest, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven” (comp. Prop. 143). The mansions are given, John 14:2, 3, when “I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also” (comp. Prop. 170). The “new heavens and new earth” are still future, and linked with the Sec. Advent, e.g. 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1 (comp. Props. 148–151). While perseverance unto death secures a crown (Rev. 2:10), yet the time when the crown itself is given is thus stated: 1 Pet. 5:4, “When the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away” (comp. when Paul, and all others, receive their crown, 2 Tim. 4:8). The period of rewarding is thus explicitly described: Matt. 16:27, “For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works” (comp. Rom. 2:6, 16; Rev. 22:12, and 11:18; Luke 14:14, etc.). Thus the entire tenor of the Scripture is, as our position demands, an overleaping of the intermediate state, as if it were not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed at the Coming again of Jesus; and a positive asserting of rewarding, crowning, inheriting, etc., at that time. We dare not reverse the order thus laid down, and any theory which requires such a transposition is most certainly defective.*

Obs. 3. Other Scriptures confirm the imperfect and waiting condition of the saints. Thus e.g. in Heb. 11:39, 40—after the apostle had enumerated a long list of ancient worthies, some deceased for many centuries and others more recent, but all in this intermediate state—he says of them: “And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.” Here it is positively asserted: (1) that not having received the promise (which refers to the promised inheritance, as shown e.g. v. 13, comp. with Gal. 3:18, etc.—comp. Prop. 49), it is still future to them; (2) that in their present condition they are not “perfect,” i.e. enjoy the blessings of a full Redemption as promised; (3) that this perfectness or completeness of realization of faith in God’s promises is to be attained in connection with believers in Christ

(who also receive the promise by faith, but under increased light, divine teaching, etc.); (4) that all believers, ancient and modern, Pre-and Post-Christian, are to be made perfect or complete at the same time, i.e. experience the completeness of salvation. (Some, as Barnes, apply this "perfect" to the completion of Revelation as a system, but this is not the subject discussed; the reference to the non-reception of the promise demands an interpretation of the "perfect" in a realization of the promise by themselves personally.) The saints after death are represented as hoping and waiting for greater blessings (Rev. 6:9, 10, 11, comp. with 20:4–6), and it is in view of this that the apostles, when comforting the bereaved, do not dwell on the intermediate state, but refer such for consolation to the period when Redemption is completed, as e.g. 1 Thess. 4:13–18. And it is because of this still imperfect and waiting nature of the period between death and the Advent, that the apostles, in the midst of trials and sufferings, overleap the intermediate, and exhort to patience unto the Coming of the Lord, e.g. James 5:7.*

Obs. 4. In the very nature of the case there must be an incompleteness of salvation during this period, because both soul and body constitute the person redeemed, and so long as "the redemption of the body," Rom. 8:23, is not experienced, an imperfect state must exist. Besides this, the forfeited blessings, such as the restored earthly Paradise, the dominion over the earth, the absolute victory over death, are not realized in it. And in the promised blessings of glorification, rulership on the earth, association with Jesus in His inheritance and glory, none of these are experienced, being, as we have seen, always combined, as a resultant, with the Sec. Advent.*

Obs. 5. Another distinctive and remarkable feature corroborates our position. Every writer on the subject of the intermediate state confesses that no attempt is made in any place whatever to describe it. The various theories and descriptions respecting it are drawn from inferences, and the admission is fully made by writers of all classes (who hold to a future personal Sec. Advent), that the eye of faith and the heart of hope is fixed, not so much on the condition after death as to the condition after the Advent. Now why such a procedure? The key lies in this simple fact, viz., that the intermediate state (whatever it may be) has no relationship whatever to the fulfilment of covenant and prophecy pertaining to Redemption, and consequently is not portrayed.*

Obs. 6. The Early Church doctrine, established under the direct auspices of the apostles, and the elders appointed by them, was, over against Gnosticism and other errors, universally held as follows: that the hope of the believer was in the Sec. Advent (expected speedy), at which period the inheriting of the Kingdom, the crowning and rewarding was located. In the intermediate state it was held that there was a non-fulfilment of covenant promises, the realization of which was allied with the Sec. Coming of Jesus. Much was made of the Sec. Advent, the resurrection of the saints, and the resultant glory, so that in Eschatology these things were pre-eminently prominent—a prominence unfortunately undermined by the Alexandrian school and overthrown by the Papacy. Now how can we possibly account for the Early Church view, given under divine auspices, on so important a matter, unless it be the correct one, sustained as it is by a consistent appeal to Scripture?*

Obs. 7. The Jewish view must be considered by the student. This, as stated by numerous authorities, was decided, viz., that the Patriarchs and their deceased descendants, that all who had died true Israelites, were only to be raised to glory and covenanted promises at the Coming of the Messiah. Whatever differences of opinion existed as to the actual condition of dead ones, all were united in the common view that at the Advent of the promised David's Son, then, and then only, would the promises of God respecting a glorious Salvation be completed. The abundance of quotations already given under previous Propositions fully show this faith. But now observe that this identical Jewish faith is incorporated in the New Test. and in the Early Church, with this difference, that what the Jews attributed to the First Advent of the Messiah, the New Test. and Early Church applied to the Second Advent of Jesus the Messiah.*

Obs. 8. While it is true that our argument is not affected one way or the other, no matter what theory of the intermediate state is held (provided only that the non-fulfilment of the covenant promises, the inheriting, crowning, and rewarding, is conceded)—the third heaven theory of the multitude, the spheres of Origen, the intermediate state of Stilling, Hahn, etc., the underground world of Storrs, etc.—yet it may be proper, in this connection, to point out that if this intermediate state is one of detention, if it is intermistic and incomplete, a certain incongruity exists in locating it in the third heaven. Rejecting Romish Purgatory and Cameron's (Future State) prayer for the dead as unscriptural; without attempting to explain the actual place and condition of the saints which the Bible leaves indefinite and unexplained (saving in general terms expressive of security of Redemption and blessedness), it may be sufficient to direct attention to the Primitive Church view as presented by Justin Martyr (Dial. Tryp. c. 80): "If you meet with some who are called Christians" (i.e. Gnostics) "who ... dare calumniate the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that at death their souls are received up into heaven, do not regard them as Christians." This, as Hudson (Debt and Grace, p. 254) has well observed, is "the more remarkable because he had been a Platonist." Irenæus (Contra Hæres, 1. 5, c. 31, § 2), thus opposes the Gnostics: "How shall not they be confounded who say that the Underworld (inferos) is this world of ours, and their inner man, on leaving the body here, ascends the supercelestial place?" "The souls of His (Christ's) disciples also, for whom the Lord did these things, go away into an unseen place appointed them by God, and there abide until the resurrection which they await. Then receiving bodies and rising entire, that is, bodily, as the Lord also arose, they come thus to the vision of God." Others, as Polycarp (Epis. Phil.), speak of "the place due and promised," and Tertullian (On the Soul, On Paradise, and On the Res.) asserts that the souls are "detained in safe keeping in Hades until the day of the Lord," "that all souls are

compelled into the Underworld” (although the love of martyrdom and its eulogy made an exception as stated by Tertullian: “No one, on leaving the body, dwells immediately with the Lord, except he who, by the prerogative of martyrdom, shall go to Paradise instead of the Underworld.” The only key to Paradise is your blood”). Such a doctrine of detention and of non-introduction to heaven itself, in view of the prevailing philosophy and the earnest desire of believers to secure Redemption, could not have arisen and become so extended unless it were derived from apostolic teaching. It is, therefore, the most prudent to avoid a dogmatic expression as to place, seeing how largely the Early Church, which one should suppose, owing to nearness to the apostles, ought to know the truth, if revealed, differs from modern conceptions.*

Obs. 9. We insist upon it that the intermediate state, expressed by the terms Hades and Sheol, continues down not only to the Second Advent, but to the end of the Mill. age. For it is only (Rev. 20:13, 14) after the close of the thousand years and little season that the realm of the dead, through the power of Jesus, is utterly removed. (Comp. Revision, Variorum, etc.) While some are removed from it, and reign with Christ, etc., others are kept in it until this final period. Hence, we cannot, without violence, allow a change to have been introduced at the First Advent, viz., that saints since then are directly taken to heaven, and therefore do not now enter Hades. Such a view is opposed to the general analogy of the Scriptures, which makes every believer to follow the humiliation of the Master, and like Him enter Hades; it multiplies the prayer of faith given to every believer (e.g. in Ps.) for deliverance from Hades; it makes the distinguishing characteristic of Jesus at His Coming, as having “the keys of Hades,” of no personal interest to the believer. One passage alone is decisive of two truths, viz., that the saints in Hades are not in heaven, and that believers at the future res. of the saints are still in Hades, and that is, 1 Cor. 15:54, 55, “I will redeem them from the hand of Hades, I will ransom them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues; O Hades, I will be thy destruction.”*

PROPOSITION 137.—This doctrine of the Kingdom sustained by the phrase “the world to come.”

If we find this phrase employed by the Jews to designate a particular period of time, and if it is adopted by the apostles, without the slightest hint as to a change in its meaning, it is fair and just to conclude that in the Apostles’ estimation it continued to retain the meaning ascribed to it by the Jews.

Obs. 1. Let us briefly consider in what sense the phrase, “the world to come” was used by the Jews. Prof. Bush (Anas. p. 136) says: “ ‘The judgment of the great day,’ the period of ‘the world to come,’ is that period which in the Jewish Christology was identical with the reigning and judging supremacy of the Messiah.” He quotes Lightfoot in confirmation, and adds from the Sohar, fol. 81, “In the world to come the holy blessed God will vivify the dead and raise them from their dust,” etc., and then refers to Pococke (Porta Mosis, Not. Miscel. p. 166) who says, that R. Saadias maintains that “the resurrection is to take place during the Messiah’s reign on the earth, and so that the promise of the dead Israelites being brought out of their sepulchres is to be accomplished in this world or age, and that we are not to suppose that it pertains to another; consequently the prediction of Daniel respecting the many that sleep in the dust, with various other Scriptures, is to be fulfilled in the time of salvation, a phrase entirely equivalent to the days of the Messiah.” “So it is said in Toreth Adam, fol. 105, that the day of judgment will commence, sub initium dierum resurrectionis, at the beginning of the days of the resurrection.” (Comp. Prop. 133.) According to Buxtorf, as quoted by Barnes on Heb. 2:5, it was employed by the Jews to denote “the world which is to exist after this world is destroyed, and after the resurrection of the dead, when souls shall be again united to their bodies,” or “the days of the Messiah, when He shall reign on the earth.” The Targum of Palestine (Dr. Etheridge’s Transl.) on Balaam’s prophecy has: “If the house of Israel kill me with the sword, then, it is made known to me, I shall have no portion in the world to come; nevertheless, if I may but die the death of the true! O that my last end may be as the least among them.” The student will find additional references to the opinion that “the world to come” referred to the reign of Messiah after the resurrection in Lightfoot’s works, Wetstein, Schoettgen (Bloomfield, Heb. 2:5), Clarke’s, Lange’s, and other Commentaries. See Props. 138 and 139.*

Obs. 2. The effort made by Barnes, Bloomfield, etc., to make this expression used by the Jews, and adopted without dissent or change, in the New Test. to mean the present dispensation, age, or world under the Messiah fails, because it does not meet the conditions attached to it in that day, viz., it included the reign of the Messiah after the resurrection of the dead. This will appear evident if notice is taken of the distinctive usage accorded to the phraseology in Matt. 12:32, “neither in this world (age) nor in the world to come.” Critics, Lightfoot, Wetstein, etc., refer the latter to Christ’s Kingdom, and according to Wetstein (Lange, loci) it was a proverbial expression referring to the Advent of the Messiah. Jesus adopts it, and links it therefore, as we maintain, with His future personal Advent. And this is conceded (unwillingly) by our opponents, in the simple statement that the sin or guilt alluded to remains unpardoned after the Sec. Advent of Christ, and therefore this world or age to come is included in the period after the Advent. The language being addressed to Jews, without any of those modern explanations attached, is a virtual indorsement of the phrase as understood by them. So Paul, Heb. 2:5, “for unto the angels hath He not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak,” argues that this subjection is not witnessed, as many passages prove, down to the Sec. Advent of the Messiah, and hence necessarily locates it in the future after that Advent. Therefore his use of the word corresponding with that of the Jews he intimates

no change in its usage, as fairness would have required if it referred to another period. It is never employed to designate heaven or the state after death (as our opponents, Barnes, etc., loci, frankly admit, but to point out this very earth, regarded as “inhabited” or “inhabitable.” The choice of the phrase directly refers us to the covenant and its promises, which, if fulfilled, require under the Messiah such a world. The only period when all things, as this predicted world demands, are brought into subjection, is after Christ’s Sec. Coming, for down to this Pre-Mill. Advent Gentile domination is existing, and even preceding it confederations of wickedness are witnessed. This world to come is given to Jesus as man, thus corresponding with His future coming as the Son of man, etc. But this expression receives its fair and honest interpretation only by regarding the general analogy of the Word; and for a proper and full understanding must be viewed in the light thrown upon it by “the day of Jesus Christ,” “the end of the age,” and “the coming age,” as given in Propositions following. Therefore the reader, before deciding, will await the additional evidence to be placed before him. In regard to the phrase in Heb. 6:5, however much some may make the tasting of “the powers of the world to come” the enjoyment of religion, etc., in this present dispensation, or the gospel period (thus making the world to come equivalent to “the gospel dispensation”), yet numerous commentators and others, who have no sympathy with our views, tell us that there is a reference to the future, making it to refer to the future heavenly state, so e.g. Bloomfield, Scott, etc. That it has reference to the future, and to the future as understood at that period by the Hebrews addressed, must be apparent to the scholar from the occurrence of no proposed change by the apostle to its usual significance.

Obs. 3. The Bible clearly teaches a dispensation to succeed our present one. This is done in a variety of ways, and is confirmatory of our position. Leaving the intimations of a new ordering or arrangement given by “restitution,” “regeneration,” “new heavens and new earth,” etc., this is virtually admitted by Fairbairn, Brown, and others, in that they inform us that the Mill. age can only be introduced and realized as predicted by the bestowal of new and extraordinary measures, agencies, etc., thus showing marked and distinguishing changes in the order then established. The “harvest” at the end of this age bounds the closing of this and the commencement of the new dispensation. This “harvest” is predicted, as we have shown, Rev. 14:14–20; Joel 3:13, etc., to be Pre-Millennial. The Millennium itself, including the resurrection and events which require the exertion of supernatural power, etc., is indicative of a new era or age. The dispensation that follows is one of Redemption, perfected Salvation, and it is a low estimate to confine the redemptive period to this age or dispensation, in which it remains incompleting down to the Sec. Advent. This is the preparative stage of Redemption; that which follows is Redemption fully realized. Consequently such declarations as Eph. 1:10, “that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things,” etc., must be understood of that dispensation still future which shall be ushered in when the times preceding it have been completed. The proof that Eph. 1:10 thus refers to such a dispensation is found in the context, for (1) as numerous passages plainly state, this gathering of all things into one is only witnessed when this dispensation or age closes; (2) in this gathering “all things,” in the Greek the neuter form, evidently also embraces the creation then redeemed from the curse, which only is done in the re-creation after this dispensation has ended; (3) all things are under Christ in this dispensation mentioned, which is not realized until after the Sec. Advent; (4) the connection of the “inheritance,” “the redemption of the purchased possession” with this dispensation indicates the same; (5) the adopting the exact phraseology of the Jews respecting an incoming age, with the sole change of applying it to Jesus Christ, David’s Son and Lord. It seems to us strange that some theologians, seeing the gathering and oneness ascribed to the Millennial period, seeing that the churches under the direct teaching of the apostles all believed in a future and incoming dispensation—Millennial—should so persistently, to defend a theory, apply this to the present dispensation, and yet acknowledge, as many of them do, that its realization will only be witnessed fully when Christ comes. Such arguments as are derived from the Pre-Mill. Advent, resurrection, judgment, etc., form the introduction of the incoming Kingdom by the power of Christ—indeed all the varied propositions derived directly or indirectly from the Covenant, the foundation of all that is future, converge in a dispensation succeeding this one.

PROPOSITION 138. This doctrine of the Kingdom fully corroborated by “the day of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

This Kingdom is after the Sec. Advent, and in a period, dispensation, age, day, or time, which, owing to the public, personal manifestation of Jesus Christ, is by way of pre-eminence entitled “His day,” etc. Now, if it can be shown that the Jews believed that the day or age of the Messiah was thus identified with the period of the reign of the Messiah on David’s throne, and that the Apostles, without any change or transformation, apply this phraseology to Jesus after His Sec. Advent, it at once powerfully confirms our doctrine of the Kingdom. For, if our interpretation of the Covenant and promises is correct, then such a day or time of Christ must be still future.

Obs. 1. The Jewish view is given by many writers. Thus e.g. Mede quotes R. Saadiah Gaon, who indorses the ancient opinion on Dan. 7:18 by saying: “Because Israel have rebelled against the Lord, their Kingdom shall be taken from them, and shall be given to those our monarchies which shall possess the Kingdom in this age, and shall lead captive and subdue Israel to themselves in this age until the age to come, until the Messiah shall reign.” The ancient opinion of the Jews previous to and at the First Advent are given in Commentaries, Sys. Theologies, etc., viz., that the times or reign of the Messiah was frequently denominated “the day or the days of the Messiah” originating from the prophetic announcements of “the day of the Lord,” etc. Knapp, Barnes, Bloomfield, and

many others, show how the Jews regarded "the day of the Lord" as equivalent to "the times of the Messiah." Indeed, as stated in previous Propositions, it was fully identified with both the resurrection and the judgment which it was believed the Messiah would bring to pass. How later Jews continued to hold this notion of the day thus linked with these adjuncts is evidenced by the following extract from R. Menassah Ben Israel (in Res. of the Dead, p. 254), who, commenting on Isa. 2:12–17, "For the day of the Lord of hosts," etc., remarks: "It is not to be doubted, as we shall demonstrate in the sequel, that by 'the day of the Lord' the prophet intends 'the day of judgment,' which is otherwise called 'the day of the resurrection of the dead.' " Again (B. 3, c. 2), he says, on Mal. 4:5, "That great and terrible day of the Lord is the day of judgment, which shall be conjoined with the resurrection." The day of Messiah, the day of judgment, the day of resurrection, the day of the Lord, etc., were all associated in the Jewish mind with the predicted coming and reign of the Messiah.*

Obs. 2. Next, it is important to notice, (1) how the inspired apostles adopted this phraseology, applying it to Jesus, and (2) locating this "day," that the Jews expected, in the future. (1) A period of time, separate and distinct from previous ones, is called "the day of the Lord Jesus," 2 Cor. 1:14; "the day of Christ," 2 Thess. 2:2; "the day of the Lord," 1 Thess. 5:2, etc. This is so apparent that it needs no additional mention. (2) That this day of Christ is not in the present dispensation (comp. e.g. John Wesley's remarks, Prop. 133, Obs. 5), but in the future one, is evident by reference to the general tenor of Scripture concerning it, and by then giving the opinion of our opponents as indicative of its relation to the future. Thus e.g. 1 Cor. 5:5, "that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus;" Barnes, Com. loci, "the day of judgment when the Lord Jesus shall come," etc. 1 Cor. 1:8, "blameless in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ;" Barnes, loci, "in the day when the Lord Jesus shall come to judge the world; and which will be called His day, because it will be the day in which He will be the great and conspicuous object, and which is especially appointed to glorify Him." 2 Cor. 1:14, "ye also are ours in the day of the Lord Jesus;" Barnes, loci, "in the day when the Lord Jesus shall come to gather His people to Himself." 2 Thess. 2:2, "that the day of Christ is at hand;" Barnes, loci, "the time when He should appear, called 'the day of Christ,' because it would be appointed especially for the manifestation of His glory." 1 Thess. 5:2, "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night;" Barnes, loci, "Of the Lord Jesus," etc., " 'the day of the Lord' means that day in which He will be manifested," etc. So also 2 Pet. 3:10; Phil. 2:16, etc., and Barnes, loci, gives the same. Barnes even indorses the Jewish view on John 8:56, when he says, "the day of judgment is also called the day of the Son of man because it will be a remarkable time of His manifestation." (Compare also Knapp, Ch. Theol., s. 155 (4).) Jesus Himself employs the phrase, as e.g. Luke 17:24, 30: "So also shall the Son of man be in His day;" "even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed," with which compare Matt. 24:30, 31, 37, etc., and then notice the concessions of Barnes, etc., that its ultimate reference must be to the time when He personally comes to judgment, etc. We have thus a distinctive "day of Christ" ushered in at the Sec. Advent; and with the predictions relating to "that day" by the prophets; with the Scriptural usage of the word "day;" with the events connected with it and the guards thrown around it to prevent, if possible, misconception of its duration, etc., it is simply to be faithless not to identify this "Lord's day," this "day of the Messiah," with the promised exalted Millennial times of the Word with which it is blended. That this "day of Christ" embraces a long period of time is apparent from the examples already given, but the Spirit multiplies evidence; for believers, being "the children of the day," see on every side "the day" linked with the Advent, with Mill. blessedness, with entering into (comp. Matt. 7:21, 22), and realizing the Kingdom, and with Barnabas they look for a "holy age" to come, believing Him to be "King of the ages" (1 Tim. 1:17; Heb. 1:2, Vulgate), who will manifest Himself in the day that significantly and appropriately is called after Himself. And when the Spirit, to whom a thousand years are as a day, pronounces it "a great day," we are very slow in limiting it.

Obs. 3. To satisfy some objections, it is necessary to allude to Waggoner (Ref. of Age to Come), who refuses to acknowledge an "age to come" to follow this age, on the ground that that which succeeds this is called "an everlasting age" or "the eternal age." But this is a mere play on words so far as the phrase is concerned, for (1) he thus professes his belief in an age to come, although "everlasting;" (2) he divides this "everlasting age" arbitrarily into two periods, the first part of one thousand years in the third heaven, the second part, or remainder, after the thousand years here on the earth. While we do not even thus limit it by the thousand years (which years do not limit the reign, but the binding of Satan and non-resurrection of the wicked), extending it through and beyond them into the future (Prop. 159). When the characteristic duration, etc., of the age are to be determined, we find it extending to, merging into, and embracing perpetuity. To build up his theory, Waggoner contends that "the end," "Christ's Coming," and "the termination of Salvation," are synonymous terms, and taking this for granted (without the least proof), he proceeds to erect his argument upon it. This is a sad mixture, seeing that Christ's Coming is not to "terminate Salvation," or to make an "end" of all things, but is for purposes of salvation and to gather all things into oneness, etc. Again, a favorite phrase is quoted, and paraded even as a title of sermons and books, as if it were a Scriptural one, viz., "The End of Time," as if it were an equivalent for "the time of the End." In tracing the matter somewhat, it seems to be founded on Rev. 10:6 in our Eng. Version, which unguardedly reads "that there should be time no longer." That this is a misapprehension of the passage is evident, for (1) critics and commentators pronounce it incorrect. (See Barnes, Stuart, Elliott, Lord, etc., loci.) (2) It is inconsistent with fact: (a) as to the text, seeing that instead of a closing of time, time is represented as continuing on, and events occurring during its progress; (b) as to the creation, for while time may be regarded as unmeasured, eternal, yet no creature or event can be duly considered apart of time. Time cannot end; a day, year, age, cycle may close, but not time; eternity itself embraces endless time. The arguments erected upon this phrase, therefore, can well be dismissed without more attention, seeing that "times" are connected with, 1 Tim. 6:15, "the appearing of our Lord Jesus

PROPOSITION 139. The Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, as covenanted, is sustained by what is to take place in “the morning” of “the day of Christ.”

We now come to one of those beautiful, most forcible evidences of the truthfulness of our position, which no other theory can present. For, the Divine Spirit, taking part of the phrase “the day of the Lord,” etc., viz., the morning or introductory of that day, allies with it such events, identified fully with the Millennial era, that the student can be at no loss to distinguish and locate the period of time intended. “The morning” is so widely different in blessing, judgment, etc., from the beginning of this present dispensation, that no comparison can be instituted between them. The fact, too, that this figure of “the morning” is employed by writers separated by ages; that they coincide in attributing to it the same results; that they preserve a wonderful unity in the use of it, establishes us the more firmly in a doctrine universally received by the Early Church.

Obs. 1. The Millennial day being represented as preceded by a “morning,” the period of time just previous to the breaking of this morning is appropriately, to complete the figure, called “the night.” This is done by the Spirit in Ps. 30:5; Rom. 13:12; Isa. 21:11. The time of trial, fighting, struggling, pilgrimage, absence from the bridegroom, mixture of tares and wheat, tribulation, sorrow, death, etc., is forcibly designated as “the night.”*

Obs. 2. The Millennial day is introduced by the personal coming of Jesus. To perfect this figure of “the morning,” if it alludes to the beginning of the same period of time, it would be highly appropriate, if thus dependent on Christ’s Coming, to designate Him either as the Morning Star or as the Sun ushering in this day. This also is done to prove to us, if we will but accept of it, that this coming is the real, veritable coming of the person called “the Star” and the Sun,” who shines forth, not through others, but, in His own proper effulgence. It is therefore with pleasure that we read in “the last words of David,” that (2 Sam. 23:1–4) “there shall be a Just One ruling over men, ruling in the fear of God; as the light of the morning shall He arise, the Sun of an unclouded morning, shining after rain upon the tender grass of the earth.” Night disappears when the sun comes, so this “night” shall fade away when “the Sun of an unclouded morning” arises, ushering in a glorious day. Hence Jesus is styled also “the bright and morning star,” “the Day Star,” because His coming shall be the sure sign of the dawning of the foretold morning. He is not merely called such owing to the glory of His person or the splendor of His appearing, but because He reveals Himself in the early morning. For, Hos. 6:3, “His going forth is prepared as the morning.”*

Obs. 3. The events associated with this morning are of such a nature that they can only be realized after the Second Advent; and they thus confirm the Pre-Mill. Advent, the reign of the Just One in the day following this morning, etc.

1. The resurrection and the dominion of the saints is connected with this morning. Thus in Ps. 49:14, 15, the Psalmist contrasts the condition of the wicked and righteous: “Like sheep they (the wicked) are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them IN THE MORNING; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling. But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for He shall receive me.” Here the prophet distinguishes between those who rise in the morning (1st res.) and have dominion, and the rest of the dead who lived not again until the one thousand years were finished. In Ps. 88:10–15, after alluding to death and the grave whither he was tending, the Psalmist asks, “Wilt Thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise Thee?” etc., and then expresses his hope of a resurrection: “But unto Thee have I cried, O Lord; and IN THE MORNING shall my prayer prevent Thee.” The same is found in Ps. 143:8, where death is described as smiting the righteous one and making him to dwell in darkness, and the prayer, inspired by the Spirit, comes forth impressively: “Cause me to hear Thy lovingkindness IN THE MORNING, for in Thee do I trust,” etc. The expression found in several Ps., “I will awake early,” can only be satisfactorily explained of his awaking (res.) in this morning. In Ps. 90, after alluding to the universality of death, etc., the petition is offered: “Return, O Lord, how long? and let it repent Thee concerning Thy servants” (that is, do not let them thus be subject to the power of death); “O satisfy us early (lit. as some critics: in the morning), with Thy mercy, that we may be glad and rejoice all our days.” If we are to take the rendering given by the Vulgate, Syriac, Chaldee, and by some critics, of the phrase, Eng. Version of Isa. 26:19: “for Thy dew is as the dew of herbs,” which is presented as “the dew of the dawn,” then in immediate connection with the resurrection there is reference to the morning. Delitzsch, sustained by Alexander on Isa. and others, translates Isa. 8:19, 20, “they are a people for whom NO MORNING DAWNS,” which the marg. reading, “Heb. no morning,” also affirms; thus corroborating that the wicked, living or dead, have no part or lot in this morning.

2. The utter destruction and removal of the wicked is identified with this incoming morning. This we have seen is predicated also of the introduction of the Mill. age. Thus Isa. 17:14, speaking of the nations who set themselves against God (as in the last confederation, Rev. 19, etc.), adds: “Behold AT EVENING TIDE trouble; and BEFORE THE MORNING he is not. This is the portion of those that spoil us (compare Zech. 14), and the lot of them that rob us.” In Mal. 4 the wicked are consumed and utterly rooted out at the time “the Sun of Righteousness” arises. In Ps. 59:16, after describing the confederation and overthrow of the wicked by the

power of God, foreseeing the time of its accomplishment, the prophet bursts forth exultingly: "But I will sing of Thy power, yea, I will sing aloud of Thy mercy IN THE MORNING," etc. If we take even Origen's (Ag. Celsus) rendering of the word "early" in Ps. 101:8 which he makes "morning," we have affirmed the destruction of the wicked of the land that they may be cut off from the city of the Lord.

3. It is, as the Mill. descriptions predict, a time of deliverance and salvation. Thus in Ps. 46:5, after portraying the mighty confederation under the figure of the roaring waters and the swelling sea, and then continuing the figure drawn from the waters and representing the incoming river or Kingdom so gladsome, the Psalmist assigns both the reason and the time when this confederation shall be overthrown and His Kingdom shall be established to the joy of His people: "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved; God shall help her, and that RIGHT EARLY," or as marg. reading, Heb. "WHEN THE MORNING APPEARETH." If it is allowable to receive the translation of Zeph. 3:5 given by Gildas (A.D. 546), there would be a distinct reference to this morning, as follows: "Our Lord is upright in the midst of His people, and in the morning He will not do injustice, in the morning He will give His judgment." Job even (7:21) expresses the idea that deliverance shall be granted by God "in the morning" to those whom He, "the preserver of men," has pardoned.

4. This morning is identified with the rule of Christ, and the glorification of the saints. This we have already seen, but the Spirit gives us additional evidence. Thus in Ps. 110:2, 3, at the very time that "the Lord shall send the rod of His strength out of Zion and shall rule in the midst of His enemies," then, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauty of holiness from the womb of THE MORNING" (alluding to "the birth," etc.); "Thou hast the dew of thy youth" (referring to the renewal). If considered in the light of the general tenor of the Word, this passage is exceedingly expressive and beautiful.

5. Having shown and advocated as a necessary condition the restoration of the Jewish nation, a confirmation is found in the specification that this also (as we contended) takes place in this morning. Turning to Hos. 5:14, 15, and 6:3, when the Jewish restoration is spoken of in verse 11 (see McNeile, Lec. 4, Prospects of the Jews), it is said: "in their affliction they will seek me IN THE MORNING;" and in the next chapter, verse 3, the Lord's return or coming is likened to "the morning."

Obs. 4. The identification of this morning with the beginning of the Mill. day not only confirms the doctrine of the Kingdom, but teaches us how to estimate the spiritualistic conception of "the Morning Land," etc., to be immediately realized after death.* It puts aside as irrelevant a mass of matter put into print concerning "the morning" as connected with the present state of the Church, with death, or with the third heaven. It enables us also to correct such unintentional mistakes into which Lange falls, when he says (Com., p. 355), "the festive evening (hour of final reward) of the Church will take place at the Sec. appearing of Christ, which must not be confounded with the final judgment." The substitution of "morning" for "evening" makes the sentence more Scriptural.

Obs. 5. This subject gives pertinency and preciousness to the promise: "I will give unto Him the morning star." This Star is Jesus Himself, Rev. 22:16, etc. There is even here an allusion to the time of a special bestowal, viz., at the period when Jesus is manifested as "the morning star," i.e., even before the dawn of the day itself. Jesus will come, and the saints, to whom the ruling is promised in the context, shall be associated with Him in judgment, etc. We have in "the Morning Star" an implied reference to the first stage (Prop. 130) of the Advent, the thief-like coming for the saints, and to obtain it indicates that we are worthy of the better res. or (if living) of the translation. The mention of this in such a connection is also exceedingly significant of the exaltation of the saints to coheirship with the Christ when the morning breaks. It embraces more than the comparison of Dan. 12:3, viz., distinguishing honor and intimate relationship with Jesus at a specified period. Blessed they, who shall experience this bestowal of love.*

PROPOSITION 140. This doctrine of the Kingdom confirmed by the phraseology of the New Test. respecting "the end of the age."

Having shown that the Jewish idea of a "world to come," a dispensation or age to come, a septenary or millenary still future, necessarily involves the ending of this age and the introduction of another (which the Jews also plainly stated, as e.g. Prop. 138, Obs. 1 and 3), a link in the chain of evidence (seeing that the Messianic Kingdom is with them identified with the closing of this age and the coming in of a future one) is presented by considering how the New Test. language corroborates the Jewish view when reverting to "the end of the age."

Obs. 1. The student will notice how the Jewish idea is presented in Matt. 24:3, where the disciples asked concerning "the end of the world." (1) Almost every commentator frankly admits that the word translated "world" is in the original "age" or "dispensation." To the critic or the Biblical investigator, there is no question respecting its reference to "the ending of the age." For, as is well known, the Jews expected under the Messiah (who should abide forever John 12:34) such great changes that they looked for a termination of the present, and the introduction of a new order or arrangement of things under Him. Hence the pertinency of the disciples' question, being in accord with the current views on the subject. (2) This is made decisive by their uniting, just as the Jews did, with the ending of the age the coming of the Messiah. The coming and the ending of the age were inseparably connected in the Jewish mind. The

reader will also notice that Jesus in His reply gives not the slightest hint of their being mistaken, but proceeds to answer the questions as legitimate. This Jewish usage is also seen in Heb. 9:26, where Christ is said to have come, to make a sacrifice for sin, at the conclusion, ending of the preceding dispensation or age, then called "The end of the world," or ages. (Comp. 1 Cor. 10:11.) The same is found in the promise of Christ, Matt. 28:20, to be with His people "unto the end of the world" or age—that is, down to the very close of this dispensation. Some have confined this to the Jewish age ending at the destruction of Jerusalem, but united as it is with the gospel preaching, etc., it seems rather to apply to the present dispensation. The ending of the age, to usher in another and more glorious Messianic one, is a Jewish conception which has Scriptural foundation and inspired warrant for its adoption.

Obs. 2. For it is employed by Jesus Himself in His address to the Jews, without any alleged change of meaning, and in accord with their views. Thus Matt. 13:39, 40, 49, "the harvest is the end of the world," "so shall it be at the end of this world," simply means that such things will be at "the end of the age." Every commentator, with sufficient candor, whatever his views may be, will acknowledge that such is its definite meaning. Jesus, thus adopting the Jewish phraseology, points unerringly to a future age to be introduced, after this one is closed, connecting with it the Kingdom of the Son of man precisely as the Jews were accustomed to regard the matter. The disciples to whom the parable was explained understood the phraseology in its usual Jewish significance, as is evident from their questions, Matt. 24:3 and Acts 1:6. If it be said, that after the day of Pentecost they changed their views, it is found amply rebutted by the continued usage of the phraseology, as in Eph. 1:21, "not only in this world (aiōn, age) but also in that which is to come," Eph. 2:7, "in the ages to come;" Eph. 3:21, "throughout all ages, world without end" (or, throughout or unto all the generations of the age of ages), etc. Allusion has already been made to Luke 20:34, where the Saviour contrasts "this world" or age with "that world" or age, linking the future one, just as the Jews did, with the resurrection. Addressed to Jews, it certainly must have strengthened them in their belief of the Messianic Kingdom and age being still future, because, first, it could only begin when at least the one in which they lived had run its allotted course, and second, it was identified, as they also held, with a resurrection from the dead.

Obs. 3. This expectation of the Jews of a closing and then an incoming age throws light upon the language of Martha, John 11:24, when she says, "that her brother shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." The "last day" was synonymous with the ending of the age at which time the Jews believed the resurrection would take place. Jesus, by employing the same phrase, John 6:39, 40, 44, 54, directs attention, according to the prevailing belief, to another age, of which "the last day" of a closing one is the precursor. So delicately guarded too are the expressions concerning this "last day," that in no respect do they embrace the notion of our opponents. The resurrection of believers (as we hold) is only associated with the phrase. The wicked, the rejecter of the truth, is indeed judged by the Word in "the last day," John 12:48, but he is judged by it unworthy of the first resurrection. So also the phrase "last days," derived from Gen. 49:1; Isa. 2:2; Micah 4:1, was applied by the Jews to that closing period of time, when under the auspices of the Messiah a new era or age would be inaugurated, and thence were allied with the coming and reign of David's Son. The apostles, as well they might, retain the expression and locate them in the future—knowing that they were universally held to be followed by the era of blessedness delineated by the prophets—as e.g. 2 Tim. 3:1; James 5:3; 2 Pet. 3:3. The phrase as used in Heb. 1:2 may denote either the concluding portion of the Jewish or Mosaic dispensation, or it may, in view of the unknown duration of this dispensation, refer to the fact that these "last days" are associated with this dispensation, and in the largeness of the Divine measure of time were regarded as near at hand, and even present. For we have another expression which covers the same ground, viz., that of "the last time" in 1 Pet. 1:5, 20, where "the last time" is future, and the plural form "last times" is both present and future. In 1 John 2:18, "the last time" includes this dispensation, which, according to the Jewish estimate, would then be preparative to the ushering in of the new and desired dispensation. This is clearly seen in John's associating the Coming of the Messiah (v. 28 etc.) with the close of this "last time." Comp. Jude 18 with preceding context. Thus by a comparison of Scripture, and observing the current views on the subject, it is found that while there are strong intimations that this age is "the last" one preceding the final and much-desired one of Messianic manifestation in glory, yet the most of the references direct our attention to the future, the closing period of the dispensation, for an astounding outbreak of wickedness and an open display of Divine power, to be followed by a glorious age. Not one of these utterances indorses the monkish notion—even now entertained by learned men—that time will end, or that no other age shall succeed this one on the earth. The very phraseology, Jewish in origin, and the manner in which it is united with the Coming of Jesus, the resurrection, and the rejection and overthrow of the wicked, amply sustains our position.

Obs. 4. The expressions "end of the world," "last day," etc., have influenced many to reject the Jewish idea of a dispensation to follow this one; and in their eagerness to make out such an age or era impracticable, they have even asserted the complete destruction of the world (some even have it annihilated, see following Prop.), and a previous withdrawal of the righteous to the third heaven, where they forever remain. In brief, the perpetuity of the earth is denied, or at least its being rendered unfit and uninhabitable for the redeemed, is declared. Now our entire argument assumes the exact reverse, and if such a Kingdom, age, day of Christ, etc., is to come at the end of this age, then the continued existence and perpetuity of the earth must, in the very nature of the case, be also a fact. How else can the Davidic throne and Kingdom be re-established, and all the covenant promises be realized? Instead of casting ourselves upon the Covenant, and the promises derived from the Covenant, which boldly take the matter for granted, assume it as self-evident and indispensable, we shall now proceed, in order to guard our argument on all sides, to produce direct reasons given by the Spirit to indicate this very perpetuity.*

Obs. 5. So powerful and convincing are the reasons for holding to the ending of the present age or dispensation and the ushering of another and more glorious (the Sabbatism), that a multitude of the most eminent and learned men firmly hold to it. Indeed it would be almost universal, if all could be persuaded that the predicted reign of the Messiah on earth is still future. Dr. Breckenridge (*Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered*, p. 668–9) only expresses the opinion of these, when he speaks of the Mill. period, introduced by the Sec. Advent, as “a new dispensation,” “as distinct and real as any preceding dispensation,” made requisite in order to fulfil the Scriptures. If we accept of the Pre-Mill. Advent, the Pre-Mill. resurrection of the saints, the Scriptural idea of the day of judgment and the day of the Lord Jesus, the personal reign of Jesus and the saints, we are inevitably forced to this position, which the Scriptures so abundantly sustain, seeing that a new period, new ordering, new dispensational arrangements, are a necessary sequence. This is indorsed by the highest theological authorities, as seen e.g. in Rothe, Delitzsch, Auberlen, and others. (Comp. e.g. our quotation from Van Oosterzee, Prop. 133, Obs. 4, note 1.)*

PROPOSITION 141. This Kingdom necessarily united with the perpetuity of the earth

Necessarily, because this earth is the promised inheritance tendered to Abraham; this earth is the theatre on which David’s throne and Kingdom existed, and if re-established at the Sec. Advent demands its continuance; this earth is covenanted to David’s Son and promised to the saints, and hence God’s oath and faithfulness are involved in its perpetuity (comp. Props. 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 144, 152, etc.).*

Obs. 1. The misleading phrase “the end of the world” has been considered under the previous Prop. If employed simply to denote the end of an order or arrangement connected with the world, it would not be objectionable, but used as it is by learned divines without explanation in support of a preconceived theory, it leaves the impression that the world itself, the earth or globe, shall come to an end. This indeed has been maintained by Popish and Protestant writers, has been so sedulously preached and printed, until the minds of multitudes, misguided by the phrase just alluded to and the refusal (designed?) of popular commentators to explain it in the Gospels, hold to the earth’s utter destruction and annihilation. Dr. Hodge (*Sys. Div.*, vol. 3, p. 853) declares, on the authority of Schmid (*Dog.*), that the Lutheran doctrine is that the world shall be reduced to nothing. This indeed may be the individual opinion of some Lutheran divines, just as it is that of some Calvinists, but it is no Lutheran doctrine, from the fact that both Luther and Melancthon taught the contrary, and that multitudes of Lutherans, not being bound by any confession on the subject, teach the renewal and perpetuity of the earth.*

Obs. 2. It is admitted that there is no direct passage within the lids of the Bible which teaches the annihilation of the earth. It is remarked by Olshausen (*Com. Matt. 24*) and others, that we never find the expression in the original which would indicate a proper ending of the world in the sense held by many divines. It is simply inferred from an incorrect reception of certain phrases, and from the conflagration of 2 Pet. 3, and finds acceptance because eminently fitted to carry out the spiritualistic and mystical conceptions of their preconceived Kingdom of God. What foundation the inference has in the phrases “last day,” etc., has been made apparent, and what basis it finds in Peter’s portrayal will appear (Prop. 150) as we proceed in the discussion. Thus much may now be said of the latter, that neither the early Jewish nor Gentile churches taught the inferences so confidently advanced by moderns concerning the results of that fire. If it were so fatally Anti-Millenarian as alleged, it is singular, to say the least, that it had no effect on the Early Church belief, and not even on Peter himself, who, as a host of able men (our opponents), tell us, was “Jewish Millenarian, in view, retaining to the last “a materialistic husk.”*

Obs. 3. In this discussion the reader will not fail to notice the important concessions made by many of our opponents. Literally a multitude of them might be adduced, in which the perpetuity of the earth, after some changes and a process of renewal, is asserted. Neander in several places emphatically declares that at the consummation, restitution, new creation of nature, Coming of Christ, (p. 524), “this globe is destined to be the scene of the triumphant Kingdom of God,” and that such is the teaching of Paul, etc. Barnes, *Com.*, advocates the renewal and perpetuity of this earth, but is somewhat at a loss what to do with it after its renewal; hesitating between putting the saints in it, or in the third heaven. Dick, (*Phil. of a Fut. State*), speaking of the opinion held by some that “the material universe be blotted out of existence,” etc., adds: “it is astonishing that it should ever be entertained by any man calling himself a divine or Christian preacher,” and then advocates a renewal, etc. Calvin correctly says (*Insti.*, ch. 25, s. 9), “Christ will come, not for the destruction of the world, but for purposes of salvation;” and in sec. 11 advocates a complete restoration. Dr. Hodge, *Sys. Div.*, after finding fault with Dr. Seiss for presenting precisely the view and almost the language of Calvin, finally admits the renewal and perpetuity of the earth. This slight notice of admissions, made by hundreds of writers of a similar tenor, is amply sufficient for our purpose, which is this—that such is the nature of prophecy relating to the earth, the removal of the curse, its renovation, etc., that able and learned men, largely addicted to spiritualizing, find it impossible, without direct antagonism, to indorse either the daring speculation of annihilation, or the equally bold conjecture that the new creation refers to the third heaven. This, as

far as it goes, is so much added to our side of the argument. It is remarkable that while there is a general acceptance of Origen's alleged views respecting the end of the world, he himself (De Prin., B. 1, ch. 6), expressly asserts that he did not wish to be understood as presenting them as "a fixed and certain decision," but rather "in the manner of investigation and discussion." His aim, however, to present them "in the style of a disputation rather than of strict definition," was defeated by their being accepted as weapons against Chiliasm. Origen, in the same book (De Prin., B. 6, ch. 6, s. 4), rejects the idea of annihilation or utter destruction, fully indorsing a renewal. Thus the very man, to whom we are the most indebted for influencing, by his system of interpretation, the obscuring of the truth on this and other points, frankly admits in one aspect the Jewish and Early Church view of renewal and perpetuity.

Obs. 4. The Word expressly declares the continuance and perpetuity of the earth, and no one should venture a counter statement without the same is presented in similar positive terms. Thus e.g. Ps. 104:5, "God laid the foundations of the earth that it should not be removed forever." Compare Ps. 148:3, 5, 6; Eccl. 1:4; Ps. 89:36; Jer. 31:35, etc. But to place it apparently beyond all contradiction, the perpetuity of God's promises and faithfulness is contrasted with the perpetuity of the earth, as e.g. Jer. 33:25, 26, and, especially when the covenant itself is specified, in Ps. 89:34–37. Other passages will be presented in the following Propositions in order to save repetition.*

Obs. 5. Aside from various considerations presented in previous Propositions which direct the eye of faith to the perpetuity of the earth, a few additional may be adduced, as follows. (1) The Early Church, having the advantage of apostolic teaching on a subject which excited special attention, held, as far as known, to the same. (2) Taking the Millennial descriptions as a whole, without forcibly separating them, they clearly teach a purification, renewal, and perpetuity. (3) The promise individually to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to inherit the land, and the same promise to the saints, imply it. (4) The praying of God's will to be done on earth as in heaven—which we know will never be done in the mixed condition of the Church and world down to the Second Advent—infer it. (5) The harvest at the end of the age, by a comparison of the Scriptures bearing on it, teaches it. (6) Separate prophecies which speak of the perpetuity of the Kingdom, etc., after the Advent of Christ, such as Dan. 7, Isa. 65 and 66, etc., cannot be consistently explained on any other ground. (7) The same truth is contained in the predictions, that He shall have all rule, all enemies under Him, etc., after His Sec. Advent, He being at the same time the Restorer. (8) The Pre-Mill. Advent, with the results attending it here on earth, evince the same. (9) The throne and Kingdom—the inheritance of David's Son, cannot be received, as covenanted, unless the perpetuity of the earth after His Coming is upheld. In brief, (10) the restitution, the heirship of the world (Rom. 4:13), removal of the curse, the predicted reign of the saints on the earth, the occurrences after the Millennial era, as related by John and the prophets, etc., all inculcate the same truth.

Obs. 6. Besides this, it may well be asked whether an earth so highly honored by the birth, presence, sufferings, and death of Christ (and which is His also by inheritance), can possibly be blotted out of existence. Events, the most intensely interesting in the moral government of God, have here taken place; the most astounding display of Divine attributes is linked with its history; the marvellous Redemptive process has magnified this globe into a prominent place among all the worlds of the Universe, and, unless specifically declared, it is opposed to all our higher and nobler views of God's grandeur, Christ's honor, and the Spirit's agencies, to suppose that such an earth, which witnessed the humiliation, tears, sufferings, agony, and blood of Jesus; which was hallowed by His infant, childhood, and manly feet and voice, and consecrated by His miracles and works of mercy and love, should ever be utterly destroyed. Neither piety nor reason, neither the glory of God nor the welfare of man, desire an earth containing a Bethlehem, a Jerusalem, a Gethsemane, or a Calvary to be erased from the Universe. The thought is revolting. Aside from God's glory in Redemption, it does not accord with our feelings or wishes that this earth, in which we were renewed, the witness of our pilgrimage, the scene of most intimate and endearing relations, the place of ennobling associations, should be blotted out of existence. From such a belief, a reduction to nothing, etc., enlightened piety and reason, and even feeling, shrink as inconsistent with the Divine attributes and the utterances of Scripture. And it is a matter of amazement, that through a mystical conception of God's Kingdom, divines ever entertained a view so derogatory to truth and God's dealings, as well as to the noblest instincts of man; just as if the latter could desire that his own childhood's home—the spot on earth sweetest to memory—should forever perish and attribute the same feeling to Jesus.*

Obs. 7. The renewal and perpetuity of the earth is requisite to secure the Redeemer's glory, in the perfecting of His Redemptive work, etc. If the earth should only contain the Church in its mixed condition, the entailment of the curse, the products of selfishness manifested in wars, etc., down to the Sec. Advent, and it should then be utterly destroyed and ever remain thus, then it follows that the Scriptures respecting the Christ would evermore remain unfulfilled. For down to that Sec. Advent, owing to the postponement of the Kingdom, He does not reign in the covenanted Kingdom; down to that Second Advent, owing to that postponement and a consequent preliminary gathering out of saints, He does not fulfil the promises respecting His own reign, or those pertaining to the saints inheriting the Kingdom. His Sec. Advent being for purposes of salvation, constitutes, in the work then performed, Him a perfect Redeemer. It is fully admitted that down to that Advent salvation is imperfect—the forfeited blessings are not restored. Hence it follows, that if the earth is destroyed, as many hold, soon after that Advent, there is no place for the fulfilment of covenant or covenant promises. More than this: it gives, so far as this earth is concerned, the victory to Satan; for, if the curse is not repealed; if

evil is not extirpated; if the forfeited blessings are not restored; if man's long-lost home is not given back to him in its Edenic loveliness; if the race is not brought back to its original condition and dwelling in a purified earth, then Satan triumphs in the ruin accomplished, just as he would triumph if the grave should evermore hold our bodies in confinement; just as he would gain the victory if our hearts would never more exultantly swell with love supreme to God. But in the redemption of the earth itself, in the recreation and perpetuation of it, in the fulfilment of the promises pertaining to it, as embracing the Kingdom extending over it, etc., Christ's power and glory as Redeemer, as King, as the All-sufficient, is duly manifested.*

Obs. 8. The proposition is apparent even from the manner in which the Bible begins and ends. It commences with an earthly Paradise lost, an earth cursed; it ends with an earthly Paradise regained through Christ, just as Milton, Cowper, Heber, C. Wesley (and other poets), but above all the sacred writers, so sweetly describe. The last scene, showing the ability of Jesus to save, is one here on a redeemed earth, for that which is of the third heaven is expressly declared to come down, from God, out of heaven upon it and remains (at least there is no record of its removal afterward). It must be so, or else the Plan of Redemption is imperfect, and the Kingdom of God cannot be manifested as covenanted and predicted. We are sinners, the Plan makes us holy; we lose our bodies by death, the Plan recovers them again; we lost Eden, the Plan restores it again; we lost the personal Presence of God, this Plan recovers that soul-satisfying Presence when God again dwells with man; we lost the contemplated visible Theocratic rule of God, this Plan makes, in the sacred Person of Jesus Christ, the most ample amends in filling the earth with His sovereignty, etc. Thus, in brief, every blessing with the removal of every evil, is linked with the culmination of this Divine Plan, and is inseparably fixed with the continuation of the earth itself. It is a Divine Purpose, culminating in the Kingdom, which shines forth at the end of the Bible in actual realization upon the earth—pertaining as it does to this world—and triumphant in overcoming the evil, and in bestowing the blessings contemplated by it. And if men would read the Word unbiassed, this relationship to the earth would appear as strongly to them as it did to the Early Church, which clung to it as something pertaining to Christ's honor and to man's happiness. However much the caution given by Luther is violated, yet there is profound wisdom in his saying: "It is important for us to recur to Adam's original condition, as we expect all things to be brought back again to that." Man's fall is on the earth, and his recovery is on the earth, and, therefore, the earth itself is called upon to rejoice and exult in witnessing his glorious restoration.*

Obs. 9. The perpetuity of the earth is so much taken for granted, is so undoubted, that numerous promises are based upon it. Thus e.g. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." How this passage is to be understood is apparent from the prophets, who predict the time coming, still future, when this shall be realized, under the reign of David's Son, when the Jewish nation is restored. Ps. 37 alone, from which Jesus quoted, contains this promise several times, and describes its occurrence to be when (as takes place at the Second Advent) the wicked shall be destroyed and utterly rooted out of the earth. The identical earth, occupied and so largely controlled by the wicked, is to be possessed by the righteous. The auditors of Jesus could not mistake the tenor of the promise, seeing that they all believed that the land was promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob individually and to their seed to inherit; and certainly we ought not to spiritualize it away when an inspired apostle, taking into a comprehensive view the covenanted relationship of Abraham, calls Abraham (Rom. 4:13), "the heir of the world." The inheriting (as even the Jews believed) follows the resurrection of the just, and Christ's promise is only the confirmation of a general belief on the subject founded upon covenant and prophets. It assumes, as a necessary contingency or result, the perpetuity of the earth, recalling at once the fact that Palestine itself is pronounced to Abraham and his seed to be "an eternal inheritance." The Millennial predictions, embracing the promises of the removal of sorrow, suffering, disease, and even death, portray events here on the earth which are positively located after the Second Advent, so that for their realization the continued existence of the earth is constantly implied, and asserted. Messiah's Kingdom and the blessings relating to it are all experienced here, where the Theocracy was once established—where David's throne and Kingdom once existed; the Bible closing with leaving Jesus, the saints, and the New Jerusalem here on the earth; the Word locating the "we shall reign with Him on the earth" after the Advent; Holy Writ speaking of "the day of Christ," "the world to come," etc., in which a Kingdom under the whole heaven shall be witnessed, after the Sec. Coming here in the world; Revelation making the will of God to be done on the earth in the coming Kingdom as it is done in heaven only after "the appearing" or "revelation of Jesus Christ;" in brief, the Word of God giving so many intimations and declarations as have already preceded (and as will immediately follow), in various propositions, it is impossible, intelligently, to entertain any other belief than the one advanced. The Divine Purpose is expressed in Isa. 60:21, "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever; the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified."

Obs. 10. The perpetuity of the earth is so frankly admitted and even advocated in works especially intended against Millenarianism, that it seems to require no additional proof. Thus e.g. Brown (Christ's Sec. Coming) receives the doctrine of the earth being renovated at the Advent of Jesus and forming the continued home of the saints, "a congenial abode for the glorified Church." He defends this view against the charge of "carnalism" or a lowering of the celestial state, ascribing the objection to "some tincture of morbid spiritualism, which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as if separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness;" and he pertinently asks, "May not the Gnostic element of the essential sinfulness and vanity of matter, be found lurking beneath it?" Barnes on Isa. 45:18 says: "The Jews from this passage infer, that the earth shall be inhabited after the resurrection—an idea which has every probability, since there will not be fewer reasons why the earth should be inhabited then than there are now; nor can there be any reasons why the earth should then exist in vain any more than now." Various writers have held

that, whatever changes or transformations may ensue hereafter at the consummation, the earth's continuance will not be interfered with even by a destruction as great as that occasioned by the flood, alleging as proof Gen. 8:21, 22. Others have inferred the same from the phrases "an everlasting Kingdom," which shall not pass away or be destroyed Dan. 7), from the reigning "forever and ever" attributed to Christ (Rev. 11:15) in relation to the earth, etc. To this period evidently belongs 1 Chron. 16:30, "the world also shall be stable, that it be not moved," i.e. enjoying the stability induced by God's reigning in the Theocratic order. For this Kingdom, prepared from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:34), necessitates (as we have previously shown) the laying of "the foundations of the earth that they should not be removed forever" (Ps. 104:5). One of the works specifically attributed to Christ is (Isa. 49:8), "to establish (raise up) the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages," so that the significant address is made through Him (Isa. 51:16): "I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of My hand, that I may plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art My people." Thus taking the plan of Redemption, which includes "the redemption of the purchased possession," the restoration of order to the world through Messiah's Kingdom; taking the faith of the Jews, the Early Church and many eminent believers; taking the concessions, etc., of opponents, this doctrine—a requisite link in our argument—is unmistakably confirmed. It crops out, undesignedly, in various portions of the Word, as e.g. in Ps. 148:6, where the heavens, heights, angels, sun, moon, stars—all things created are mentioned as praising God, and their perpetuity is announced in "Let them praise the name of the Lord, for He commanded and they were created; He hath also stablished them forever and ever." The earth has been created to show forth the praise of God, and sin shall not mar this laudation of the Most High (as it now does through the imperfection and evils entailed), and hence the time is coming when the declaration (Rev. 4:11) will be verified: "Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created." God's pleasure concerning the things created by Him is to be glorified by and through them; this, in the nature of the case, can only be effectually attained by their continuance, etc. Therefore it is, that in the description of the reign of David's Son, as given in Ps. 72, the perpetuity of the Kingdom, of the Kingship of Christ is contrasted with the perpetuity of the Sun and the Moon—both are represented as enduring forever—the former dispensing blessings and the latter (creation) acknowledging them with grateful praise, under a supremacy over the world (inhabitable, Heb. 2:5), only realized after the Second Advent. The statement of Ps. 115:16 is true, and the promise made to Noah (Gen. 8:21, 22) is ever faithfully preserved.*

PROPOSITION 142. The Kingdom being related to the earth (extending over it), and involving the res. of the saints (in order to inherit it), is sustained by the promise to the saints of their inheriting the earth.

It has been shown that the land is covenanted to the Patriarchs personally (Prop. 49), and that a res. is indispensable to its fulfilment; that (Rom. 8:13) "the promise" to Abraham involved, "that he should be the heir of the world," and that all believers inherit—being identified with him as his seed—the same promise with him. This, of course, includes their res. also, for it promises them to inherit the land or earth. Having shown the res., let us notice those special promises as a confirmation of our doctrinal position.

Obs. 1. The re-establishment of the Davidic throne and Kingdom here on earth, as Covenant, Prophets, pious Jews, Rabbis, disciples, Apostolic Fathers, etc., teach, and as presented in previous Propositions, demands, if God reveals at all the destination of saints, a specific mention of their receiving the earth as an inheritance. This has indeed already been established (see e.g. Props. 49 on covenants and Props. 116 and 122), but God has accumulated proof, as if purposely to rebuke and render inexcusable the prevailing unbelief in this particular.*

Obs. 2. The declaration of Jesus, Matt. 5:5, that the meek shall inherit the earth, ought to be decisive. But men under the influence of a plastic system of interpretation, urged on by a preconceived notion, leave the plain meaning of the promise and explain it away. One gravely tells us that it is "a proverbial expression," not seeing that, as employed by the Jews, it favors our view. Another informs us "that the Jews considered Canaan a type of heaven," without an attempt of proof, and against their expressed hopes on the subject. One tells us that it means that the meek man is in this world the most prospered, against innumerable examples to the contrary. Another passes it by with some generality or vague expression, that it is "a symbol," or "an outward possession." Some tell us that it is "a spiritual inheritance" over the earth by individuals and the Church; others again, not satisfied entirely with such meanings attached, inform us (as Gerlach, Lange's Com.) that the promises will only be fully accomplished at the Sec. Advent, or (as Neander, Life of Christ, s. 149), that it is not merely to be confined to "the blessedness of the Kingdom of God," but denotes a "world-dominion which Christians, as organs of the spirit of Christ, are ever more and more to obtain as the Kingdom of God shall win increasing sway over mankind and the relation of society, until, in its final consummation, the whole earth shall own its dominion." Every writer too acknowledges that it includes this inheriting in the Messianic Kingdom. Rejecting the manner of introduction suggested by Neander and others, they certainly are correct in the main idea of its including the notion of "a world-dominion," thus identifying it, as it should be, with the possession of the earth given to the saints in Dan. 7, etc. The position of some German and other commentators, as well as that of the Early Church, is alone tenable, viz., that this promise yet remains unfulfilled, and pertains to the future. Now aside from the various and numerous arguments already given to show this, we are content to let only one passage indicate the time of its fulfilment. Let the reader turn to Psalm 37, where this same promise is repeated five times.* and he

will find it in vs. 9, 11, 22, 29, 34, directly joined to and following a complete removal of evil-doers, not preceding it or contemporaneous with the continued presence of the wicked. It is significantly pointed out as future by the exhortation to “wait,” “wait patiently” for the Lord, and the blessedness that Christ alludes to is also attributed to it. Jesus undoubtedly quoted it, and if so, a reference to the connection in which the promise stands is all that we need to establish the time of its fulfilment—a time too, which the most uncompromising of our opponents fully and frequently admit—is only to be witnessed at the Sec. Advent, for volumes could be filled with the concessions made that “evil-doers” shall exist down to the Advent itself.*

Obs. 2. To avoid repetition, we leave direct arguments bearing on this point under following Propositions, and only give some allusions to this future possession of the earth by the righteous. Thus e.g. Prov. 11:31, “Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth;” Prov. 12:7, “The wicked are overthrown and are not, but the house of the righteous shall stand;” Prov. 10:30, “The righteous shall never be removed, but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth,” evidently refer to the time Ps. 76:9, when God shall cast the wicked, “the stout-hearted,” into a “sleep,” when He shall be “terrible to the kings of the earth” (comp. Rev. 19, etc.), and shall “cut off the spirit of princes,” and “when God arose to judgment to save all the meek of the earth.” Under this period too fall the many promises to the righteous, that they “shall be blessed on the earth,” confirming the importance of our seeking true wisdom, “For (Prov. 2:21, 22) the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it, but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it.” Hence in this Millennial period, when, as our argument indicates, this is to be realized, the promise is reiterated. Thus e.g. in the sublime description of Isa. 60, it is added: “they (the righteous) shall inherit the land forever;” and in Isa. 54, “this is the heritage of the servants of the Lord,” so that, Isa. 57:13, it will be verified that “he that putteth his trust in Me shall possess the land, and shall inherit My holy mountain.” If we take the translation given by some (Clarke’s Com. loci) to the clause “for His mercy endureth forever,” in Ps. 136, viz., “For His tender mercy is to the coming age,” or if we only keep in view the idea of perpetuity or futurity in the phrase, and apply the same to vs. 21, 22, then the land is for “a heritage unto Israel” in the time yet to come. In Ps. 115 this doctrine is evolved, for, declaring the people of Israel are the “blessed of the Lord,” the Psalmist adds, “the heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord’s: but the earth hath He given to the children of men. The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence. But we” (notice the implication sustained by the proof already adduced: we who are raised up from the dead, we who remain not thus in silence, we who shall receive the earth thus bestowed) “will bless the Lord from this time forth and for evermore.” The land of Canaan is called “rest,” and it is God’s “rest” (Ps. 95:7), as shown under Props. 122 and 143. It is not typical of something else, for that would overthrow the covenant and its promises. It is His “rest,” because in it the headship of the Theocratic government shall be specially manifested. A comparison of Scripture shows that, after a res. from the dead, an entrance into this “rest” is to be obtained. Thus e.g. Ps. 116 has “return unto thy rest, O my soul; for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. For Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living.” The identical “rest” promised is the one obtained after a res. The Jews thus understood the “rest” to denote the land, and the making of this rest glorious, etc., to mean that under the Messiah it would be renewed and beautified. Paul in writing to Jews does not contradict, but positively confirms this idea of the future inheritance, for instead of calling this rest the third heaven (as many unwarrantedly add), he (Heb 3 and 4) quotes Ps. 95, and designates the same “rest” the Psalmist does into which certain ones could not enter, but fell in the wilderness. He argues that through unbelief we too shall be cut off, but through faith in Christ, and by the power of Jesus, we too shall enter in “His rest” according to the promise. In the same epistle he declares that the promise is realized when this Jesus comes the second time unto salvation. If the Jews were mistaken in their conception of “the rest,” surely an inspired teacher like Paul ought to have corrected their views when adverting to the subject. But he could not, dared not contradict the plain truth, which they also held, and, therefore, as the unity of the Spirit and Divine Plan required, employs the reasoning best calculated to establish them in the only true idea of the inheritance promised to the Patriarchs and to all God’s people. (Comp. Prop. 143, on Sabbatism, etc.) This is strongly corroborated by other phraseology also employed by the Jews, indicated further on.

Obs. 3. Attention is again called to the confirmation our doctrine receives from the alleged omission of any but earthly blessings promised to believers in the Mosaic record, and long after. Bh. Warburton and others contend that we find nothing but what relates to this earth; some, as Edwards and others, that heavenly blessings are inferred; others, as Dr. Graves, that it can be found in a state of very gradual development; others again, as Horne, think that heavenly rewards, etc., are presupposed as an adopted article of religion. These, and opinions similar, reveal a darkness on the subject which the Jews and Early Church never possessed. The cause of the perplexity in such writers is simply this: coming to the Bible with the foreign derived idea of the saints’ inheritance, they find themselves at the very outset confronted with its direct opposite, and they are forced to resort to arbitrary conjectures and suppositions to support an uncalled-for theory. Rejecting Warburton’s explanation of the fact, yet he is correct in asserting that nowhere do we find in any of those records any other but an earthly inheritance promised. This has been noticed extensively by German critics, and even enemies of Christianity have sought to make it (on the supposition that the monkish notion of the third heaven inheritance is the true one) a fatal objection to the Bible. Let, however, the entire scope of the Bible speak; let Moses, David, Paul, let all speak; let covenant and covenant promises declare what is this promised inheritance, and in perfect harmony each and every one, proclaim it to be the inheriting of the land, of the earth, of the world, and the possessing of it for the ages. There is nothing hidden in these promises; they mean precisely what the words in their general usage indicate. Moses promises not merely, if

the people are obedient, a temporal possession of the land, but a perpetual one. Those who died are still promised the same, implying a triumph over death and the grave; and, what ought to suffice, the assurance that God's promises would, in this respect, be faithfully realized, is the golden chain which binds Moses, Prophets, Jesus, Apostles, pious Jews, Apostolic Fathers, and other worthies to hold that the time will most certainly arrive when all the meek shall inherit the earth.*

Obs. 4. Surely those who write so confidently that "the land (the earth) is of little worth to such as have tasted of the higher bliss of a heavenly state;" that it would be "an alarming retrograde of being from a heavenly state back to an earthly one;" that the saints themselves, on account of their heavenly experience, would be "unfit for any degree of blessedness this side of heaven itself," besides a host of similar expressions, should well ponder lest they be found underrating, and sitting in judgment over the inheritance itself and its desirableness. This all may appear very foolish to man, but after all it may prove to be "the wisdom of God." All such criticisms arise from making more of the intermediate state than the Bible warrants. If the pious dead are rewarded, crowned, inherit (Prop. 136), etc., as Popery and some Protestantism make it, then there would be some propriety in the objection. But until this is first established, the criticisms have no force. Again, they overlook what has been repeatedly stated by us, that this very possession of the earth is part of the Divine Plan in the Redemption of the race of man, and promotive of the greatest glory. The facts that we have urged, the passages presented, together with the belief of so many of God's children in different ages, ought in themselves to be amply sufficient to prevent such disparaging remarks.*

Obs. 5. Truth demands the correction of esteemed writers, such as Jones, Shimeall, Butler and others, who make this inheritance to extend to the possession of other worlds, or the third heaven, or the Universe, in brief, "all things." Leaving this theory for examination, especially as held by Shimeall, under the Prop. pertaining to the New Heavens and New Earth, and not objecting to the view that the saints in their glorified condition have access to other worlds, etc., we object to the theory on the ground that it makes the inheritance something very different from the one alone promised to the Patriarchs and to David's Son, and under which promise the saints only inherit. That inheritance is the earth and not the third heaven or the Universe. The proofs assigned by Judge Jones (Notes on Scrip., p. 560) are purely inferential and opposed by direct covenant promises. The texts given against our view are the following: 1 Cor. 3:21, 23 (which says nothing contrary, merely specifying "things to come"); Rom. 8:38, 39 (which only asserts that nothing can separate us from the love of God); 2 Tim. 2:12 (that only declares the reign with Christ); Rev. 22:5 (which asserts a perpetual reign); John 20:17 (which has no reference to the subject). Indeed, we might ourselves select stronger passages than these, but over against any and every such selection can be placed the impregnable covenant, and the multitude of explicit promises based on, and derived from, it.*

Obs. 6. We append a few statements, out of many that could be adduced, in behalf of our position. Fairbairn (whose testimony is the more valuable, being an opponent to Chiliasm) justly refers (Typology, vol. 1, p. 314, 15) this inheriting to the renewed earth after the Sec. Advent, and observes that Christ could not have called a prosperous life in the present world as constituted "blessed," but would rather (as He did) warn against the deceitfulness of riches and the abundance of honors; because "to be blessed in the earth as an inheritance, must import that the earth has become to them a real and proper good, such as it shall be when it has been transformed into a fit abode for redeemed natures." He approvingly quotes (p. 316) Usteri (as given by Tholuck on Rom. 8:19) as saying that the "conception of a transference of the perfected Kingdom of God into the heavens, is, properly speaking, modern, seeing that according to Paul and the Apocalypse (and he might also have added Peter and Christ Himself), the seat of the Kingdom of God is the earth, inasmuch as that likewise partakes in the general renovation." Such, he informs us, was the view "adopted by the greatest number, and the most ancient, of the Expositors," such as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Luther, etc. He quotes as indorsing this view Jerome (on Isa. 65), Justin Martyr (Semisch's Life and Times of Justin, Bib. Cab., vol. 42, p. 336), Calvin (Rom. 8:21), Haldane (Rom. 8:21), Fuller (The Gospel its Own Witness, ch. 5), Thiersh (His., vol. 1, p. 20), and Olshausen (on Matt. 8). How extended this list can be made is readily seen in the Props. on the history of our doctrine. Fairbairn (Typology, vol. 1, p. 292) argues that the possession of Canaan by the Jewish nation was "an earnest of the whole inheritance, and, as the world then stood, an effectual step toward its realization. Abraham, as the heir of Canaan, was thus also 'the heir of the world,' considered as a heritage of blessing." The tendency to make the one simply typical of the other, or of heaven, vitiates the reasoning and conclusions of many writers, who forsake the covenants for mere human opinions. The Kingdom and the earth sustain an inseparable relationship, and the inheriting of the one is the inheriting of the other. Rothe (Dogmatic, P. 2, p. 58) clearly apprehends this, and says: "He, moreover, designates the blessedness of this Kingdom as an inheriting the earth, for to this Chiliastic Kingdom the passage, Matt. 5:5, must be referred."*

Obs. 7. This doctrine teaches us how to regard the various theories of inheritance, such as the third heaven idea, the central universe notion, the metaphysical heaven (of Good's, etc.), which gives no place of existence, the spiritualist's visible unfolding of the invisible, "the Sun our Heaven" (so Mortimore, Wittie, etc.), and the infidel's no future inheritance. By overlooking the plainest promises and oath-bound covenants, or by spiritualizing them, men manufacture inheritances of their own. No matter that the inheriting of the earth was a favorite Jewish doctrine based on the Messianic prophecies and the predicted supremacy; when Jesus uttered this promise it must be modernized and accommodated to the supposed advanced theological opinions of the age, moulded by the influence of some favorite philosophy. No matter that the Patriarchs are personally promised such an inheriting; that the

Messiah is personally to receive the land as an inheritance; that the saints, as part of a perfected Redemption, are to realize it; that a thousand predictions direct attention to it, the leaven of the old Gnostic spirit against matter and the claimed higher spirituality, deliberately refuses the plain grammatical sense, and substitutes another sense at the will of the interpreter.*

PROPOSITION 143. The early church doctrine of the Kingdom is supported by “the Rest,” or keeping of the Sabbath, mentioned by Paul.

If it can be shown that the Sabbath was regarded as typical of the Kingdom of the Messiah as covenanted, and of the Millennial era, and then if it is found that Paul adopts the phraseology current on this point and uses it, without change of meaning, in a way to confirm the opinions existing, it forms an additional argument in favor of the primitive view of the Kingdom.

Obs. 1. Observe how the Jews believed on this subject. Bh. Newton has well stated (Dis. on Proph., p. 587) on the thousand years of Rev. 20, “that the Jewish Church before John, and the Christian Church after him, have believed and taught that these one thousand years will be the seventh Millenary of the world. A pompous heap of quotations might be produced to this purpose, both from Jewish and Christian writers.” He then produces a few quotations from Rab. Ketina, from “the tradition of the house of Elias, who lived two hundred years or thereabouts before Christ,” etc. Mede, Burnet, Lightfoot, Russell, Brookes, Taylor, Elliott, Bush, and many others, give various extracts establishing the general view thus entertained. As impartial authority, we may give what Dr. Whitby observes on Heb. 4:9, quoting R. Eliezer (c. 18, p. 41) as saying, “the blessed Lord created seven worlds (i.e. aiōnas, ages), but one of them is all Sabbath and rest in life eternal,” and then adds: “he refers to their (the Jews’) common opinion that the world should continue six thousand years, and then a perpetual Sabbath should begin, typified by God’s resting on the seventh day and blessing it.” Elliott notices that this same Rabbi makes (Midras Till., p. 4) “The days of Messiah are one thousand years.” Whitby also quotes Bereschith Rabba: “If we expound the seventh day of the seventh thousand of years, which is the world to come, the exposition is, ‘He blessed it,’ because that in the seventh thousand all souls shall be bound in the bundle of life.” “So our Rabbins, of blessed memory, have said in their commentaries on ‘God blessed the seventh day,’ that the Holy Ghost blessed the world to come, which beginneth in the seventh thousandth of years. Again, Philo is copious on the same subject, stating that the Sabbaths of the law were allegories or figurative expressions.”*

Obs. 2. Writers inform us that this Jewish opinion of the seventh Millenary, however we may account for it, was continued in the Christian, Jewish, and Gentile churches established by the apostles and their successors, and that it was entertained both by Millenarians and their opponents. This is abundantly confirmed by a little research. Papias (Frag. Ante-Nic. Lib., vol. 1, p. 447, inferred from Euseb. His., B. 3, s. 39) makes the days of creation typical. Barnabas (Epis., c. 15), commenting on the words: “And God made in six days the works of His hands and He finished them on the seventh day and He rested in it and sanctified it,” says: “Consider, children, what that signifies, He finished them in six days. This it signifies, that the Lord God will finish all things in six thousand years. For a day with Him is a thousand years; as He Himself testifieth, saying: “Behold this day shall be as a thousand years.” Therefore, children, in six days, that is in six thousand years, shall all things be consummated. And He rested the seventh day; this signifies that when His Son shall come, and shall abolish the season of the Wicked One, and shall judge the ungodly and shall change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then He shall rest gloriously in that seventh day.” Such also is the opinion of Irenæus (Adv. Hær., 5), Justin Martyr (Ques. and Ans., 71, Dial. with Try.), Polycarp (see testimony of Irenæus concerning him as given by Brooks, El. Proph. Inter., p. 38, etc.), Tertullian (Ag. Marcion, B. 3, c. 24, etc.), Lactantius (Div. Insti., c. 14, 24, 26), Cyprian (See Exh. Mart., 11), Ambrose (In Luc., 8:23), and others. So deeply rooted was this notion of the Millenaries that even Origen, Jerome, and Augustine indorse it. The student knows that Bh. Taylor (Lib. of Prophecy, s. 5) ranks Origen among the Millenarians, and critics suppose that it arose from Origen’s expectation of the renovation of all things at the end of six thousand years. Jerome’s statements are to be found in his letter (139) to Cyprian, Comment on Ps. 90:4, and Micah 4. As Augustine aided largely in overthrowing and darkening the early Church view of the Kingdom, we may, in this respect, more particularly specify his opinion. In De Gen. contra Manich., he proposes that the six days give a prophetic sketch of the epochs in the history of man, making the sixth the Christian dispensation, etc. In City of God, B. 20, c. 7, he says that he would not object to a literal resurrection to be succeeded by a Sabbath rest during one thousand years, provided it were spiritual: “a kind of seventh day Sabbath in the succeeding thousand years; and it is for this purpose the saints rise, viz., to celebrate this Sabbath. And this opinion would not be objectionable, if it were believed that the joys of the saints in that Sabbath shall be spiritual and consequent on the presence of God; for I myself too, once held this opinion.” That his opinion concerning the Millenaries underwent no change, is seen by reference to the City of God, last chapter, where he makes the days ages, counting his own age in which he lived the sixth, calling the seventh age the Sabbath in which we shall have rest, and this last day or age he has closed by the ushering in of an eighth and eternal day or age. It has been noticed by various writers that many of the later Anti-pre-millenarians explained the seventh day to be typical of an eternal Sabbath. So generally was this theory of the Millenaries held that, adopting the chronology of the Septuagint, at different periods, when it was supposed that the six thousand years were ending, an almost universal belief in the ending of the world was entertained. The duration of the world for six thousand years, to be followed by a Sabbath of rest, was so rooted into the Church that

the Reformers frequently expressed their faith in a speedy end, even after the Hebrew chronology was adopted in place of the Septuagint. Elliott (*Horæ Apoc.*), Taylor (*Voice of the Church*), and others (as Seiss, Brooks, Shimeall, Lord, etc.) have given numerous extracts from Luther, Melancthon, etc., indicating this remarkable feature, viz., their belief in a near closing of the dispensation, etc. It would be easy to introduce a long list of eminent names in the Church who have continued to hold to this ancient belief, not only Millenarians, but many of their opponents; and, account for it as we may, such an opinion, if not susceptible of definite scriptural proof, deserves, in view of its reception and retention, the respectful attention of the Biblical student.

Obs. 3. A few remarks may suggest reasons for there being so widespread and deeply imbedded a feeling that the seventh Millenary will introduce something extraordinary in the Divine Purpose. Students of deep reflection have considered that about the two thousandth year the call of, and promise to, Abraham was given, that about two thousand years after was the Coming of the promised seed to make a sacrifice, and that, judging from analogy, we may reasonably expect something remarkable to occur at the expiration of two thousand years more. Besides this, eminent writers, as Kurtz (*His. of Old Cov.*), Prof. Stuart (*Com. Rev.*), and others lay stress on the symbolical character of the numbers ten, seven, three, etc. Among their statements we find it frequently asserted that "seven is the seal of the covenant with Jehovah," of "rest" and "completeness," and is applied to the Abrahamic. But such writers overlook the important and significant fact that if it is such, then it embraces the Davidic Covenant also, which is an outgrowth or enlargement of the Abrahamic. If so (for we are only taking their deductions for granted), then it legitimately follows, provided the symbolical import is adopted, that we are directed to the seventh chiliad as the period when the covenant shall in every particular be realized. Any other explanation makes their use inexplicable. Again, the typical nature of certain seasons has caused many to regard this theory with favor. Thus e.g. the feast of trumpets, which came in with the new moon of the seventh month. The moon is regarded (Dr. Etheridge's *Targum*, 2 vol. pref.) as an emblem of the Church, and the new moon of the seventh month is selected to indicate that at the seventh period of time the Church in its renewed state shall be the cause of rejoicing, etc. Whatever may be thought of this and similar typical comments, it is certain that the Sabbatical year, introduced once in seven years, has been esteemed by Jewish and Christian writers as a type of the repose, etc., to be enjoyed in the seventh age or the Great Sabbath. The Year of Jubilee, or Great Year of Redemption, after the lapse of seven Sabbatical years, when there was a general release and restitution, has been regarded as a more striking type of the same future Sabbath, when man shall be fully restored, re-instated to all forfeited blessings. With Isa. 63:4; 1. 27:13; Matt. 24:31, etc., apparently alluding to the same, thoughtful readers of the Word have been slow to discard the ancient belief in these things.*

Obs. 4. Now, to return to the use made by Paul of this opinion entertained by the Jews. Brought up under Gamaliel, he must have known how the Jews regarded the Sabbath as typical of the reign of the Messiah, etc. Hence, the references made by him to this opinion, and their future application to Jesus Christ is a virtual indorsement of the same. We have, first, his declaration, Col. 2:16, 17, that "the Sabbaths are a shadow of things to come," viz., typical of things future as related to Christ. Second: the "Rest" which the Jews attributed to the Messianic reign, he applies, 2 Thess. 1:7, to the period of the future revelation of Jesus from heaven. The very phrase current to designate the Millennial glory (comp. Isa. 11:10), Paul refers to the Second Advent. Third: The manner in which he employs the word "Rest" in Hebrews, being addressed to Jews, could not but confirm them in their belief of the future reign of the Messiah during the seventh Millenary. (1) In chap. 3:11, 18 he calls the promised land, the land of Canaan, the covenanted land—the "Rest" He locates, as our argument based on the covenant necessitates, the Rest here on the earth. (2) Then, without any change of meaning, he speaks of the same Rest, ch. 4:1, 3, etc., as promised also to us. (3) If we take the rendering of verse 3, ch. 4, given by Bloomfield (after Kuin, Wets, and Schoettg.), Stuart, etc., then there is an evident admitted "Jewish cast of reasoning," making the Sabbath typical. (4) This is done, verse 4, where "the seventh day" is specially mentioned as a type. (5) This same "Rest" is spoken of as future, v. 9. (6) An important and significant change is observable in verses 9 and 10, for this "Rest" still in the future is called in the original "Sabbatism" (or marg. read. "Keeping of a Sabbath"), thus indorsing the Jewish septenary or Millenaries. Even Whitby, *Com. loci*, admits that the change from "Rest" to "Sabbatism" leads us "to the spiritual Sabbath of which the Jewish doctors speak so generally as the great thing signified by their Sabbath." Commentators generally confess that allusion is made to the then existing view held by the Jews. What abundantly confirms this is the manner in which John introduces the one thousand years in Rev. 20. The Jewish notion of the septenary is pointedly reproduced by the Spirit, and referred to the future, being also connected with a resurrection. Now, it is impossible to conceive, if the Jewish idea of the Millenaries is an erroneous one, of a more effectual way of re-establishing and confirming the Jewish conceptions than is done in the Apocalyptic portrayal of the Millennium. This is fully evinced by the profound impression in this direction made upon the early churches. All this, however, only teaches us that, as the Jewish conception of the Kingdom was invariably identified with the future Sabbatism, the language of the apostles indorsing such a Sabbatism, is also virtually the reception of their doctrine of the Kingdom. Otherwise, the matter would have been explained, and a new meaning attached to it. But, seeing that the Covenant promises were linked with the seventh Millenary by the Jews, that they believed that David's Son would inaugurate in His Kingdom the Great Sabbath, we may well contend that, as the apostles employ the same phraseology without the least hint of a change in meaning, that they also held to the fulfilment of the covenanted Kingdom at that period, or, to say the least, taught that such a Sabbath should, in the future, be witnessed here on earth, following regularly preceding ages.

Obs. 5. Another feature, which has materially served to perpetuate and enforce this Sabbatical view, is the following: Whatever

application prophetic writers or commentators have made of the prophetic dates of Daniel and Revelation, which precede the ushering in of the Mill. era, they have been almost universally made to end within the 6000 years. This prophetic Chronology thus harmonizing with the idea of a Sabbatism following the closing of 6000 years, has necessarily resulted in keeping the Sabbatical idea prominently before the Church. For so limited are the prophetic dates, and within the seven thousandth year, that they serve materially to impress the tradition of Elias.*

Obs. 6. There is something remarkable in the contrasts presented by this Sabbatism. Man, when created, immediately entered upon the Sabbath, so when re-created (the resurrection being such) he again enters upon one, for the Sabbath is a following after a creation, and it is but reasonable to suppose that the Mill. age, preceded as it is by an astounding exertion of creative energy and power, should be a glorious Sabbatism. God, instituting the Sabbath, assigning the reason of resting or ceasing from creation, refers us (as Lewis, *Six Days of Creation*) to “a greater Calendar” in which a special Day of the Lord is thus expressed, and as sons of His (made such in realization, as David’s Son was, by the power of the resurrection), we enter into the same kind of a rest after a baptism of creative power is experienced, thus in actual experience constantly representing in a lesser state or condition that occupied by God Himself. For being incorruptible, immortal, fashioned after Christ, etc., there is no more creative power to be exerted to bring us to the destiny intended. Creation ceases: a Sabbath follows—a Sabbath, however, in which works of Providence (“He hath worked hitherto and yet worketh”), works of mercy, love, etc., are still continued. With the Sabbath begins man’s inheritance; with it begins his divine calling to bless God; with it begins the dominion over the earth: it is fitting that another Sabbath should re-introduce the inheritance which he lost, the divine calling which he prostituted, and the dominion which he forfeited. Hence as Adam in company with Eve went forth into the Sabbath to participate in the rest and enjoyment of God, so the Second Adam accompanied by His “Helpmeet” go forth upon their inheritance, calling, and dominion, in the glory of a Sabbath, which the Spirit of God, which knoweth all things, eulogizes in the most exalted terms.*

Obs. 7. The student scarcely needs to be reminded that the Sabbatism presented needs not necessarily be pressed in its chronological aspect, although great stress has been laid on the same. For, so far as our argument is concerned (which is not a chronological one), it will be amply sufficient, if it be only conceded that the times, past and present, will be succeeded here on earth by another period containing this Sabbatism. This has been fully established, for Pre-Christian and Christian interpretation—aside from the chronological feature, almost invariably attached—takes it as fundamental that such an era will follow other past eras (as the Sabbath follows the days of the week), that it pertains to the earth, and that in it the glorious Messianic blessings will be fully realized.

Obs. 8. As indicative of the class of men who hold to this Sabbatism view, we present a few more illustrations. Rothe (*Dog.*, P. 2, p. 60) says: “The Apostles describe the Chiliastic Kingdom. Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, calls it ‘a Sabbatism’ for the people of God.” Archb. William Newcome (*Bickersteth’s Diss. on Proph.*, p. 106), referring to Rev. 20:4, and advocating our view of it, adds: “This is the great Sabbatism or rest of the Church.” John Bunyan (*First Chaps. Genesis*) advocates “the glory that the Church shall have in the latter day, even in the seven thousandth year of the world, that Sabbath when Christ shall set up His Kingdom on earth.” Hippolytus (*Clarke’s Ante-Nicene Ch. Lib.*, vol. 6, p. 447) remarks: “And 6000 years must needs be accomplished, in order that the Sabbath may come, the rest, the holy day, on which God rested from all His works. For the Sabbath is the type and emblem of the future Kingdom of the saints, when they shall reign with Christ, when He comes from heaven; as John says in his Apocalypse: For a day with the Lord is as a thousand years.” Gieseler (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 100), after stating the universality of Chiliasm in the second century, adds: “The Millennium was represented as the great Sabbath which was very soon to begin, and to be ushered in by the resurrection of the dead.”*

PROPOSITION 144. This Kingdom embraces “the times of refreshing” and “the times of the restitution of all things” mentioned, Acts 3:19–21.

Having had occasion several times to refer this passage to the Pre-Mill. Advent and the Millennial refreshing that follows, it may be advisable to give, more at length, the reasons for such an application.

Obs. 1. Before entering into a discussion, the reader is exhorted to notice that Peter is addressing Jews who were familiar with, and employed, the phraseology used. The very phrases derived by the Jews from the typical year of Jubilee, from the typical Sabbath, and from the promises of the prophets, and applied by them to express the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom and the happy times resulting therefrom, Peter takes, without explanation, to be fulfilled at the repentance of the nation and at the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. This is so evident that a number of writers on this ground reject Peter’s statements as too exclusively “Jewish.” If the present time or dispensation was intended, then Peter ought, as an honest man, to have explained the phrases accordingly. If the phrases were to be spiritualized, he ought to have stated the fact, and assigned the reasons for such a transmutation. Those who differ from us should explain, if they can, how Peter could possibly employ the current Jewish

phraseology in the connection of a future Coming Messiah, knowing how the expressions were applied, unless he fully indorsed the opinion entertained by his hearers. If the Apostle meant something else, then they ought also to show how it came to pass that all the churches organized by the Apostles still retained a firm and continued belief in the Jewish view of “the times of refreshing” and “the times of restitution,” and looked for the same in the prayed-for Coming of the Son of man. If the predicted refreshing and restitution under the Messiah was, as modern writers tell us, to be experienced in this dispensation, why is it that the faith and hope of the Early Church was so constantly directed to the speedy Second Advent? Consistency and the preservation of the integrity of the early faith, covenant and prophecy, all require us to receive those expressions as still relating to the future.

Obs. 2. Notice the meaning of “the times of refreshing.” Barnes (Com. loci) tells us that “refreshing means properly the breathing or refreshment after being heated with labor, running, etc; hence denotes any kind of refreshment, as rest, or deliverance from evils of any kind.” He speaks of “the common belief of the Jews” concerning it, and adds: “The idea, however, that the times of the Messiah would be times of rest, and ease, and prosperity, was a favorite one among the Jews, and was countenanced in the Old Test. See Isa. 28:12, ‘To whom He said, This is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest; and this the refreshing,’ ” etc. Prof. Bush (Anastasis), after giving “refreshment, produced by cooling after excessive heat” (so Vulgate: tempora refrigerii—times of refrigeration), including, as some have it, “free respiration,” and adding the idea of “comfort, consolation,” and, as Syriac, “times of tranquility,” informs us that it means “refreshment and invigoration,” and then adds: “It implies a kind of return to the body of its animating principle.” Bloomfield (Com. loci) says: “ ‘Refreshing’ properly denotes a regaining one’s breath after it has been interrupted; a breathing time from some labor, a rest from trouble or deliverance from evil generally; in which sense it occurs in the Sept. and Philo cited by the commentators.” This interpretation accords with that given by a large number of writers, which need not be repeated, seeing that there is no material difference existing. The differences of opinion arise from the location of the fulfilment of the refreshing. Barnes, however, anxious to apply the phrase exclusively to this dispensation, is forced to acknowledge that it “includes the restitution of all things and the return of Christ,” etc. Bloomfield, utterly rejecting its application to this present period, adopts its connection with the Sec. Advent and makes “the refreshing” “the same with the ‘rest,’ 2 Thess. 1:7.” Olshausen (Com. loci) contends that “the times of refreshing” and “the times of restitution” are the same, being identical in point of fulfilment. After showing that any other translation is inconsistent with the laws of language, he adds: “The Coming of Christ (i.e. his parousia) is therefore to be conceived as coincident with the times of refreshing, and His sojourn in the heavenly world closes with His return to the earth for the completion of His work.” “The expression occurring here, ‘times of refreshing,’ is easily explained. Life in this sinful world is conceived as a time of conflict and distress, and it is followed by rest in the Kingdom of the Messiah. The phrase is only to be found in this passage of the New Test., and has but feeble parallels in the Old Test., as e.g. 2 Sam. 23:7. Probably it takes its origin from a comparison of the Messianic era with a Sabbath day in the higher sense, which, it is known, was very current among the Jews.” Let the reader pass over the predictions of this Kingdom under the Messiah, and see how (Isa. 35) “waters shall break out in the wilderness and streams in the desert;” how “the parched ground shall become a pool and the thirsty land springs of water,” and “the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away;” how (Isa. 41:17, 18; Isa. 43:19, 20, etc.) drink will be given to His thirsty people; how the righteous (Isa. 25) shall enjoy “a feast of fat things full of marrow” with victory over death, etc.; how (Rev. 19) they are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb, etc.; and surely the phrase “times of refreshing” is well chosen to designate the period when “the rest” is obtained, and God wipes away all tears. Consider, also, that this refreshing proceeds “from the presence (face) of the Lord” (which, while it denotes that the Lord is the author of it, really with the views of the hearers means more), and to show how this will be done by the Messiah personally, the Apostle proceeds to state that this same Jesus, crucified, preached and ascended to heaven. God will send, thus meeting the objection of the Jew that might be urged, viz., where is the personal Messiah who is to introduce this refreshing? Peter thus transfers the anticipations of the Jews to the time of the Sec. Advent. Lechler’s remarks (Lange’s Com. loci) are pertinent: “Of that time (i.e. refreshment and blessedness) God is the author and source; it commences with the return of Christ, whom heaven receives during the interval, but whom God will send personally; it consists of all that which God had hitherto promised through the prophets.” (See also Doc. and Eth. Remark, s. 6.) Prof. E. W. Hengstenberg (The Jews and Christian Church), although having no sympathy with our views, is forced to say that “the times of refreshing are identical with the regeneration,” and “that the detailed description thereof is given in Rev. 21 and 22, is as certain as that its advent is set forth as contemporaneous with the re-appearance of Christ.” This view is correct, and how it harmonizes with ours will be seen under following propositions. It is only necessary to add that the varied renderings of “when,” “that,” “in order that” or “until,” the times of refreshing “shall” or “may” come, etc., do not affect the application of the passage, since Millenarians from Irenæus and Tertullian down to Judge Jones (Notes) have received one or the other rendering. The rendering itself, whichever is attached, forbids the reception of a then existing present condition of things, and embraces the notion of a future occurrence. It is true, as Judge Jones has most ably shown (Notes on Scripture, loci), that if the rendering of the English Version is discarded for “that times of refreshing may come” (which Jones adopts), then “Peter connects the national conversion of Israel with the promised times of refreshing,” etc. His argument is that the Apostle urges the Jews, as a people, to repentance and conversion, because the times of refreshing, as the prophets abundantly testify, are connected with just such a repentance and conversion. It is implied that until this is done, such promised times cannot come, seeing that the Kingdom cannot be set up, as predicted, without it. The delay in carrying the Gospel to the Gentiles, the priority given to the Jews, the sparing of the nation for some time, etc., was to still mercifully tender to them—in

view of their being nationally entitled to the blessings—the promised times of refreshing on condition of repentance. The continued national unbelief and impenitence prevented—as had been already foreseen and predicted—God’s gracious purposes, and delayed them until the “times of the Gentiles” would be fulfilled. It is unnecessary to declare that if this is the meaning, how well this meets the conditions given under previous propositions. On the other hand, if “when” is to be retained, then the idea of Calvin and others may be the correct one, viz., to refer the times of refreshing and the peace, etc., to the Advent of Christ—or Jones’s view can be received, implying that then the sins of the nation (under which it is even yet suffering) shall be entirely removed when, owing to its repentance, etc., these times will be introduced. As stated, no matter what rendering is adopted, the allusion is directly to the future as related to the Advent of Jesus.

Obs. 3. In reference to the meaning and application of “the times of restitution,” we shall again chiefly rely upon the comments of opponents and others. Barnes (Com. loci) says: “It means properly to restore a thing to its former situation,” and while inclined by this theory to apply it in a measure to the present dispensation, yet he admits that it includes the return of Jesus and the work that He may then perform. Bloomfield: it “properly signifies a restoration of anything to some former state,” and he unhesitatingly applies its fulfilment at the Sec. Advent. Prof. Bush (Anastasis) says the word “restitution” means a restoration to a former condition, restitution to original state, and quotes philologists who give such a rendering, and refers it to the future. Scott (Com.) remarks that it denotes the restoration of a thing to the state from which it had fallen, and that it must include the Sec. Coming and the restoration of Israel. Dr. Bell (The Times of Restitution) says: “The word translated ‘restitution’ might be rendered ‘restoration.’ Calvin has it, ‘The times of restoring.’ ” The remark of Calvin on the passage is worthy of our notice. He says: “If at this time we see many things confused in the world, let this hope refresh us, that Christ shall once come, that He may restore all things.” This was the view of the Reformers generally, several of whom we have already quoted in another connection. Prof. Hackett (Com. on Acts) makes it: “The times of the restoration of all things i.e. to a state of primoval order, purity, and happiness, such as will exist for those who have part in the Kingdom of Christ at His Sec. Coming.” Olshausen (Com.), of course, makes Jesus the Restorer at His Coming again, and restitution to be “that of bringing back to its originally pure condition,” etc. Lange (Com. loci) says: “It (‘restitution’) denotes a restoration or return of an earlier condition,” and declares: “it commences with the return of Christ,” etc. So Lechler and Gerok in Doc. and Eth. remarks, s. 6, confirm this usus loquendi, refer its fulfilment to the Advent, and show that, according to the prophets, it is even more than restorative, transcending all that ever existed. The student, who has investigated this subject, well knows that a multitude of eminent theologians and writers can be adduced, who present similar definitions, and apply its fulfilment to the Sec. Advent. Indeed, this is the almost universal interpretation—both ancient and modern. But what is to be restored, brought back to its former condition with increased glory? Gerok (Lange’s Com. loci, Doc. 6) quotes Baumgarten (Die Apostelgeschichte, 1, p. 80) as saying: “Nothing else than the Kingdom of Israel, the whole power and glory of the Israelitic Kingdom.” While Gerok justly observes that it includes more, as the prophets predicted, yet Baumgarten is right in laying stress on the restoration of the Theocratic Kingdom; for that is the burden of prophecy, that is the main, leading object to which the eye of faith and hope is directed. The idea of restoring this Kingdom is stated in Acts 1:6, and is plainly repeated in Acts 15:16, the same idea running through—from the time of its overthrow and even before—the Old and New Tests. Peter, well knowing how his hearers understood this phrase as directly including the rebuilding of the fallen throne and Kingdom of David, instead of giving it another meaning, tells those hearers that it is postponed until the Sec. Advent of Jesus, thus fully corroborating the statements of the Master concerning the postponement. But, as stated, it embraces more than this, for the persons addressed by Peter—owing to the portraiture given of the things pertaining to, and accompanying, this Kingdom—were accustomed to ally with it the resurrection and the renewal of nature itself, and, as is well known, this uninterruptedly continued to be the belief of the Christian Church for several centuries until the Origenistic interpretation prevailed. The restitution, in the very nature of the case, includes all things specified by the covenants, both the Abrahamic and Davidic, and the promises based upon the same, extending not only to the Jewish nation and to the Gentile nations, but even to creation. For the Kingdom in which this restitution is to be experienced, is the bringing forth the Divine Purpose in a manifested form as the consummating of the Infinite Plan, which has for its object the restoring of man and the world to their originally destined place. The restoration of the Theocracy—thus bringing God again to earth as the Ruler in the Person of Jesus Christ—makes the restoration of all other things not only possible but a requisite measure to preserve the dignity and glory of the then prevailing Theocratic relationship. “The days of heaven,” Ps. 89:29, to which even Moses alluded (Deut. 11:21 “as the days of heaven upon earth”), will through the throne then established and by the power of the Mighty King (The Restorer) produce that ample deliverance from all evil and that perfected salvation of which the prophets so sweetly predict—all resting upon and resulting from the displayed authority and rule of the God-man—the Theocratic King. It is impracticable for a Theocracy—in the pure and high form covenanted—to exist side by side with a prevailing curse, and hence its very establishment is a triumph (in the resurrected and glorified ones, etc.) over the curse, insuring its repeal and ultimate destruction. In brief, this, this will form the day of completed Redemption.

Obs. 4. While the view of restitution, embracing the restoration of the Theocracy and the return to the condition of things before the fall of Adam, is consoling and grand, yet even this would limit its meaning, for a more sublime and scriptural aspect of it is, that, while including those mentioned, it is a restoration to that very condition which Adam and his descendants would have attained to had they not fallen. Adam himself is restored in that immortal condition which he forfeited by sin (i.e. to that which he had not yet attained), and in the entire restitution God indicates, not merely the bestowment of blessings previously enjoyed, but that of others

superadded to qualify those participating in it for the exercise of that government which the number, state, etc., of Adam's descendants and God's purpose in creation makes important or even necessary. Hence in some of its aspects, transcending all experience and knowledge, it may be beyond our comprehension; at least, the Bible intimates in a number of places that it is scarcely possible for us now, situated as we are, to form adequate conceptions of its extent and glory. Hence, also, as we shall show in a following proposition, it extends to the restoration of the race (not of the wicked) as a race to its lost, forfeited condition.*

Obs. 5. Again, let it be distinctly understood that Jesus "the Christ" is the Refresher or Reanimator, the Restorer, the Mighty Deliverer. This power and honor He has delegated to no one in this future dispensation (whatever the glorified saints may, associated with Him, perform through Him in the world to come), and He justly claims that it belongs to Himself exclusively, as e.g. "Behold, I make all things new," etc. Before restitution comes, Jesus must first come; this is the divine order plainly laid down. In this dispensation, whatever the love and grace of God in the hearts of believers, etc., it cannot remove the curse, renovate the earth, or restore a single forfeited blessing; it cannot save from pain, sickness, or death, from trial, sorrow, or bereavements; it cannot deliver self or our neighbor from the troubles incident and allotted to the present life. The caution thus briefly expressed is the more needed, since believers in the Word too much overlook it.*

Obs. 6. As various writers (e.g. Lord, Judge Jones, Brookes, Bickersteth, etc.) have intimated, these "times" may include successive eras, economies, ascending stages of glory. Beginning with the Millennial period, restitution manifests itself magnificently in the Theocratic order, in the persons of the saints, in the dispensing of blessings, etc.; and by a comparison of Scripture there is reason to believe that the work is—so far as the whole earth and the nations are concerned—progressive, for at the close of the distinctive thousand years additional facts, indicative of the removal of the last vestiges of evil, are mentioned. While the Millennium is thus, in a manner, initiatory to succeeding dispensations or ages, yet, as we shall show hereafter (Prop. 159), the restitution thus affected is not displaced by another one, for it is always spoken of as eternal (see Prop. 159). Whatever of an additional nature is introduced, forms only an increased glory (resulting from continued Redemption), added to that which already exists. As the design of this work is only to take the reader to the close of the Millennial era and the entrance into the eternal ages (where the Bible takes and leaves us), when already refreshing and restitution have been experienced and tested in all their preciousness, it is proper for us to avoid giving, what can only be conjecture, any decisive opinion concerning the phraseology which seems to involve a succession of eras in the continuation of a restored world.*

Obs. 7. So interesting is this subject, that the utterances of others may prove acceptable, and several more illustrations are appended. The Art. "Restitution" in M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclop., after making "restitution" to mean "emendation, restoration to a pristine condition, change to a better state," says: "By the expression 'until the times of the apocatastasis of all things which God has spoken' etc., Peter means the time when all affairs shall be consummated, all the prophetic announcements shall be accomplished, including the inauguration of the Kingdom of the Messiah and its attendant events, the full extension of the Gospel, the resurrection, judgment, etc., in short, the end of the world." The reader will observe that the writer—taking the definite Jewish and early Christian view, as well as the analogy of the Scriptures—crowds entirely too much into his definition. Pressense (*The Early Days of Christ*, p. 48), speaking of "the first Christians," says: "They believed in an immediate return of Jesus Christ 'to restore all things.' They supposed that the end of the world was at hand, and that the last days foretold by Joel had begun to dawn, Acts 2:17 and 3:19, 20. Thus they awaited those days of refreshing from the presence of the Lord which were to inaugurate the Second Coming of Christ." Pressense is incorrect when he says "the end of the world," for they located this refreshing and restitution in this world after the Advent, and hence only held to "the end of the age or dispensation." Dr. Schaff (*His., Apos. Ch.*, p. 631), in reference to Acts 3:19–21, correctly remarks: "He (Peter) points to a still future time of refreshing, a restoration of the physical and moral world to the state of perfection, to be accomplished at the visible return of Christ, who now fills heaven—a time when all the predictions of the holy prophets of God shall be completely realized." Alford (*Com. loci*) refers both the refreshing and restitution to the Second Advent, and says of the former, "The times of refreshment (is) the Great Season of Joy and Rest, which, it was understood, the Coming of the Messiah in His Glory was to bring with it," and of the latter, "a glorious and Complete Restoration, especially of 'the Kingdom to Israel,' Acts 1:6." This introduction of the Kingdom brings out the distinctive meaning always attached to it by the Jews, disciples, and early believers. Fairbairn (*Typol.*, vol. 1, p. 314) remarks on Acts 3:21, that "the Apostle Peter represents the time of Christ's Sec. Coming as 'the time of the restoration of all things,' that is, when everything should be restored to its pristine condition—the same condition in kind, all pure and good, glorious and blessed, but higher in degree, as it is the design of Redemption to ennoble whatsoever it touches." It is a pity that he could not apply this, then, to the restoration promised of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom as seen e.g. Acts 15:16. The *Comprehensive Com.*, so largely addicted to spiritualizing, makes the following comment: "That times of refreshing will come from the presence of the Lord, v. 19, and that they will be times of the restitution of all things, v. 21. There is a future state, another life after this: those times will come from the presence of the Lord, from His glorious appearance at that day, His Coming at the end of time. This we may receive, excepting the Popish idea of time ending, seeing that these times are to be realized in 'the day (or time) of the Lord Jesus.' This *Com.* in a foot-note correctly associates these times with the restoration of the Jews, just as Meyer (*Com. loci*), Baumgarten (*Apos. His.*), Da Costa (*Israel and the Gentiles*), and many others. Indeed, they are inseparable; and to the critical student it may be observed that these words were exclusively addressed to Jews, some time before the call of the Gentiles, and therefore must have been based on the prophecies relating to that nation. Dr. Brown

(Com. loci) comments: "When the times of refreshing shall come—rather 'in order that the times of refreshing may come;' that long period of repose, prosperity, and joy, which all the prophets hold forth to the distracted Church and this miserable world, as eventually to come, and which is here, as in all the prophets, made to turn upon the national conversion of Israel." "Restitution of all things—comprehending, probably, the rectification of all the disorders of the fall." This comment, if logically applied, is an ample reply to much of his reasoning against us in his polemic work *Christ's Sec. Coming*; and especially does it contradict that portion of it which leaves out or denies the restoration (as advocated by us) of important blessings forfeited by the fall, and giving us, in place, an imperfect Redeemer and Redemption. M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Restitution," quotes from Kuinöl Com. loci as follows: "Morus and Rosenmüller make 'times of refreshing' to mean 'happy times, not merely the day of the resurrection of the dead, but also spiritual benefits of every kind which Christians enjoy in this and the future life (Morus: the Messianic times), and refer the 'times of restitution' (full and perfect fulfilment of prophecy) to the consummation of that auspicious period when all enemies shall be subdued (1 Cor. 15:25 sq.; Heb. 10:12, 15; Comp. Ps. 101:1) and every influence opposing true religion removed." "De Dieu, Limbach, Wolf, and others, understand by the times of 'refreshing' and 'restitution' (i.e. the predicted period when the due position will be assigned each one) the days of the last judgment, the times of affliction to the impious and contumacious, but of relief, quiet, and safety to the saints. In support of this view they adduce the frequent arguments of the sacred writers to induce Christians to diligence and hope drawn from the prospect of the last day (Acts 17:30, sq.; 2 Pet. 3:7; 2 Thess. 1:7 and 2:16), and the fact that Jewish writers were accustomed so to speak of it (Pirke Aboth. 4:17)." It may be said that if the scriptural idea of judgment is received, then such declarations may be accepted, excepting the reference to this life, concerning which Olshausen aptly (Com. loci) remarks: "The grammatical connection admits only the first view, which regards the two expressions (viz., times of refreshing and times of restitution) as identical, and as not referring to the present time." Dr. Craven (Lange's Com. Rev., p. 339) gives an interesting note on this passage, well worthy of notice. He refers to the plural "times" as indicative of lengthened period (to which we also attach the idea of successive stages or periods), and fully advocates our position. We give this extract: "The following seem to be the elements of the restitution predicted in the foregoing Scriptures: 1. A restoration of the hearts of the fathers to the children, Mal. 4:6. 2. The restoration of the rejected seed of Jacob to holiness and the subsequent favor of God, Isa. 1:25; Jer. 24:7. 3. The restoration of Israel to their own land, passim. 4. The establishment of Israel not again to be dispersed, Jer. 24:6, 7:5. The establishment of the Kingdom of righteousness as a visible Kingdom, in power and great glory, with its seat at Jerusalem, Isa. 1:25, 26 (2:2, 3); 58:12–14; Jer. 23:5–8; 23:7 sqq. 6. The gathering of all nations as tributary to Israel or the Church. 7. The Palingenesia, Isa. 11; 65:17 sqq."*

PROPOSITION 145. This Kingdom includes "the regeneration" of Matt. 19:28.

This follows from previous Propositions, especially the one relating to the resurrection (which was shown, as in Christ's own person, to be expressed by a renewed or new birth or regeneration through the power of the Spirit), that this Kingdom can only be established, as promised, "in the regeneration." For, its rulers are immortal and reign ever more. Embracing a most precious promise, it is worthy of a more extended notice, making it confirmatory of our position.

Obs. 1. Again, to avoid the charge of forcing the application of the passage, the comments of opposers and friends will be both given. Barnes (Com. loci) says: "It refers to that great revolution, that restoration of order in the Universe, that universal new birth when the dead shall rise," etc., and reads the passage: "Ye which have followed me, shall, as a reward in the great day of the resurrection of the dead and of forming the new and eternal order of things—the day of judgment, the regeneration—be signally honored and blessed." He unites the regeneration with the Sec. Advent. Bloomfield (Com. loci) remarks: "I cannot hesitate to adopt, in preference to all others, the sense assigned to the passage by the ancient expositors in general (and of the modern ones by Kuinoel and Fritzsche), confirmed by the Syriac, Persic, Arabic, Æthiopic, and Italic versions; understanding 'regeneration' of the resurrection to judgment and a new state of existence." He gives this, as required by the context, viz., the revelation of Christ on the throne of His glory (comp. Matt. 25:31), and affirms that the strongest proof of its relationship to the future is found in the fact that those who differ in its application "are compelled to engraft this," and adds: "Nay, even Campbell grants that 'the principal completion of the promise will be at the general resurrection.' " Dr. Wordsworth (Gr. Test. loci) gives: "In the new birth of the saints at the resurrection, in the New Jerusalem. See 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 3:12 and 21:2, 5," etc. Olshausen (Com. loci) makes this equivalent to "the coming forth of the Kingdom from its concealed and purely spiritual into an external form," etc., calling it "a restoration" advancing from the individual "to the final glorifying of the body" and "the outward visible world as a whole." It thus comprehends the resurrection and the final glorifying, as they stand related to the Kingdom. Lange (Com. loci) says: "The Lord here primarily referred to the final completion of the Kingdom of heaven," and regards it very much in the light Olshausen does, calling it a stronger expression than "restitution" (Acts 3:21, with which he says it coincides), since it points to a higher state of existence of man, etc., in the future when restitution is realized. It is scarcely necessary to repeat the interpretation and application of the passage by other commentators and theologians, seeing that it would be, substantially, a repetition of what has preceded. The reader can easily, if desirable, extend such references (with the note appended).

Obs. 2. Without denying that “the regeneration” when once experienced will include much, or even all, that the writers, just quoted, have attributed to it, yet evidently in the comments of many of them there is a wide departure from the early simplicity attached to the phrase. This is true of later Millenarian authors, who (as e.g. Jones, *Notes on Scripture*) make it a renovation of all things, a universal recreation, “Paradise restored or brought back again,” etc. Freely admitting that when this “regeneration” is experienced, that then, also, the new heavens and new earth appear, that Paradise is restored, that the Kingdom of heaven is outwardly manifested in glory, etc., it does not follow by any means that “regeneration” denotes all these things. Logically, it cannot. Let the reader glance over the various commentators and writers who attempt to explain this phrase, and he will notice one distinguishing peculiarity attending nearly all, viz., that in some way it does, and must, include the resurrection of the body. The primary meaning of a second creation, renewal, restoration, necessarily, when considered in its relation to the future, embraces the idea of the resurrection. Let us give a few more illustrations, showing how persons, whatever their views, are impelled by the signification of the word itself to allow its reference to the resurrection. Augustine (*Treat. on Forgiveness*, B. 2, ch. 9) quotes Matt. 19:28, and refers the regeneration to the bodily resurrection.* Doddridge (*Com. loci*) calls “regeneration,” “the renovation of all things, when all the children of God shall, as it were, be born anew from their graves,” etc. Bengel (*Gnomen, loci*) remarks: “There will be a new creation, over which the Second Adam will preside, when the whole microcosm of human nature, by means of the resurrection, and also the microcosm of the universe will be born again (*genesim iteram habebit*).” Jones (*Notes*), including the renovation of the earth, the restoration of the twelve tribes, the re-establishment of the Theocracy, etc., says: “It includes the resurrection, exaltation, and glorification of the Church of the first-born or elect.” Stier (*Words of Jesus*) on the passage, calling it “the renewal of the world,” also makes it contain “the resurrection of the dead” and subsequent glorification. Simon, the Romanist, translated by Webster (and quoted by Jones), remarks: “By the regeneration most of the ancient commentators understood the resurrection.” Beza (margin of the Old Eng. Bible, ed. 1598) refers it to the day of resurrection; so also Olearius (*Obs. Sac.*) says that part of the regeneration is the restoring of the dead by the resurrection, which itself is called regeneration, illustrative of Epiph. Ad. Hœres. 36:1; Deylingius (*Obs. Sac.*), the same; while Munster (*Crit. Sac.*) says positively: “This second generation is the resurrection of the dead,” etc.; Le Clerc and Hammond make regeneration equivalent to resurrection, so Jansenius (*Harm. Ch.*, c. p. 717), Cornelius a Lapide, Chemnitz (*Harm.*, ch. 132), and the reader will find these quoted at length by Judge Jones (*Notes on Scripture*, pp. 214–216). This is so evident that Trench (*Syn. of N. T.*, p. 97), after admitting that “the day of resurrection will be the day of ‘regeneration,’ ” adds: “So that those fathers had a certain, though only partial, right, when they interpreted the word at Matt. 19:28, as though it had been only equivalent to anastasis (resurrection), and, as a consequence, continually used it as a synonym for the resurrection.” Trench himself, as well as many of the authors already alluded to, certainly are illogical when they tell us that the scope of the passage relates to the future, and then drag in that which pertains to the past. Admitting the necessity of moral regeneration before this promised regeneration is experienced, yet the former is not the subject of the promise; admitting also the renewal of the earth, etc., it does not seem appropriate to crowd into this one word quite a number of events which are clearly set forth in other places. The simplicity of the early meaning is to be retained, viz., its reference to the resurrection for the following reasons: 1. The Res. is a “regeneration,” admitted by all, and believed in at the time Jesus spoke. The Jews held to the resurrection of the pious dead at the Advent of the Messiah (see *Prop. on Res. etc.*), and from the prophets believed that this would be followed by a renovation of nature resulting from the exalted nature, power, and glory of the Messiah’s Kingdom. But from Isa. 66:8–10; Ezek. 37:1–14, and other predictions, the resurrection was regarded as a new birth or second creation through the special power of God. So that let the word be applicable to both (and thus employed), yet the meaning that Jesus attached to it must be sought in the general complexion of the passage. Hence, correct at least in retaining the idea of resurrection (without which all the rest could not be attained), let us ask whether the other idea was directly included or only implied. 2. This is answered by noticing: (A) That Jesus speaks of the reward or compensation being received (the reward itself being the resultant) in or through this regeneration, which remarkably accords with other sayings of His, as, e.g., “Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just,” Luke 14:14. (B) It is observable that the reign of Christ on the throne of His glory, as well as that of the apostles subordinately, being placed after the Sec. Advent is uniformly introduced in promise as preceded by a resurrection of the righteous, and with this the words of Christ correspond. (C) “The manifestation of the sons of God,” Rom. 8:19, precedes the deliverance of creation—the latter being a result of the former having received “the redemption of the body.” Jesus—the question of the deliverance of the creature not being suggested but only that of rewarding the sons of God—would hardly introduce the latter when the reigning with Him is invariably—when explained—predicated of this very period of manifestation. (D) The parallel passage in Luke 22:28 aids in enforcing our position. Here we have the same promise given to the apostles, by which we learn that by this “regeneration” (omitted by Luke), the apostles receive “a kingdom,” and that, what Matt. declares Christ does, is “in my Kingdom.” When search is made to ascertain how and when this “Kingdom,” in which this reign of Jesus and the apostles is to be witnessed, is obtained, then the interpretation of “regeneration” as “resurrection” stands forth in such a passage as this: “Flesh and Mood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God,” but, as the connection shows, the power of the resurrection of the just with its glorifying accompaniments must be experienced (1 Cor. 15:50). Whatever secondary meaning may inferentially or by implication be attached to the word, evidently the primary meaning is the one thus suggested and so long held to by ancient expositors.

Obs. 3. The Kingdom itself, the reign of the saints, the deliverance of creation, in brief, all the blessings, so vividly described by Jones, Seiss, and many others, are introduced by this very “regeneration.” Jesus is the first begotten of the dead, and His brethren

must first experience the same birth before these promises can be verified. Hence it is very doubtful whether it is a word as far-reaching as the phrase “the restitution of all things;” for the latter embraces the resurrection, restoration of Kingdom, Paradise, etc.—the bringing back of all things to their original condition or intention—while the latter, at most, can only refer to man and nature, taking the broadest definitions given to it. But with Lange and others, it must be said to be more precious, since it more directly refers to the individual, not simply restored to a forfeited position, but brought into a life most exalted and glorious through resurrection and transforming power, thus fashioning the saint after the pattern presented by Jesus. The phrase “in the regeneration” does not simply allude to the time when the resurrection is experienced, but to the fact that it is an ever-continuing reality—an unchangeable state from the period of its happy realization. It is during this wonderful regenerated life that the Kingdom of God is manifested; or, as Robison (Gr. N. Test.), “the complete external manifestation of the Messiah’s Kingdom, when all things are to be delivered from their present corruption, and restored to spiritual purity and splendor” shall be seen; or, as Van Oosterzee (Theol. N. T., p. 123), it shall embrace after the personal Sec. Advent, “the entire renewal of the natural and spiritual creature.” As the regeneration of the Lord Jesus (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5; 1 Cor. 15:20) is separate from, precedes, and yet is connected, with the ultimate renewal of creation itself, so the regeneration of the believers, accounted worthy to obtain this Kingdom, is separate from, precedes, and yet stands related to, the mighty changes which shall transform nature into the Edenic state so rapturously delineated by the prophets.*

PROPOSITION 146.—This Kingdom is associated with the deliverance of creation.

A Theocracy, perfect and extending over the earth, which brings God—the Creator—into the relationship of an earthly Ruler, and exerting His dominion over all, must, in order to exhibit the dignity and value of His rule, and to promote the welfare and happiness of His willing subjects, remove the evils under which man and the creation have been groaning. The Kingdom itself being redemptive in its intent and work, brings deliverance from the curse, however widespread, restores forfeited gifts, and even bestows riches never before conferred upon man or the earth. The Divine-human relationship of the King, who declares that He (Rev. 21:5) “will make all things new” insures all this; while the Divine Purpose, foreshadowed in covenant, prophecy, provisionary dispensations and acts, and, above all, in the bestowal of the King, and qualifying Him (as the promised David’s Son) for the position of Theocratic King, evidences how reasonable and just are the anticipations of such a renewal. The honor and glory of the King and Kingdom, the ability and representations of God to save, are involved in restoring the earth to its Edenic state. The Plan of Redemption, of which this Kingdom forms the culminating agency of affecting and completing, contemplates a return to the condition existing before the fall, and even to that which man would have attained to had he not sinned. Of course, it must then include the renewal of creation.*

Obs. 1. One of the striking peculiarities attached to Millennial prophecies describing the establishment of this Kingdom, is, that the land, the earth is represented as participating in the favors of the King; and the joy and happiness of the nations is immeasurably enhanced by their liberal bestowal. This is so clearly and explicitly stated, was so universally received by the early Church, and has been so generally entertained by eminent divines of all denominations, that it needs no special pleading. Even our opponents, who are the most disposed to depart from the grammatical meaning and engraft a spiritual sense, admit that, if those predictions are fulfilled as recorded, they must bring back a Paradise regained. No system of Theology is completed, without, in one form or another, advocating a final restoration of nature. Without detaining ourselves with a feature that is so commonly received, let our attention be directed to several disputed points.*

Obs. 2, Rom. 8:19–23 deserves particular consideration, seeing that some (as Barnes, Com. loci) are disposed to make “the creature” refer only to believers (renewed), and not to inanimate and animate creation. Admitting that the word translated “creature” does not distinctively specify creation (although Barnes says it means “creation, the act of creating, Rom. 1:20; the creature, that which is created or formed, the universe, Mark 10:6; 2 Pet. 3:4; Mark 13:19; Rom. 1:25 and 8:39”), or the renewed man (not unless the word “new” is added), it is evident that its meaning in this place ought to be decisively made out by what the Word in other places teaches shall occur at the manifestation of the sons of God, i.e., at or after the resurrection. Now, Barnes himself so freely admits (as e.g. Notes on 2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21, etc.) a renewed creation after the resurrection, that it seems both strange and inconsistent to deny it in this passage. Bloomfield indorses the view that it means “the whole visible creation” (mentioning “ancient and many eminent modern interpreters, especially Luther, Grotius, Cassell, Danhauer, Dodd., Michael, Knappe, Rosenm., and Carpzov,” as holding to it), showing that the word is used in this sense; he opposes the opinion of Hammond, Le Clerc, etc., that it denotes a “moral creation,” i.e., “the Christian Church,” which “is liable to insuperable objections, which are well stated by Ammon;” he also objects to the interpretation of Whitby and Ammon, which would limit it to “all intelligent and sentient creatures,” i.e., “the human race,” and presents an important argument when observing that this deliverance must include “such a renovation as the Jews especially supposed would take place in the age of the Messiah.” In addition, we would say, that Paul, knowing not only the views of the Jews respecting a restoration of nature, but that of the Romans even concerning the same, if nature was not to be included in this description, he certainly made choice of very imperfect (i.e. by not defining) language. His phraseology, however, is vindicated both by its meaning being in accord with the views thus entertained, and by the fact that the ancients thus interpreted it.

The sublimity of the passage, which troubles some so much that they desire to tone it down, is amply sustained by what Paul knew of the events pertaining to the resurrection. Dr. Neander (*His. Plant. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 523) says that this is connected with the resurrection of the body, and denotes a restoration of nature, adding in a foot-note: "The later distinguished commentators on this epistle have acknowledged this to be the only tenable exposition; and even Usteri, who had before brought forward the strongest objections against it, has been induced, for the same reasons that appear to me convincing, to accede to it." (See his reasons for rejecting the opposite view.) It is surprising that, to make out a theory (wresting the passage from us), men of ability, as those mentioned and others, will restrict the groaning creature to the Gentile world or to the heathen, not seeing that by so doing they represent such (against fact) as earnestly desiring to become Christian—having this feeling constantly—and of being subjected to bondage without blame, etc. Schmid (*Bib. Theol. N. T.*, p. 511) on this part forcibly says: "That 'creature' here refers to the inanimate creation in distinction from men, is clear, if we consider two points; on the one hand, that a contrast to Christians is thus established; and on the other, the 'creature' is not described as a subject burdened by sin, but only as liable to perishableness. Linguistic usage, the predicates, and the connection of the section, are all in favor of this explanation." Probably Schmid's restriction to inanimate nature, thus excluding animals, etc., is limiting its meaning too much; but he is correct in asserting its distinction from man. The "creature" certainly is something distinct from "the sons of God;" and it cannot be "the heathen world," for it has not waited for the manifestation as here represented. Van Oosterzee (*Theol. of N. T.*) fully indorses our position, and declares that nature looks for redemption. Even Knapp (*Chr. Theol.*, S. 155 II. 2) remarks, "the passage, Rom. 8:19, seq., also treats of this renovation and beautifying of the world." Dr. Hitchcock (*Fut. Cond. and Destiny of the Earth*), quoting this passage in Romans, remarks: "That Tholuck, the distinguished German theologian, considers this a description of the present bound and fettered condition of all nature, and that the deliverance refers to the future renovation of the earth. Such an exposition chimes in perfectly with the views on this subject, which have long and extensively prevailed in Germany. And it certainly does give a consistent meaning to a passage which has been to commentators a perfect labyrinth of difficulties. If this be not its meaning, then I may safely say that its meaning has not yet been found out." Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, S. 199, 4), expressly applies this Scripture to the removal of the curse entailed upon nature and to the renovation of the earth. These allusions to authorities who find in the passage a direct reference to the renewal of nature could be abundantly multiplied, but these are sufficient to indicate that we do not seek to force such an interpretation upon the text. Writers of the most diverse views and hostile to Millenarianism freely concede this; and they append that it shall only be witnessed at the Advent of Jesus Christ, and after the resurrection of the saints. This, of course, leads us back to examine when this Advent and resurrection take place. Having proven (*Props. 121, 125, 119, etc.*) that both are Pre-Millennial, there arises at once a beautiful symmetry between a harmonious blending of the Millennial predictions and Paul's declaration, which no other view can give.

Obs. 3. This leads us to consider whether Paul's declaration and the Mill. prophecies, etc., include the deliverance of the animal kingdom. This, as is well known, was the position of the early Church, as is evidenced by their writings, especially Tertullian, Lactantius, and the earlier Fathers—Papias, Barnabas, and Justin. And, in point of fact, it is impossible for a man to be a consistent Millenarian (hence, with scarcely an exception, the long line of eminent men hold to it) without adopting it. The ablest Millenarian writers unhesitatingly give it their support, and the reason is self-evident. Coming to the Bible, resolving to accept of the sense given by the plain grammatical interpretation, they find involved with the description of this re-established Kingdom at the Sec. Advent and with the blessedness and glory of the saints and the living nations such direct and explicit assertions concerning the change of disposition, etc., in the lower creation, that to reject these predictions (or engraft upon them another sense) would be doing violence to their principles of interpretation and to the Book. As this feature of the renovation has caused some to recoil from the entire subject, as if it were dishonorable to the future state and derogatory to Christ, it may be well to notice upon what it is grounded. Some are influenced by the hasty conclusion arrived at by Doddridge, when commenting upon Rom. 8:19; he says: "To explain it, as chiefly referring to the brutal or inanimate creation, is insufferable; since the day of the redemption of our bodies will be attended with the conflagration, which will put an end to them." This allusion to Peter's conflagration is to be found in every writer advertent to this point, and is the main proof relied on against it. As the conflagration theory comes up in a following proposition (*Props. 149 and 150*) to remove another objection, with which this stands associated, we may, for the present, pass it by with the single remark that such a conclusion by no means follows, provided God has declared that it shall be done and that the animals shall share in the deliverance. It is not for us to limit either God's purpose, or wisdom, or ability to perform. Without laying stress on the admitted fact that the curse has fallen upon the animal creation through man, and that perfected Redemption reasonably claims Divine interference in its behalf, which idea Olshausen, Lord, and others have ably advanced, without insisting that the objection is really based upon a spiritualistic conception of the future abode of the saints out of which the materialistic element has been (Gnostic-like) eliminated, it is amply sufficient to rely upon its being promised in the Word. Following our usual plan to allow those who have no special sympathy for our doctrine to speak their sentiments, it will answer to give first the views of others, to show that in their estimation this doctrine is taught. Thus e.g. Dr. Clarke, in his comments (*Com. loci*) on Ps. 104:29, 30, extends the renewal not only to the earth, but includes a resurrection of animals, arguing that the mention of their death preceding, and then the addition of "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created again," clearly teaches this, and refers to Rom. 8:19–23. This probably is going farther than Millenarians, who generally are satisfied with simply saying that the animal condition (with that of the earth) will be changed for the better, leaving the resurrection as a matter open to conjecture. Calvin, on Isa. 11:6–8, says that the prophet "asserts here the change of the nature of wild beasts and the restitution of creation as at first," and he substantially repeats this, when in *Insti.*, vol. 3,

ch. 25, he says, "I expect with Paul a reparation of all the evils caused by sin, for which he represents the creatures as groaning and travailing." John Wesley, in his *Ser. on Rev. 21:5*, decidedly takes this ground, delineates at length the happiness resulting from such deliverance, quotes Paul and the prophets, understands the prophetic delineations literally, having on the new earth all the animals, etc., so changed that "no creature, no beast, bird, or fish will have any inclination to hurt any other; for cruelty will be far away, and savageness and fierceness be forgotten," etc., and emphatically declares: "He that sitteth upon the throne will soon change the face of all things, and give a demonstrative proof to all His creatures, 'that His mercy is over all His works.' " It is difficult to understand Fairbairn's language (*Typology*, p. 461) otherwise, when (after making the restitution, Acts 3:19–21, at Christ's Sec. Advent "everything restored to its pristine condition") he writes: "It is precisely on the same object, a redeemed and glorified earth, that the Apostle Paul, in the 8th of Romans, fixes the minds of believers as the terminating point of their hopes of glory. An incomparable glory is to be revealed in them, and in connection with that, the deliverance of a suffering creation from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." So also a large class of writers, who expressly affirm that creation is to be brought back to its former "paradisiacal state," cannot be comprehended, unless violence is done to their own statements of what redemption is to accomplish, without receiving such a deliverance of the animals. Luther gave no uncertain sound, when (quoted by Taylor, *Voice of the Church*, p. 143) he said: "It is written, God will create a new heaven and a new earth wherein righteousness shall dwell. It will be no arid waste, but a beautiful new earth, wherein all the just will dwell together. There will be no carnivorous beasts, or venomous creatures, for all such, like ourselves, will be relieved from the curse of sin, and will be to us as friendly as they were to Adam in Paradise." The frequent assertions of this Reformer and others of the restoration of the earth to the Edenic state, certainly imply such a restitution. Dr. Kurtz (*His. of the Old Cov.*, vol. 1, p. 81) advocates a return to Paradise, saying: "The heavenly Jerusalem in the transformed earth is Paradise renewed, enlarged, transformed and perfected," etc., and (Pref. p. 118) this includes the deliverance of the groaning creation which, he holds, embraces the animal Kingdom, while Isa. 11:6–9 he thinks has reference, at least, to the original state of the animal kingdom, or the state it would have been brought to under Adam. How else can we understand the pious Bradford (*Letters*, 83) saying: "I therefore take the apostle to mean by 'every creature' simply, even the whole shape and creatures of the world." "As everything and all things were made for man, so, by the man Christ, all and everything, both earthly and heavenly, shall be restored." "In our resurrection, all things shall be repaired for eternity, as, from our sin, they were made subject to corruption." "Now every creature travaileth and groaneth with us; but we being restored, they also shall be restored: there shall be new heavens, new earth, and all things new." Such language is too comprehensive to exclude the lower creation. Dr. Charnock (*Attributes of God*) forcibly remarks: "As the world, for the sin of man, lost its first dignity and was cursed after the fall, and the beauty bestowed on it by creation defaced, so shall it recover that ancient glory, when he shall be fully restored, by the resurrection, to that dignity he lost by his first sin. A man shall be freed from his corruptibility, to receive that glory which is prepared for him, so shall the creatures be freed from that imperfection or corruptibility, those stains and spots upon the face of them, to receive a new glory suited to their nature, and answerable to the design of God, when the 'glorious liberty' of the saints shall be accomplished." "The earth hath borne thorns, and thistles, and venomous beasts; the air hath had its tempest and infectious qualities; the water hath caused its flood and deluges; the creature hath been abased to luxury and intemperance, and been tyrannized over in man, contrary to the end of creation. It is convenient that some time should be allotted for the creature attaining its true end, and that it may partake of the peace of man, as it hath done of the fruits of his sin, which prevailed more than grace," etc. Henry (*Com. on Rom. 8:19–23*) has "the whole frame of nature," "the whole creation, the compasses of inanimate and sensible creatures" delivered, and adds: "There shall be a glory conferred upon all the creatures, which shall be (in the proportion of their natures) as suitable, and as great an advancement, as the glory of the children of God shall be to them," etc. Tyndale, on Rom. 8:21 affirming that "all creatures descry that day as the time of their rest and perpetual Sabbath;" Gill (*Divinity*, p. 427, 8) contending that "every degree of that curse should be removed," so that "the new earth will be an earth refined, and renewed, and restored to its paradisiacal estate, as it was before the fall;" Toplady (*Ser. B. 3*, p. 470) affirming "that a day will dawn when a period shall be put to every disorder under which nature at present labors," etc.; these utterances, and a multitude of a similar nature that could be quoted, can only be reconciled with the deliverance of the animal world. It is to be noticed that many, aside from Millenarians, express themselves not only indirectly but directly in favor of such a restoration, virtually indorsing the interpretation put upon various passages by us. They substantially agree with Delitzsch (*Ser. on Rom. 8:18–23 in Ap. to Sys. of Bib. Psychol.*) in advocacy of a restitution of the earth—a recreation of nature—a redemption and glorification extending even to the unintelligent creation, so that "then nature, as all the prophets foretell, shall put on her blissful festal attire; and as it has been compelled to share in the sorrows of men, it shall also be a participator in its glory." It is inconceivable how so many with such views of redemption, extending from man down to inanimate nature, should be fearful in plainly stating—what they leave to be inferred—that this necessarily must include the important links existing between man and inanimate nature. As Delitzsch says, the prophets all foretell this, and in a manner that cannot be explained away. Let the reader turn to what Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 281) says of the restoration of the lost "lordship or dominion" over the earth, or, better still, let him refer to Ps. 8, where dominion over the lower creation is expressly stated as one of the prerogatives of man, and then let him see how this is applied to the Second Adam (Heb. 2.), who restores this forfeited dominion, and it is impossible to exclude the lower order of creatures. Let the question be decided in reference to the Pre-Millennial Advent of Jesus and the resurrection of the saints as the Early Church regarded it and as here advocated, and then let Hos. 2:18 be considered in the light of parallel passages; let Isa. 11:6–9; Ezek 34:25; Isa. 65:25; Zech. 14:20; Isa. 32:20, and other allusions be contemplated as occurring in "the new heavens and the new earth" (so Isa. 65) after the Coming of the Lord with all His saints (so

Zech. 14), after the smiting of the earth and the slaying of the wicked one (so Isa. 11), and in connection with the restoration of the Jewish nation (so all the prophets); and any other view, with such facts, cannot be entertained. It is true, that a large number, to avoid such a conclusion, make such language figurative, and hence expressive of alleged changes in the nature of man; but such a theory is forced and inconsistent with the laws of figurative language. It is forced; because (1) against their own assertions of the completeness of redemption, etc., they leave the animals out; (2) to confine this period to the Gospel (as Barnes), and then ask "how the Gospel has any tendency to change the nature of the lion, the bear and the serpent," is to ignore the fact that Jesus Christ is the Restorer, the One who renews things; (3) to deny this because it involves a physical change (so Barnes, Com., Isa. 11), and yet affirm, as in other places, physical changes in man and inanimate nature at the consummation, involves lack of faith in God's ability to perform what He has promised; (4) it transposes the predictions, making a past and present fulfilment, as e.g. the new heavens and new earth of Isa. 65 (under which this is to take place), continuously existing from the First Advent; (5) it is forced by the inability to show (against the facts of history) a consistent fulfilment of their own figurative sense (in its relation to the predictions as a whole), to shield itself under the expectation of a still future spiritual fulfilment, ample enough to cover the application made, without informing us how this is possible to be reconciled with the delineation of this dispensation down to the very Advent of Christ; (6) the theory does not regard the predictions as clearly distinguishing between man and the lower orders, for they are represented as separate, and distinct, and, owing to the change wrought in the latter, the former attain security, etc. (7) But it is also opposed to the laws of figurative language when strictly applied, for instead of there being a metaphor used, as supposed, it is literal language, seeing that nothing is attributed to this lower creation but what is naturally applicable to them. The only exception is that of the lion eating "straw, like the ox," which evidently is an expressed simile or comparison (not a metaphor which implies it in thought), and teaches that at this period so great will be the power of restoration, that the lion will live according to the change of nature then introduced. To discredit this on the ground of impossibility, is to limit the Almighty energy of the Restorer; to receive it only as metaphorical language, is to overlook the simple comparison instituted; to accept of the whole as figurative, is to forget that the actions, etc., ascribed to the animals, are such as are strictly accordant with their nature as it once must have been exhibited in the Edenic state, and that a restoration affected by God must, in the nature of the case, present just such characteristics, and that, therefore, the things predicated of these creatures, instead of conveying an absurdity, correspond with the comprehensiveness of the Plan of Redemption. Indeed, admitting this, we find it throwing increased light upon otherwise imperfectly understood passages of Scripture, as e.g. Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem when He rode upon an animal "whereon never man sat" (the words of Jesus and recorded by two evangelists, Mark and Luke). Surely, this has a deeper significance than to prove Christ's power over animals; for taking the analogy of faith, seeing what dominion is predicted of Him, regarding this entry as typical of the one to come, it points us back to the dominion ascribed to Him in Ps. 8 and the prophets—of which the subjection of an untrained animal is a feeble emblem—and then forward to the glorious future when all creatures shall experience the wonderful Will and Pleasure of the same King. Besides this, before the reader comes to a conclusion upon this particular point, let him first pass over the argument respecting the Kingdom; for if the Kingdom of the Messiah is that which we derive from Covenant and Prophecy, from His own words and that of His commissioned preachers, if it contains the restored Jewish nation and the spared Gentile nations, then, indeed, it would be both inconsistent and absurd to have such a Kingdom existing without the presence of the lower creation.

Obs. 4. As the curse is to be repealed, it is necessary to go back to the record in Genesis to ascertain its extent, and from this deduce what the deliverance will affect. Our opponents, admitting the literalness of the curse (as witnessed to-day) in nearly all its aspects, admit, in consequence, nearly all that is requisite to form the restitution or removal of the curse, as e.g. that relating to the earth and man. But two parts of the curse are set aside and for which no reparation is looked for or deemed necessary, viz., the perpetuation of the race in a fallen instead of an unfallen condition, (and the suffering attendant to it), and the enmity existing between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. The former will be considered in a following proposition (Prop. 152); the latter may as well be contemplated under our present one. This becomes the more important, since writers of ability (as Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 85–88) attempt to invalidate our fundamental grammatical interpretation by appealing to this curse, and asserting that a construction of it, in accordance with the usual laws of language, would invalidate our entire interpretation of prophecy, etc. It is a fact that too many, overlooking that history proper (i.e. in its more detailed statements) begins with Abraham, make too much of the introductory to history, and must needs find the Redemptive process fully contained in the curse itself. That is scarcely the place to find it; and, what is remarkable, finding it in a very obscure allusion and nowhere else, they themselves admit that, as the sacrifices indicate and the piety of those ancients show, etc., they must have received communications not recorded. Precisely so; and the simple fact follows, that the briefest of epitomes is given—just sufficient—in order to understand the relationship that Abraham sustains to those gone before and to those coming after. But to return to the record: the very writers who bring in the objection that Gen. 3:15 ("And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel") can only be understood spiritually, viz., of Christ—the seed—bruising or destroying Satan—themselves admit a literal Eden, a literal fall, that Eve spoke of a literal serpent (v. 13, whatever the influence upon the serpent may have been), a literal curse upon the serpent, a literal curse upon the woman and man, and a literal curse upon the earth. The only exception to be found in the narrative is the enmity; nothing else is spiritualized, neither the grovelling position of the serpent, nor the sorrowful parturition of the woman, nor the toil and corruption of man, nor the thorns and thistles of earth. The enmity, however, is part of the curse and cannot, without violence, be separated from it. The serpent as a bodied being (not merely

as an external agent) is cursed; and it is said to him that such enmity should continue to exist between him and the woman, and his seed, and the woman's seed, and that he should constantly feel and experience man's superiority in the injury mutually inflicted. The degradation and enmity followed—it has been realized thousands of years—and as every other portion of the curse is repealed, it is not surprising to find that, in the prophecies just noticed (Obs. 3), this very enmity is predicted to come to an end, so that the most unprotected of that woman's seed (even "the sucking child" and "the weaned child") shall be perfectly safe in the company of the serpent. The curse thus understood finds its mate (and hence the proof of the correctness of our position) in the removal of the same. Whatever agency (Comp. Martensen's Dog.) may have been in the background, one thing is certain, that the woman did not refer to it, and there is no just reason for believing that God has such reference in the curse. And, as Dr. Lord (Theol. and Lit. Journal for Jan., 1857) aptly remarks in his reply to Fairbairn: "The punishment of the seed of the serpent is a wholly dissimilar thing from the redemption of the seed of the woman. They present a contrast, not a similitude. The one has no suitableness to indicate the other, nor is one necessarily or naturally involved in and a consequence of the other." It would be difficult, indeed, to show in what the adaptation to represent redemption consists, and this difficulty must have been greater to Adam than to us. A writer (H. A. R. Proph. Times, Aug., 1869) has well expressed this: "Must not the words have been to him a densely dark enigma? An enigma, in its obscurity and mystery, calculated to increase, rather than relieve, his perplexity. Read the words—placing yourself as much as possible in Adam's position when they were delivered—and find from them alone, if you can, any consolation for the smitten hearts of the disconsolate pair!" Before such an application of the passage is made by Fairbairn and others, it must first be proven: (1) that Satan is the one that is cursed in the serpent in verse 14; (2) that the pronouns in verse 15, being connected by the copulative "and" with the preceding, do not relate to the same serpent doomed to go upon his belly; (3) that the seed of the same serpent cursed are "wicked men" and that the seed of the woman are only "righteous persons;" (4) or, that if the seed of the woman is limited to one person, the seed of the serpent, expressed in the same way, is not also to be thus determined; (5) that when the curse was pronounced upon the serpent's seed, it was virtually a curse proclaimed upon a portion of the woman's seed; (6) that if the wicked are called "children of the devil," etc., in view of this passage (and not because of their adopting, etc., his spirit), then the righteous should be called "the children of the woman," because of the enmity between the two seeds; (7) that if the grammatical sense is not allowable in the 15th verse, why it should be tolerated in the preceding and following verses; (8) that the literal fulfilment of the curse in the woman, man, earth, and serpent should have no influence in deciding the literalness of a fact, viz., the enmity existing between the serpent tribe and man, also evidenced by actual fulfilment. The truth is, that, without denying that the serpent may have been controlled by external agency (for that forms another and different subject), the more we depart from the plain grammatical sense, the greater the difficulties pertaining to the passage, while the nearer we keep to its literal meaning, the easier we make it of solution. We find it as a curse; as a curse we actually see it entailed; and as a curse we find that it shall ultimately be removed; and God's Word and honor is more completely vindicated in observing this connection, which the words do bear, than to seek for an inferential, symbolic, or spiritual meaning which, perforce, they must contain.

Obs. 5. Without pressing this subject into details (which are not given), we ought to be content with the general statements made concerning the deliverance of creation, which are sufficiently extended in their nature to indicate a completeness of Redemption, reaching to a restoration of all the forfeited blessings. To extend this deliverance to the whole universe, as Origen and some moderns, is to extend it beyond the bounds of the prevailing curse; to confine it to "inanimate creation," as Theophylact and others, is to leave the curse unrepealed upon an important member of creation; to limit it to "humanity," as Augustine, or, to "Gentiles," as Locke, or, to "the Jewish people," as Cramer, or, to "Gentile Christians," as Clericus, or, to "Jewish Christians," as Gockel, or, to "renewed believers," as Barnes, etc., is both to circumscribe the promise of restitution and the actual removal of the curse, leaving out that element of universality commensurate with the extent of the fall. Only two opinions can be held—consistent with the Plan of Redemption and promise—on this subject. One, to which we have given our adhesion, so far as Rom. 8:19–23 alone is concerned, is that "inanimate and animate nature in contradistinction from humanity" (so Lange states, as held by Irenæus, Grotius, Calovius, Neander, Meyer, De Wette; Hodge, Alford, etc., on Rom. 8:19–23) is denoted. But if confined to this alone, it would do injustice to our real doctrine and to the sentiments of some of those quoted, who, with us, hold that this only expresses the meaning of Paul in Rom. 8, where the deliverance of believers is said to be connected with that of creation (as explained), while in other places the deliverance of the race—humanity as such—is also specifically taught. Hence, it has been intimated (foot-note under Obs. 2) that we can cordially accept of the opinion advocated by Lange (Com., Rom. 8), that in this rescue of "the creature" is denoted, "the whole creation, rational as well as irrational, not yet redeemed, but needing and capable of redemption;" incorporating Riddle's remark: "The limitation to creation, as capable of redemption, implies that only so much of creation as is linked with the fall of man, and subject to the curse, should be included." Now, the curse has fallen upon the race, and all nations experience its sad consequences, but our doctrine of the Kingdom explicitly teaches that after the manifestation or the resurrection of the sons of God, the race, the nations, both Jewish and Gentile, shall be delivered from the heavy pressure of the curse (Prop. 152). Therefore, it is that this view not only harmonizes with our doctrine, but the latter serves to explain how and when it is most fully realized. If it should be thought essential not to exclude humanity and yet preserve the distinction between present renewed humanity and creation (Rom. 8), our doctrine of the Kingdom unmistakably does this, showing that humanity, as it now exists, cannot possibly hope for the deliverance—predicted by the prophets—until the first-fruits of believers receive the redemption of the body. Our doctrine thus even fortifies the opinion of Lange and others, and most forcibly confirms the rendering: "Into the freedom of the glory" (instead of

“glorious liberty” of E. V.) “of the children of God,” seeing that when the sons of God are manifested in the glory of their rulership, etc., the nations themselves are represented as sharing in the blessings resulting from the same.

Obs. 6. In view of the Supernatural being wonderfully exerted in this deliverance, two remarks may be appended: First, in the study of this subject the reader ought to keep in view a fact already evidenced in creation, preservation, Incarnation, etc., viz., that the Supernatural harmonizes itself with the natural. This will curb that extravagance of expression respecting the future Supernatural (i.e. making all such), and will restrain the undue depreciation of the natural (i.e. removing it as if it were, as Gnosticism taught, sinful, etc.). Second, that this deliverance, running like a golden thread through the whole Word, and interwoven as it is with Millennial descriptions, portraying an Edenic state in which the nations of the earth shall immeasurably rejoice, confirms the position that we have taken concerning the church. Fighting, struggling, suffering, witnessing, etc., the Church, instead of experiencing the promised deliverance, looks forward to the day when her believing and faithful sons and daughters shall be manifested, and then her groanings and desires, now constantly arising—pressed out by the curse—shall give place to joy and realization. Any other view is an undue exalting of the Church in its present state, over against existing facts, at the expense of the precious and oath-covered promises of God.*

PROPOSITION 147. This Kingdom is preceded by a wonderful shaking of the heavens and earth.

The student who has followed our argument will at once anticipate such a result, for the Kingdom, in its Theocratic aspect, with its design and connections (e.g. restored Jewish nation), cannot possibly be erected here on earth without a fearful commotion, the most terrible convulsions among the nations, in which nature itself is represented as partaking. The Millennial descriptions are introduced by this preparatory shaking, and every prophet, more or less, has portrayed its dreadful nature. It is sufficient to direct attention to two passages, which clearly announce it. Hag. 2:6, 7, “Thus saith the Lord of Hosts; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory,” etc. Heb. 12:26, 27, 28, “Whose (God’s) voice then (at Mt. Sinai) shook the earth: but now He hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a Kingdom which cannot be moved, let us,” etc. Two facts locate the fulfilment of these passages in the future, viz., (1) that before and at the First Advent there was no such shaking, for universal peace (Kurtz’s Sac. His., p. 273) existed when Jesus came, and (2) that Paul in Hebrew speaks of this shaking, not as past, but as future.

Obs. 1. Unfortunately with the rejection of the doctrine of the Kingdom, many writers, not knowing what else to do with the passages quoted, apply them to the First Advent, thus forsaking the Early Church view which understood them to refer to the future Advent. Notwithstanding this application, others who have but little sympathy with our doctrine, still regard them as related to the future. Thus, e.g. Storr (Diss. on Kingdom of Heaven) affirms that this shaking of the heavens and earth is yet to be fulfilled, and suggests that the apostle, in Heb. 12:25, does not quote from Haggai but from some saying of Christ’s uttered respecting the Kingdom of God (probably based on the prophet), and not recorded. Gildas (A.D. 546) renders Haggai as follows: “Thus, saith our Lord, I will once move the heaven, and earth, and sea, and dry land, and I will drive away the thrones of kings, and root out the power of the kings of the Gentiles, and I will chase away the chariots of those who mount upon them.” The reader will see that Gildas properly identifies Hag. 2:22 as explanatory of the other passage, and incorporates it, and thus, instead of applying the prophet’s language to an overthrow of the Jewish polity, etc. (as now so current, although the civil polity was overthrown at First Advent), assigns it to a complete downfall of Gentile domination, thus making it accord with numerous predictions. Augustine (City of God, B. 18, Ch. 35) says that Hag. 2:6 is partly fulfilled, but will only be fully accomplished “at His last Coming.” (Gilfillan, in Christianity and our Era, adopts this double fulfilment.) Numerous opinions of this kind might be quoted, but these are sufficient to indicate how, in the light of prophecies which all admit are still future and pertain to the period of the Sec. Coming, it is impossible for some of those, who adopt the Church-Kingdom view, to confine these passages to the First Advent. Indeed, let any one dispassionately consider what really occurred at the First Advent, then what is here predicted, and finally what a shaking of the heavens and earth, of nations, etc., is still described as future, as e.g. under the last vial, Rev. 16:18–21; at the conflagration, 2 Pet. 3; at the time of the confederation, Rev. 19; Joel, 3, etc., and it seems strange that believers in the Word should be so reluctant to acknowledge this shaking to be still future, when they freely locate the predictions mentioned, which include just such a shaking, at a time which is yet to come. The reason is apparent: the theory adopted respecting the Judgment and Judgment Day makes such an interpretation antagonistic to their expressed views, for they cannot reconcile with their theory the Coming of the Desire of all nations, the filling of the house with glory and making the glory of this latter house greater than that of the former, bestowing peace, etc. All these things are opposed to their notions of the ending of time, the winding up of sublunary things, etc., and hence, whether it fits or not, all these things must be engrafted in some way upon the First Advent. Our doctrine is not thus trammelled. The re-established Theocracy under David’s Son introduces the Desire of all nations, bestows peace and prosperity, brings a glory to the Davidic and Lord’s house transcendently greater than the world has ever yet witnessed. But this can never be realized without the most extraordinary revolutions, the most

unprecedented changes and convulsions, which are characterized as “a shaking of the heavens and earth.” Jesus (Matt. 24:29; Mark 13:25; Luke 21:26), in accord with the general tenor of prophecy, predicts that “the powers of the heavens shall be shaken,” which is linked with “distress of nations,” “mourning of the tribes of the earth,” “men’s hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth,” and “the Coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven.” The reader will notice that Barnes (Com. loci) and many others, who, against a comparison of these predictions, apply this shaking to the Roman army destroying Jerusalem, etc., fully admit that it also refers to the period of the Second Advent. This shaking, too, as the connection shows, is for purposes of overthrow, utter destruction, and radical change; it is preliminary to the setting up of a Kingdom that cannot be moved, i.e. everlasting, ever-enduring. It is a shaking of Gentile domination (Hag. 2:21, 22) to its complete removal, making place for the incoming Kingdom of Jesus. It is a shaking similar to the shaking of the Babylonian heavens and earth mentioned by Isaiah (13:13). It is that shaking of the heavens and earth (Joel 3:16) preceding the dwelling again of God in Jerusalem and the Millennial glory. It is that terrible shaking of the earth described by the prophet (Isa. 2:19, 21), when the glory of the Lord’s Majesty shall appear. It includes that “great shaking in the land of Israel,” when God shall destroy the enemies and restore the Jewish nation to their own land, thus magnifying Himself in the eyes of many nations.

Obs. 2. One of the best dissertations on this subject is that given by Dr. Owen in a sermon. After refuting the interpretation of Rollocus, Piscator, etc. (who make earth the inhabitants and heaven the angels, which men and angels were shaken with amazement, etc., at events of First Advent and preaching of the Gospel), by showing that the shaking was not yet accomplished when the apostle spoke, that it must exceed all former shakings, and that the things shaken are removed; after rebutting the opinion of Junius and many Commentators (viz., that heaven and earth denote the material parts of the world, etc., and the shaking comprised the signs, prodigies, darkness, earthquake, opening of graves, etc., attending Christ’s birth and death) by similar objections, he then refers to the view of Paræus, Grotius, etc., that this has reference to the dissolution of the heavens and earth at the last day, but argues that the things shaken are to be removed that the Kingdom of Jesus may be established, and pertinently inquires, taking such a sense as the ending of all sublunary things, what hindrance the material earth and heaven are to such an establishment, and concludes that the Kingdom will not be brought in until after the Sec. Advent or the judgment. He then enters into an interesting discussion, appealing to Hag. 2:6, 7, saying that “I will shake the heavens and the earth” and “I will shake all nations” is a pleonasm for “I will shake the heavens and the earth of all nations—making the “heavens of the nations” the political heights and glory, forms of government, etc., while the nations’ earth is the multitude of their people, their strength and power, whereby the heavens are supported. Owen’s argument is materially confirmed; if we turn to the latter part of the chapter in Haggai, and notice how the prophet explains by the parallelism how “the throne of Kingdoms” will be “overthrown” and “the strength of the Kingdoms of the heathen” will be “destroyed,” which finds an accurate correspondence in many prophecies as e.g. Ps. 2; Dan. 2:44; Rev. 11:13–18, etc., that describe the erection of the Messiah’s Kingdom to follow the fearful downfall of the Kings and Kingdoms of the earth, who are represented (as e.g. Rev. 19, etc.) as confederated against the truth. In perfect agreement with the tenor of the old prophets, who describe the Gentile domination to come to an end (Prop. 164) and to give place to that covenanted Theocratic order which is everlasting, Paul most delicately (to avoid exciting unduly the hostility of the Roman Empire, under which the believers then lived) and yet effectively declares the result of this shaking, just as Daniel and all the prophets portray it, viz., “the removing of those things that are (marg. may be) shaken” (i.e. those Kingdoms), “as of things that are made” (i.e. temporarily allowed, or created), “that those things which cannot be shaken may remain” (i.e. the covenanted and oath-bound promises respecting the Kingdom now to be realized in the restored Theocratic arrangement under David’s Son), “wherefore, we receiving a Kingdom” (the same that is thus covenanted and which saints inherit), “which cannot be moved” (i.e. will never be thus shaken and destroyed like the others), “let us,” etc. It is hard to say which excites our greatest surprise and admiration, the remarkable nicety of Paul’s language, thus avoiding the prejudice (cruel and persecuting) of Gentile rulers, without in the least sacrificing truth; or the exceeding harmony, even in the minutest particulars, between him and men who spoke many centuries before him.

Obs. 3. But while fully indorsing this view, that the great, important meaning of such phraseology is the subversion, overturning, and destruction of Kingdoms, etc., yet this does not forbid our entertaining the firm belief that these things will be accompanied by physical marvels, earthquakes, etc., which shall cause “men’s hearts failing them for fear,” etc. Analogy, pointing to the plagues preluding the deliverance from Egypt, to the events connected with the birth and crucifixion of Jesus, should cause us to hold that when the most solemn crisis for the world comes, God will cause His Almighty energy to be displayed in an unusual manner in the material nature which is to be a participant in the glory following. God has hitherto thus condescended to warn and speak, and there is every reason to believe, that as the end of the age draws nigh and the stupendous issues dependent upon it approach, God will again plead with man in a startling, strange, supernatural manner. While it may be difficult, and even impossible (owing to this figurative use of language just designated), to tell in each individual case whether the fulfilment embraces a literal, physical, or moral, or civil, or political sign, yet such is the variety of expression, the attitude of man himself, the actual participation of the material heavens and earth (as will be shown in following propositions) in the changes then introduced, that the wisest and most profound students of the Word have unhesitatingly given their adhesion (see Prop. 174) to such a belief. Indeed, when the writer considers that this period is to be specially characterized by the denial of the supernatural by the worldly-wise, it seems eminently fitting and proper that such an exertion of power should be manifested, not only for the believing and prudent, not only for the

admonition of the unthinking, but for the confounding of the crafty, who rely so much on nature.

PROPOSITION 148. This Kingdom embraces the new heavens and new earth.

This is so distinctly taught by Isaiah (chs. 65 and 66), by the pious Jews and Early Church, by a long line of eminent divines, including even our opponents who locate the Kingdom of God in it, and by the magnificent closing (Rev. 21) of Revelation, that it demands no special proof.

Obs. 1. The question, however, arises what are we to understand by this new heavens and new earth? Fully admitting (as e.g. the Prop. preceding 146) that the material atmosphere and earth shall undergo a transformation for the removal of evils, etc., yet, keeping in view what heavens and earth are shaken and removed (viz., the Gentile Kingdoms and their upholders), it is but reasonable to believe that the Spirit to keep up the consistency of the figure thus used, means by “the new heavens and the new earth” taking the place of the former ones, the Renewed Kingdom (i.e. Theocracy) of God and the renewed willing adherents, attached and devoted to it. This accords with the predicted fact that when the Gentile domination is overthrown, then the Kingdom of heaven (Dan. 2 and 7) occupies the supreme authority over all the earth; then (Rev. 11:15, Prof. Stuart, Com. loci) “The Kingdom of this world has become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Christ,” or (as Lord, Apoc. loci) “The Sovereignty of the world has become our Lord’s and His Messiah’s.” This prophetic usage of language is purposely and most wisely chosen to delineate the restoration of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, which supersedes all other Kingdoms. The word “new,” as has often been noticed, even by opposers, does not necessarily mean something entirely new, but denotes “a renewal or restoration” of something previously existing. It properly, then, denotes the renewal or restoration, with increased glory, of that “heaven and earth” which once existed in its initiatory form; and the entire phrase—as the ancient believers logically held—includes the Messianic Kingdom. How deeply this ancient belief was still held, even down to the Council of Nice, is seen in Gelasius (Hist. Acts Council), when he refers as proof to Dan. 7:18; Ps. 27:13; Matt 5:5 and Isa. 26:6 for the expression of faith: “We expect new heavens and a new earth, according to the Holy Scriptures, at the appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”*

Obs. 2. The creation of “the new heavens and new earth,” in Isa. 65:17 and 66:22, are intimately connected with, and indeed explained by, the unexampled prosperity and joyfulness of Jerusalem, and in the removal of the curse entailing weeping, etc. These are a result of the creation of the former, and, therefore, it is that Peter (2 Pet. 3:13), while directing attention to the wrath of God bursting forth in vengeance upon the world, and which will affect the earth materially, yet relying upon these promises given by Isaiah, looks for this very Kingdom to be established, which includes the material changes and blessedness described by the prophet. The Kingdom is designed as an instrumentality to restore man and the earth to the forfeited position, and must, if successful, embrace both in its redemptive purpose, just as the Jews held. Hence it is wrong, as some do, to regard this phraseology as exclusively applicable to a material change, and it is likewise erroneous, as others hold, to confine it entirely to spiritual things or rulership or the Kingdom. Admitting it to be, as Lord (Apoc., Ch. 21:1) maintains, a symbol of “rulers of a new order” and “subjects of a new character,” yet, as these rulers include a resurrection state and these subjects deliverance from physical evil, the phrase itself is not to be thus exclusively limited, as Peter evinces when he claims the promises of Isaiah, in connection with the conflagration. Insisting, therefore, that the figurative meaning, which applies this to the Kingdom itself, is the primary one, we, at the same time, do not discard the notion that in this new heavens and new earth are embraced material, radical changes which brings the earth back to its Edenic state. The contrast that Peter evidently refers to, must be observed and included. On account of this peculiar usage, it may be difficult at all times to explain the language attached to it, and some latitude of opinion on minor points or details is to be anticipated.*

Obs. 3. One of the most eminent spiritualizers of the Word (Barnes) tells us: “There shall be, as it were, new heavens and a new earth, in a spiritual sense, at the end of the world. Thus it is represented, Rev. 21:1.” But the reader will notice that such indefinite interpretation is inconsistent with the Scriptures and with the outward reality of the things described by “heavens and earth.” Allow the figurative use of the phrase, yet realities, observable, are denoted, viz., Kingdoms and their supporters. Some writers who, after the figurative sense is ascertained, append a spiritual sense to it, explain the new heavens and new earth to be an extension of the Gospel dispensation, and find the complete fulfilment in the third heaven. (See Edward’s Hist. of Redemption, p. 266–7, for a specimen.) This is a gross violation of prophecy, and a most arbitrary application of promises to the present Church. Isa. 65:17, 18 and 66:22 are quoted as now realized, which is positively forbidden by the tenor of the predictions (still unrealized) and by Peter, an apostle, expressly locating (2 Pet. 3) their fulfilment in the future. This is abundantly sustained by numerous other passages. The most absurd position, however, is that of endeavoring to transfer such promises to the third heaven (with which compare the singular vacillating and contradictory exposition of Barnes’ Com. on 2 Pet. 3:13), when the least comparison of the passages and the application of them by inspired men, show that they sustain a relationship to this earth. It required centuries of spiritualizing before such phraseology could be transferred from this earth to the third heaven, and it is the resultant of a total ignoring of the Theocratic-Davidic covenant. So far has this spiritualizing of the phrases gone, that we have large bodies of mystics, etc., who claim that they

are already in such a spiritual new heaven and new earth, and one body of them, to carry out their misconception of Scripture, to manifest their realization of it, live in a sort of Communism, neither marrying nor giving in marriage. A number of painful facts, illustrative of this perversion of promise, might be adduced, but these are sufficient. It is in accord with such theories—at least, it fosters them—that Frazer (*Key to Proph.*) informs us that “the renovation of mankind is so great and extensive that it is called ‘new heavens and new earth.’ ” Newcome (*Rev.* 21) says: “The new heaven and earth and the new Jerusalem are emblematical of the glory and happiness which will be the reward and happiness of good men forever” (compare Scott, *Com.*). Now, if such interpretations are to be received, what becomes of the reality and inspired application of these passages to the future here on earth after the conflagration, after the Advent of Jesus, after the shaking and overthrow of earthly Kingdoms, etc., if they do not include the Theocratic rulership, thus preserving the unity of Scripture. Many of these writers are correct when they attribute to the new heavens and earth “renovation,” “glory and happiness,” etc., for all these blessings are included in and flow from it, but they greatly mistake when they attribute one of these things to be specifically meant or typified by it, and overlook the primary, leading idea that it signifies the renewed outward Theocratic Rule of God manifested in David’s Son acting as the Judge or King and the hosts of subjects made willing in the day of His power. If the figurative usage is allowed, then the one that the Spirit Himself has given, referring it primarily to the Kingdom and subjects, is to be retained in preference to all others, seeing that in the weak state of Christianity under the power of Gentile dominancy arrogant and persecuting on the smallest provocations, it was wise and prudent to retain the old prophetic usage, easy of comprehension to believers in the covenanted promises, as evidenced by the faith of the primitive Church. If the exclusively literal idea of a material change is only entertained, then even there is consistency in Schlegel (*Phil. of His. Lec.*, 10), observing: “The last glorious transformation of nature, when creation shall be consummated, and a new heaven and a new earth shall spring into existence, are to be strictly regarded as real and historical.” To the writer, however, it appears that the latter can be entertained (being more clearly taught by another class of passages) without discarding the former; yea more, that the former is most accordant with prophetic speech and really, as a resultant, includes the latter.*

Obs. 4. In order to make our doctrine discordant, if possible, several criticisms are offered which it is necessary to answer. A class of writers inform us that the promises of the new heavens and new earth in *Isa.* 65:17 and 66:22 relate to one period of time, viz., to this dispensation, while those of 2 *Pet.* 3:13 and *Rev.* 21:1 refer to another, viz., after the Millennial age, etc. Aside from the direct argumentation following (*Props.* 149, 150, and 151), it is now sufficient simply to quote an opponent. Barnes (*Com.*, 2 *Pet.* 3:13) says: “The allusion here seems to be, beyond a doubt, to two passages in *Isaiah*,” etc., quoting the ones mentioned by us. Now if Peter referred in his “according to promise” to these predictions of *Isaiah* (and this is admitted, for no others of a like tenor can be found), then it follows that he locates those Millennial descriptions of *Isaiah* with the heavens and earth that succeed the conflagration, and the objection falls. But *Rev.* 20:11 is urged against us, because we are there informed that “from whose (the Judge’s) face the earth and the heaven fled away and there was found no place for them,” indicates that the new heaven and earth is only after the thousand years, etc., and cannot include *Isaiah*’s prediction. Various writers, however, have pointed out that this phrase here is parenthetical (as like e.g. the riding on an ass, *Zech.* 9:9, 10, etc.), alluding to what was done before, thus identifying the Judge and ascribing power to Him. The phraseology is so accordant with that employed by Daniel and the prophets when describing the consuming of the Kingdoms and their power “so that no place was found for them” (*Dan.* 2:35), which is attributed to Jesus Christ, that the reference cannot be doubted. Overlooking the past tense used, and endeavoring to confine it to the then present time, they see not that the objection—taking their notion of the heavens and earth—is fatal to their own theory, seeing that the earth is represented as continuing, the sea giving up its dead, etc. Even Augustine, commenting on the passage (*City of God*, B. 20, Ch. 14), does not confine this fleeing away to the actual time specified in context, but locates it “not before the living and dead are judged,” “but afterward,” making the declaration equivalent to that He would perform this. Now, if such liberty can be taken with the verb rendered “had fled” as to refer it to the future in support of a theory, surely no one ought to find fault with us when our explanation is directly sustained by the tense of the verb and the facts preceding the period thus predicted. In this connection may be mentioned the view entertained by Lactantius (*Div. Insti.*, B. 7, Chs. 24 and 26, and *Epit. of same*, Ch. 71), who has two renewals of the earth, one at the commencement of the one thousand years, and another at its close; also by Barnabas (*Epis.* Ch. 15), who makes a renewal at the beginning of the seventh Milliad, and another at the beginning of the eighth day. A number of modern writers follow these suggestions, and press them to unwarranted conclusions. Now, whatever truth (and there is some) there is in the gradual restoration of all things to the condition before the fall, and which is only fully reached after the Millennial age is closed, when all wickedness is forever more rooted out, yet it is a mistake to ascribe this to a renewal of “the new heavens and new earth.” This is seen by the simple fact that this phraseology includes the everlasting (*Prop.* 159) Kingdom of Jesus Christ which is never to be destroyed; that otherwise the Word is made contradictory, for the new heavens and new earth of *Isaiah* (however it may extend) is represented as “remaining” before the Lord, i.e. is permanent, while that described by Peter (2 *Pet.* 3:13) is implied by the tenor and spirit of the prediction and its righteousness to be ever enduring. These follow the Advent of Jesus, and, characterized as they are, they, in the very nature of the case, do not give place to another general transformation. The Kingdom when once established under David’s Son ever exists—His heavens rule and His earth or people are obedient—whatever changes may be introduced after the ending of the Millennial period. Unless this feature is clearly apprehended, confusion and antagonism follow. The Kingdom (presented by *Isaiah* under this impressive figure) is so great, so vast a dominion, so exalted over the earth in its grandeur, that “the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind,” i.e., shall not be worthy of comparison, etc., with it. And yet this “heaven and

earth” so grandly erected, in which His people shall “rejoice forever” and which is said to be as enduring as “the end and name” of His people, is, we are gravely told, “to pass away.” No! never; and any theory which involves such a contradiction, such a ruinous process, evidences at once an unscriptural foundation. This confusion of ideas is caused, in a great measure, by not observing the meaning of the figure, by neglecting a faithful comparison of Scripture (and accepting of the result), and by confounding things that differ. When the Spirit so directly, as in Isa. 65:17, 18 (Comp. Alexander’s Version), and 66:22, asserts the perpetuity of the new heaven and earth then created, we gratefully and joyfully accept of the same, not being hampered by the Popish theory of Judgment Day, etc., which forbids the reception of the blessed Millennial predictions associated with, and to be experienced in, this “heaven and earth.”

Obs. 5. It would be interesting to trace how the early Church linked the new heavens and new earth with the one thousand years, quoting Isa. 65:17, etc., as e.g. Justin (Dial. with Typho.; see Ch. 3, Brookes El. of Proph. Interp., and writings of Taylor, Mede, Seiss, etc., for references to various of the Fathers), and how it advocated the Kingdom of Jesus Christ as witnessed in, and through, that period, and as being embraced in the heaven and earth. The numerous quotations already presented will suffice to give the reader a just idea of the general opinion on the subject. So also, whatever explanation may be applied to the phrase “new heavens and new earth” itself, yet many theologians insist upon it, that at this future time and as part of the heavens and earth the Kingdom of the Messiah is, as the primitive Church held, set up and manifested. This, whatever views are given respecting details, is corroborative of our position. Thus e.g. in Proph. Times (Sep., 1867), is a translation of an article from Dr. Gess (of Reutlingen) in which the grand outlines of the early Millenarian doctrine are presented and accepted, and in confirmation of the Kingdom then established, quotations, evincing the same belief, are given from Herder, Steudal, Olshausen, J. G. Hess, Lavater, Bengel, and T. F. Meyer. The leading idea presented is, as Meyer expresses it: “With the Lord’s Advent begins the real reign of God upon earth, a Kingdom of righteousness, holiness, and peace, consisting of mortals, but with exemption from the Evil One and his enticements, and under a mighty influence of celestial power,” etc.; or as Hess terms it: “It has been given to be a Kingdom of God upon earth.” Dr. Tholuck has been noticed by Taylor, Seiss, etc., as saying: “The idea that the perfected Kingdom of Christ is to be transferred to heaven is a modern notion. According to Paul, and the Rev. of John, the Kingdom of God is placed upon the earth, in so far as the earth has part in the universal transformation. This exposition has been adopted and defended by most of the oldest commentators: e.g. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, Luther, Knox, and others.” Persons of the most diverse views, hostile even to the Early Church doctrine, still are forced to admit, that the new heavens and earth relate to this globe of ours, and include the Kingdom of God in a most glorious form. Thus from a variety of sources, even convergent, testimony in reference to the teaching of the Word can be multiplied confirmatory of our doctrinal position, seeing that all such make the Kingdom the main, leading idea which includes all the rest.*

PROPOSITION 149. This Kingdom is preceded by the conflagration of 2 Pet. 3:10–13.

This is self-evident, since this Kingdom is identified with the establishment of “the new heavens and new earth” of Isa. 66:17, and 66:22. Peter expressly alludes to these two passages in Isaiah and appropriates them as descriptive of “the new heavens and new earth” presented by himself, in the specific phraseology, “according to promise.” The Millennial new heavens and new earth thus claimed by the Apostle, and which are associated with the Kingdom itself, are necessarily preceded by the fire described. As this forms the leading objection to our doctrine, and as some have wrongfully (against the most explicit language of Peter) endeavored to locate this fire after the thousand years, it is proper to thus definitely state the facts and assume their weight.*

Obs. 1. It has been noticed by various Commentators, etc., that the Jews, before and at the time Peter wrote, expected that the Millennial era, i.e. the times of Messiah’s reign, would be introduced by great convulsions and a terrible fire. Knapp, if using the word “perishing” as many do, goes too far when he says (Christ. Theol., s. 155, II. 2): “This doctrine of the perishing of the world by fire was unquestionably prevalent among the Jews at the time of Christ and the apostles, although Philo does not accede to it.” That the Jews believed in a mighty change, in a renovation, purification, regeneration (see Knapp, same place, quoting Philo), etc., of the earth, and that in some way fire (as the prophets predicted) should be employed as an agency, seems certain from various testimony, but that they believed in so widespread and extensive a conflagration as moderns have fastened upon Peter, is not only unproven but hostile to the expectations they had concerning the Messiah’s Kingdom. A little reflection should suggest, that a people who looked for the restoration of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom over the nation in the flesh, which Kingdom was ultimately to embrace the Gentile nations, could not, and did not, believe in that which would utterly demolish all hope. But, as stated, they did believe that this Kingdom would be preceded by the awful judgments of God, and that fire would be used in connection with them. Now the language of Peter accords with the belief that before the Millennial period could be introduced, such a Pre-Millennial judgment by fire must be inflicted; and his undoubted reference to the only promises relating to the new heavens and new earth in Isaiah would immediately and inevitably—with the prevailing belief—direct the Jewish mind to the Millennial prophecies. If the latter are to be understood, as so many now teach, to be fulfilled prior to this conflagration, then Peter took the very means and language to confirm his readers in the opposite view. We hold that there is no antagonism between Peter and the Jewish belief on the subject.*

Obs. 2. If we refer to the promises acknowledged by Peter and given by Isaiah, we find this view strengthened by the context. Thus e.g. Isa. 66:22 is preceded by “the Lord will come with fire and with His chariots like a whirlwind, to render His anger with fury and His rebuke with flames and fire. For by fire and by His sword will the Lord plead with all flesh,” etc. While Isa. 65:17 only mentions the sword as preceding, yet, if we take the prediction and turn to its strictly parallel mates, we find that fire also is connected with its ushering in, as evidenced by the same things being delineated as then taking place. Thus e.g. take Isa. 51, and at the very time that God will “plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth,” that the redeemed return with singing and everlasting joy, the judgments of the Lord shall be poured upon the wicked and “the heavens shall vanish like smoke,” etc. At least one thing is apparent, that in the context of Millennial predictions (as Ps. 97:3; Joel 2:30; Mal. 4:1, etc.) there are sufficient intimations to warrant the Jewish belief that there would be, before Messiah’s Kingdom is established, an extraordinary manifestation of fire in some form, and that Peter in his prediction adopts this very belief by linking his prophecy with Isaiah’s.*

Obs. 3. The reader will observe that Peter, instead of giving the least intimation that the Millennial period antecedes, in his account knows nothing of the Millennial era preceding, and gives statements utterly opposed to the notion that it will be witnessed previous to the conflagration. Without pressing into service his well-known views respecting the nearness of, and looking for, the Advent of Jesus Christ (which is antagonistic to such an idea), it is sufficient to notice that he speaks of the wicked existing continuously and boldly down to this very period, and of believers being subjected to their scoffing, etc., down to the same time. Deliverance is anticipated only when this era preceded by the conflagration arrives; and hence that Millennial glory, etc., which some describe as anteceding this conflagration is something that Peter fails to portray or intimate. More than this: the apostle links this era with the Millennial predictions by designating it “the day of the Lord,” and “the day of God,” which all at that time understood as referring to the day (e.g. Prop. 138, etc.) when these Mill. prophecies would be fulfilled. It was the distinguished time when God should remarkably manifest His power in behalf of His people. The apostle only recognizes the one day future associated with this conflagration. This is in agreement with the general analogy. To illustrate: Mal. 4 describes the day of the Lord “that shall burn as an oven,” utterly consuming the outrageous wicked and only leaving the righteous, and previous to this announced day there is no Millennial rest and blessedness for God’s children. So Joel 2 and 3, the day of the Lord comes when He shall “show wonders in the heavens, and in the earth blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke,” and then follow the Millennial blessings. Peter, imbibing the same spirit of prophecy, introduces no discordant element.*

Obs. 4. It is admitted, generally, that the scenes described by Peter follow the Second Advent. When Christ comes, He comes “in flaming fire taking vengeance,” etc. (2 Thess. 1:8), with “fiery indignation” (Heb. 10:27) that shall consume His enemies. It is at this Advent that believers are also delivered and exalted. The language of Peter, the entire tenor and scope of his description, evinces that he places the Advent—the object of terror to the wicked and of joy to the righteous—at this very period of time. This, therefore, is utterly irreconcilable with the theory (Shimeall and others), that this conflagration follows a thousand years after a personal Pre-Mill. Advent of Christ. The “appearing and the Kingdom” are united, and consequently the appearing, the glorification of believers, the fiery vengeance upon living unbelievers, and the Kingdom are also linked together.*

Obs. 5. The reader will notice that the Kingdom (as our entire line of argument shows) is introduced at the Pre-Mill. Advent of Jesus, and that Christ then receives His inheritance as David’s Son. These two facts alone set aside the views of those (as e.g. Shimeall in *I Will Come Again*, and Lincoln in *Lects. on Rev.*, and Burgh, Tyso, and Ogilvy), who make the conflagration Post-Millennial, introductory to an eternal state of things. Now on the other hand the Scriptures make the glorious Theocracy established at Jesus’ return one that is perpetual, ever-enduring (Comp. Prop. 159, where this is considered in detail), and consequently it does not run the risk of ever being removed or destroyed by the universality of the conflagration. The promises of God forbid it, and therefore, as e.g. in Dan. 7 (where the fire of vengeance, v. 10, 11, precedes or is connected with the establishment of the Kingdom) the Kingdom set up at the Coming of Jesus is declared to be one which shall not pass away or be destroyed. Again—to advocate such an opinion is virtually to say that Christ’s inheritance, promised under oath in perpetuity to Him, shall be swept away by a conflagration—an inheritance too for which He suffered and died, which is to be to Him a desire and joy and glory, and which He has already (Isa. 65 and 66) retouched with His creative energy. Surely the brethren who hold to the above opinion do not see that, in the attempt to avoid difficulties connected with Peter’s account of the conflagration, they plunge themselves into far greater by the adoption of such a Post-Millennial view. The fire of Peter must, of necessity, be so interpreted as to preserve the unity of divine teaching, and how this is to be done will be the subject of the next Proposition.*

PROPOSITION 150. The establishment of this Kingdom is not affected by the extent of Peter’s conflagration.

It is important to notice this in detail (and the reader will please observe that the following Propositions are part of the discussion) since two classes make the conflagration of Peter an insuperable objection to the reception of the doctrine of the Kingdom. Those opposed to Millenarianism, as Brown, Steele, Barnes, Waldegrave, and many others, inform us that owing to the universality of the

fire it is impossible to conceive how nations in the flesh, Jewish and Gentile, can survive it to form the subjects of the Kingdom. Every work written against us produces the stereotyped difficulty, as if irremovable. Recently some Millenarians, as Shimeall and others (through an amiable weakness which impelled them to remove what they call "the great stumbling-block in the way of an acceptance of the truth"), have repeated this objection, locating the fire of Peter after the Millennial age. It hence deserves special consideration.

Obs. 1. As stated in preceding Proposition, the language of Peter was in accordance with the views of the Jews. They evidently did not consider the fire so disastrous in its effects that no nations would survive and that the Kingdom could not be set up over the nations as Daniel predicted. The proof is, that all the Jewish converts and churches, as far as we know, never supposed that this passage controverted such an opinion. Instead of being a stumbling-block in the way, this passage was thought to be confirmatory of their belief of the dreadful fire which should devour the adversaries (Dan. 7:10, 11, "fiery stream," "the burning flame"), when the Messiah would come. Jewish believers held that Peter only transferred that which they had believed would occur at the First Advent, to the Second Advent. Hence the apostle's statement strengthened them (by his appeal to Isa. and using the phrase "day of the Lord," etc.) in the faith, expressed by the Babylonian Targum (on Gen. 49:10), "Christ shall come, whose is the Kingdom, and Him shall the nations serve," or as the Jerusalem Targum has it: "The King Christ shall come, whose is the Kingdom, and all nations shall be subject unto Him." Peter's description, therefore, raised no controversy between the Jewish believers and others.*

Obs. 2. The early Church, receiving its teaching direct from inspired teachers (and appealing to them, as Papias, Justin, Irenæus), found no such limitation as was afterward engrafted upon Peter's language. That Church which claimed (as Semisch, Herzog's Cyclop. speaking of Justin's, Dial. with Trypho, doctrinal position) its "belief as the Keystone of orthodoxy," which in the person of Papias (as stated by Jerome), directly named Peter's instruction, received the epistle without regarding it as presenting the slightest objection to their doctrine of the Second Coming of Jesus, the fearful overthrow (fire as an agency) of His enemies, the exaltation of the resurrected saints, the re-establishment of the Davidic throne and Kingdom over the restored Jewish nation and the spared Gentile nations. One and all held to the fulfilment of the covenant and the prophecies based upon it as succeeding this conflagration: This is clearly announced in their writings. It may be justly claimed, that men who were so near to apostolic teaching, and acquainted with the language then spoken, were qualified to judge how far Peter's statement of the fire was to be pressed.*

Obs. 3. It is noticeable that no Millenarian author has taken advantage of the doubts cast upon the canonical authority of the Second Epistle. This has been done by our opponents and not by us. That epistle was never urged in the first centuries as antagonistic to Chiliasm, for the leading objection to it was that derived from its being too favorable to our doctrine, owing to its "Jewish conceptions." If we were to accept of its rejection—as suggested by opposers—that would at once end the discussion, seeing that the only passage relied upon to prove that the perpetuity of the Jewish nation and the race is irreconcilable with the universality of the fire at the end of the age, is to be found in this Epistle. But we are not forced to dispute its genuineness or authority, being willing to receive it, on the testimony alleged in its favor, as canonical. The opposition to the Epistle, if so fatal to our doctrine as assumed by many, ought to have come from Millenarians and not from its opponents.

Obs. 4. If there is a passage which should be examined and explained according to "the analogy of faith," it certainly ought to be this one of Peter's. The reason is apparent; it is the only passage of Scripture which our opponents allege as conveying an irreconcilable difficulty in the way of accepting what (as we have shown) is taught in the naked grammatical sense in Covenant and Prophecy, and what was unmistakably believed in by the primitive Church. To make a single passage overthrow the Jewish faith, the early Church faith, and, above all, that constant harmony of Scriptural statement down to that point, and to make it the necessity for introducing a spiritualistic interpretation of preceding Scripture, is imposing too much upon one text and is violating the proportion due to the doctrines of the Bible. The rules given by Horne (Introd., vol. 1, p. 342, etc.), are worthy of attention, and if applied will inevitably relieve our doctrine of the Kingdom from any alleged incubus said to be imposed by Peter. Surely when our doctrine of the Kingdom is founded in the oath-bound covenant given to David, is reiterated by prophets, is preached, etc., as Proposition after Proposition has proven, then it ought not to be set aside, or weakened, or condemned by one passage; then the passage assumed to be contradictory ought to be explained in the light of that vast amount of testimony preceding it; then the lesser ought to be interpreted by the greater, the more brief by the more extended, the doubtful by the plainly revealed.*

Obs. 5. Peter's representation of the Kingdom, as given in his own writings, would be vitiated, if we accept of the extravagant estimates made concerning the extent of this fire. Omitting the allusion to Isa. 65:17 and 66:22 and to "the day of the Lord" as used by the prophets and Jews, sufficient remains to show that he looked for a Kingdom to appear on earth after this fire, and in the form advocated by us. In this same Epistle, Ch. 1, he knows no other Kingdom than the future everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," for which he urges the brethren to strive, faith in which was confirmed by the Transfiguration (see Prop. 153), and which he represents (as Pet. 4:7) as not very distant, thus connecting it with this same Advent and conflagration. Now in the First Epistle, in harmony with the Second, he makes the inheritance and salvation, "ready to be revealed in the last time," dependent (1 Pet. 1:7, 13; comp. with 2 Pet. 3:13, 14) upon "the appearing of Jesus Christ;" and "the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ" corresponds with "the new heavens and new earth." In both Epistles believers are "pilgrims and strangers," suffering, etc., and urged to hope for deliverance, etc., at the Second Advent. The entire spirit expressed is, a deferring

of the Kingdom—promised by the prophets 1 Pet. 1:11, 13—until this period. This ignoring of a present Kingdom, and looking for one future, at the Advent, to fulfil the prophets—who locate Messiah's Kingdom on earth as we advocate—is evidence, if we will but accept of it, that he himself had no idea of the prediction, such as multitudes fasten upon it, seeing that the “everlasting Kingdom” once established, is ever more perpetuated, and hence is not to be destroyed by fire at the end of the thousand years.*

Obs. 6. It must be observed, that while the Second Advent of Jesus is spoken of as a coming in “flaming fire,” etc., to destroy His enemies, etc., it is at the same time represented as a coming to bless the earth, so that the earth is called upon to rejoice in His Advent, as e.g. Ps. 96:11–13; Ps. 98:4–9, etc. Creation, as we have seen Props. 145 and 146, is to exult in this Coming for deliverance, so that it is declared to follow as a result from the antecedent humiliation, death, and exaltation of Christ, the resurrection of His saints, etc., as e.g. Ps. 69:34 (noticing how the previous portion of the Ps. is applied to Jesus in his death, etc. See Prop. 126). Now such deliverance of creation, such a rejoicing of the earth in the removal of the curse, is not witnessed down to the Advent, and if fulfilled, as written and promised, necessitates, in the very nature of the case, a very material limitation to the destructiveness of this fire. Any indorsement of the sweeping assertions made respecting its universality and totality introduces at once an antagonism (unnecessary) between one passage and a host of others relating to the same time. This is the reason why so many (Prop. 146) employ language respecting the deliverance of creation, insist upon complete restoration, etc., and yet are afraid to mention the animal kingdom or animate nature, fearful that Peter's conflagration would prove an objection to its utterance. Surely there must be something wrong in an interpretation, which builds up from this passage irreconcilable features to other portions of the Word.*

Obs. 7. As just intimated, any view of Peter's statement which makes an imperfect Redemption, in not restoring the earth, the animate creation, and the race of man to their forfeited position, ought at once to be rejected as inconsistent with the Divine Purpose respecting Redemption as given in covenant and promise, and with the perfection, honor, and glory of the Redeemer (Prop. 140, Obs. 7). To make this earth, animated creation, and the race of man, as such, all to be destroyed, rooted out of existence, or (as a climax) to have it all one mass of fire, perpetuated in this state to constitute (so Pres. Edwards' *His. Redemp.*, p. 421) an eternal hell (!) for sinners and devils—this is to make Redemption incomplete, to keep this earth forever under the curse, to restore only a few of the forfeited blessings, and to diminish, with fearful rigor, some of the most comprehensively precious promises that the Bible contains. Strange indeed that men should allow one passage to crush the hope engendered in a groaning creation, in a sin-cursed earth, in the longings of nations, and to limit the rich and full restitution of all things and the expressed ability and willingness of the Mighty King to perform it. The early Church could not be so illogical.*

Obs. 8. Having clearly shown from the covenant made with David, etc., that the land and the earth is Christ's, that the Jewish nation as such (associated with the Theocracy), and other nations through it, belong to Christ, that both form “the inheritance” of David's Son, it is presuming to fasten such an interpretation upon 2 Pet. 3 as will at once and forever-more destroy the very inheritance which is promised to Him. “Feeble and weak” as the apostolic and primitive Fathers were, in some respects, when compared with the profound (?) learning of modern theologians, yet none of them has been guilty of so great a violation of propriety as to introduce a doctrine which sweeps away the inheritance of Jesus and that of His saints; which makes it utterly impossible for either to inherit promises most solemnly attested to by the oath of the Eternal One. It was reserved for men of real intellectual strength and mental ability to do this; for those ancient worthies, relying upon the simplicity of the Scriptures, and that every word of God is equally true, could find no such doctrine in Peter. Explaining (as justice and reason both suggest) Peter by the two Promises of Isaiah, they found, as we also find to day, ample evidence that Christ's promised inheritance is not affected by the extent of the conflagration. Turn again to those two passages and see how associated with the new heavens and new earth is the restoration and perpetuity of the Jewish race, of Gentile nations, and even the continued existence and change of animals, and it will be seen how impossible it was for a faith which dung both to the covenant given to David and to Peter's undoubted linking of Isaiah's predictions with his own portrayal of what should take place in connection with this fire, to adopt an interpretation which virtually denies to David's Son His own covenanted throne, Kingdom, people, land, etc. It is true, that those who do this strive to give to Him something which they esteem far better, and thus suppose that they honor Him the more; but this also is done at the expense of ignoring the covenant and going beyond the record.*

Obs. 9. The time of this fire is the time when “the harvest of the earth” is gathered and the tares (Matt. 13:30, 39, 40) shall be “burned in the fire” (as “the ungodly men” mentioned by Peter), but this harvest (Rev. 14:14–20) occurs under the seventh trumpet preceding the Millennial age. When this conflagration takes place it is associated with the resurrection of the saints, for Peter encourages believers to expect a glorious deliverance at that period; this accurately corresponds with the resurrection (Rev. 11:15–18) and rewarding of the saints under the last trumpet when “the sovereignty of this world” shall be wielded by Christ. The mention of “the Day of Judgment” (comp. Props. 133 and 134) with a knowledge of the Jewish and Scriptural method of speaking of that day, viz., to be followed by Messiah's Kingdom here on earth as the Millennial prophecies declare; these are additional reasons why we should not force upon Peter an interpretation which must result in introducing an element of discord, thus preventing a harmonious adjustment between the Old and New Testaments.*

Obs. 10. This passage has received various interpretations. (1.) One class, to which we have alluded (Prop. 133, Obs. 1.; Prop. 141, Obs. 1, etc.), bring the most extravagant interpretation to bear upon Peter, by which they evolve not only the utter destruction of the earth but that of the planetary system. As the very prodigality of expression and profuseness of imaginary extent is—aside from the arguments herein presented—the best refutation of its unscriptural attitude, it may be passed by without additional remark. There is another class, allied with these in a rigorous interpretation, but far more moderate in their estimation of the ultimate result of this fire. While advocating its universality and the burning up of all things, etc., they at the same time deny that annihilation is denoted or such complete destruction is intended as to forbid the renewal and perpetuity of the same earth. In addition to the writers mentioned (Prop. 140, etc.) who hold to this, many others could be added, as e.g. Augustine, Griffin, Jay, Gregory the Great, Fuller, Pope, Benson, Urwick, Hodge, James, Brown, Pye Smith, etc. The distinguishing peculiarity of these two classes is, that they make the conflagration post-Millennial. Another class, who make the fire about as disastrous as the second class noticed, and yet hold that it is Pre-Millennial, that it will be followed by the setting up of Christ's Kingdom as predicted in the Millennial prophecies—are represented by Cumming* (The Gr. Trib., Lect., 12), Irving (Orations), Gill (Divinity), and others. These three classes, by the extent of the fire advocated, make no provision for the Kingdom to exist in its expressed covenanted terms, and none for the deliverance of inanimate and animate creation, having the same destroyed and an entire new creation erected from the ashes, etc. Instead of the curse being removed from the existing world, the world falls beneath the curse and is sacrificed, so that an entire new one which has never borne a curse may be created. The position, however, of the one party, that the fire is Pre-Millennial, is undoubtedly correct.

(2.) Then we find a large class who make the entire fire a figurative description; and these again are divided into different parties. Thus e.g. that one which makes the destruction of the heavens and earth the overthrow of the Jewish polity, etc., and the new heavens and new earth the introduction of the Christian polity, etc.; so Dr. Hammond, and various of the destructive critics. Others, as Prof. Bush (Mill., p. 202, etc.), taking the figurative view, apply it to the overthrow of systems of error, etc., by the purifying influence of the truth (i.e. fire), which is yet to bring about "that renovated order of things, moral, mental, and political," etc. Dr. Thomas (Elpis Israel), and Christadelphians generally, refer the destruction to the Jewish polity, but explain the new heavens and earth to be still future, the introduction of the new polity under the Messiah at His Sec. Coming (thus separating by a long interval what Peter unites in succession). In regard to such applications of the figurative sense, it may be observed, that the destruction here presented, whatever it may denote, is inseparably joined with the Sec. Advent, the Day of Judgment, and the Day of the Lord, and hence is still future; while the contrasting with the literal perishing at the deluge indicates that more must be attached to it than the simply figurative. Mede (Works, Exp. Peter), and others, in adopting the figurative conflagration, are more logical and consistent with the tenor of Peter's statements when they make it adumbrating or symbolizing the overthrow of governments, systems, etc., at the close of this dispensation, preparatory to the establishment (comp. Lord, Apoc., 21:5) of the Kingdom or government under the Messiah. It must be admitted, when the figurative language of Scripture is consulted and compared (see Sir I. Newton's Obs. on Proph., p. 1, Ch. 2; Faber's Dis. on Proph., Daubuz, Perp. Com. on Rev., writings of Brookes, Bickersteth, etc.) with each other and with Peter's language, there is sufficient force in the comparison instituted to lead to a belief that it is, at least, included. The Scriptures sometimes include the physical with the moral, etc., as in the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus, etc. To make it entirely figurative destroys at once the express contrast instituted by Peter respecting the perishing of the old world by water; and to make it entirely literal is to ignore the Scripture usage of such language. Taking into consideration the views then prevalent derived from the prophets, the style in which the prophecies are given, and the fact that both things (viz., the overthrow of all human governments and the renovation of the earth) are really embraced at this period, it seems the most consonant to believe that Peter comprehends both, that as water was used to destroy the old world, materially and in its governmental arrangements, so fire (not excluding other agencies) shall be employed in modifying and changing the present heavens and earth, materially and in the overthrow of earthly governments, and that the result will be the introduction of a new heavens, and new earth, materially renewed, and in the establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom. The old "heavens" really did not perish excepting as they adumbrate governments, etc. The contrasting of the three worlds—the three heavens and earth—seems to demand something like this interpretation, indicating that the truth lies somewhere between the figurative and literal application, embracing both in the manner pointed out. For, let us impress the reader with a fact, already noticed in Paul, that the apostles, in view of the enmity and persecuting spirit already prevalent, and which they knew was yet to come, could not be too cautious to express their views respecting the certain overthrow of earthly governments; and that all such teaching, to avoid bitter animosity and persecution, had, in the nature of the case, to be couched in prophetic language. The wisdom and admirable tact of Peter (as in Acts 3, using restitution) is noticeable, in his taking language not only correspondent with the usage of the prophets, but even in accordance with that employed by the nations around him, and which virtually comprehends both.

(3.) Then again there is an able and growing party who advocate that the fire of Peter will be literally experienced, but that it is confined to localities (some few writers have confined it to Judea or Palestine, others to the Roman earth, and still others have made it local, and by slow degrees, gradually extending over the earth), and will not be so disastrous or extensive as many suppose. This view was early presented, has more or less continued, and recently has had a number of writers to express it in a most forcible manner. D.N. Lord in several of his writings, Dr. Seiss in his Last Times (see it eloquently presented in Third Dis., also "Day of the Lord"), and others, have argued against the universality of the fire (1) from the declared perpetuity of the earth; (2) the Noachic covenant, which promises no such destruction in the future as that of the deluge; (3) the saint's inheritance; (4) the meaning of Peter's phraseology; (5) the design of the fire, "the perdition of ungodly

men;" (6) the agreements of Peter's language with the descriptions of volcanic eruptions, etc.; (7) the language of the prophets describing the same events, etc. They exhibit those fires as dreadful and connected with "terrific phenomena." In conclusion: looking at those various interpretations, the dispassionate student will certainly feel inclined—considering the Oneness of the Spirit through whom holy men spake—to give the preference to those who, instead of taking Peter's prophecy isolated and then proceed to build upon it a series of tremendous doctrines, endeavor to ascertain its meaning by a comparison with the analogy of faith, with other predictions given by the same Spirit. Caution must be engendered by the simple fact that equally as strong language as Peter uses is employed by Nah. 1:5 in reference to Nineveh, and in Deut. 32:22; Micah 1:4; Isa. 13:9–14; Amos 9:5, etc., in such a way as to indicate a continuation of the earth, nations, etc., after terrible convulsions and punishments. The same is true of Isa. 24:19–23; Isa. 2:10–22; Jer. 4:23–28, and numerous other passages. The limitation even with which sometimes the word "earth" is used, the verbal criticisms (Crit. Eng. Test.) which unite men of opposite views, the fact that change and not such destruction is evidenced by Ps. 102:25–27; Heb. 1:10–12 (the parallelism limiting and defining the first clause)—all this should have its influence in forming our decision. Even the "earnestly expecting and ardently wishing, and anticipating" (Bloomfield), "earnestly desiring" (Newcome), "awaiting with eager desire" (Barnes), this "coming of the Day of God," corresponding again with that of the prophets, with the pious Jewish language, etc., should be regarded. While a comparison of the intent of this fire with the overthrow of the wicked—in which fire is also alluded to—Rev. 19:19–21; Matt. 25:31–46; Ps. 11–16; Dan. 7:9–11; 2 Thess. 2:8; Joel 3:9–16; Zech. 14:1–15; Ezek. 38:22, etc., leads to the conclusion that it must be—Peter also linking it with Isa. 65:17, and 66:22—Pre-Millennial. Linked with a coming of the Messiah, with which the restored Theocratic Kingdom is associated; with an earth, however it may experience the ordeal of fire, the same earth renewed; with a continued materiality (see Chalmers's Sermon on 2 Pet. 3:13), which, as in glorified humanity, etc., God employs, as the prophets teach, to display His attributes and glory and to make His creatures happy; with a new heavens and new earth, which was inseparably connected in the Jewish mind with the Kingdom of the Messiah and a return to a Paradisiacal state; with the extirpation of sin from the world and not with a destruction of that which is not in itself sinful; with the inheritance of Abraham, the saints, and Christ Himself, which cannot be effaced without violation of God's faithful Word; with "the restitution of all things," "the regeneration," the deliverance of groaning creation, the shaking of heaven and earth, and numerous other promises which are then to be realized—surely with all this before us, the conflagration of Peter can only be explained consistently with the uniform and concurrent teaching of Holy Writ. It cannot, it does not form an exception. Taking, on the one hand, the most positive declarations that sin, suffering, opposing and hostile powers shall continuously exist down to the Sec. Advent, and then, on the other hand, the emphatic predictions that these shall be rooted out of the very same earth—that all sorrow, misery, and wickedness shall cease to exist in it—and that it shall become fruitful, beautiful, etc.,—it follows that the only position—consistently sustained by the reasons adduced—for a believer in all that God says, is that already indicated. Peter's statement shows us, how both these Scriptural representations are sustained and verified; how the sin-stained vesture and fashion shall be changed for the garments alone suited for the manifested royalty; how this earth now can expectantly look for redemption and then can rejoice and exult in the possession of the same; how God can (for He is not wasteful of material) take the old and out of it bring forth the gloriously renewed without impairing His own workmanship; and how this earth, once pronounced good but now marred by sin, shall again be restored to all its forfeited blessings and to the singing of "the morning stars" and the shouting of "the Sons of God" over its recovery.

Obs. 11. But in this discussion we are not concerned in advocating any specific interpretation of Peter's language. Let it be admitted, that all the explanations given are "pitiful subterfuges," and that the fire is universal, yet a believer in God's Word should find no difficulty even in this extreme statement of the case. Let the conflagration be thus universal or local, universal by slow advances or confined to the Roman earth, universal by uniting Pre- and Post-Millennial agencies, or entirely Pre-Millennial, one thing ought to be self-evident to the believer, viz., that this fire, whatever it may be, and however extended in its effects, will not and cannot destroy the mortal men in the flesh, the Jewish nation and spared Gentiles, whom God has determined to save. The difficulty is, as alleged, that we cannot tell how, if the conflagration is general, at the same time, these can be preserved. Taking it for granted that it is thus universal, we are told that we cannot give "a reason" for the hope that is in us, and that our theory is "a stupendous theological misnomer," etc. Having already shown, in various places, the just connection existing between reason and faith, it is not necessary to restate our position. While advocating the use of reason, yet, after reason has once admitted the Omnipotence, etc., of the Eternal One, it must be regarded as very unreasonable to limit the Divine attributes. It is a characteristic of believers, in opposition to unbelievers, to receive all that God says He will perform, even if not able fully or satisfactorily to explain or reconcile all His words and predictions;—and this is properly based upon the reason (derived from reason apprehending God as described), that the wisdom and power of God will be found equal to any emergency that may arise in the fulfilment (in the order given) His predictions, no matter how inexplicable they may appear unto us. Indeed, one of the writers (Shimeall) who expresses himself so strongly against us on the ground of impossibility, etc., gives us in the very same book a sufficient reply to his own objection in the following just lesson of faith urged against another party who lacked faith: "We might ask, 'Is anything too hard for the Lord? Is our unbelief to be the measure of his truth?' If a few had objected, before the events, the improbability, approaching not only to moral but to physical impossibility, that Messiah could ever be born of a virgin: suppose, further, he had objected to the improbability of such a religion as that of Christ, with such apparently inadequate support, and so contrary to men's prejudices and passions, ever so prevailing in the world, as that one day all nations should bow to Him—how would such an objection meet this antagonist but by

arguments that would equally refute his own, viz., faith in the truth and power of God.” If this is so, why then urge “physical impossibility” against us, when we even by no means make the emergency for such to arise in our interpretation of Peter? A moral inconsistency or impossibility would be fatal to our argument, but that of mere “physical impossibility” (because the objector cannot see how it is to be done) has no pertinency or force relating to the accomplishment of any prediction that God has given, after the mighty exhibitions of His ability to perform anything and everything that He has determined. Witness the saving of a remnant in the flesh when the deluge encompassed the earth, the birth of Isaac, the salvation of Israel at the Red Sea, the protection of the flesh and even the clothing of the Hebrews in the intense heat of the king’s furnace, the conception of Jesus, etc., and surely with such manifestations of God’s most wonderful ability to accomplish all things, we must utterly repudiate the principle that we are at liberty to reject any prediction, or to reverse its order of fulfilment, because we, forsooth, cannot comprehend or explain how it is to be done, or how it is to be reconciled with natural causes. Apply this unbelieving principle to the conflagration itself, to the resurrection of the dead, to the changing of the living saints, to the miracles of Christ, creation, the mode of our existence, etc., and see how little these, as well as a multitude of other things, are dependent upon our amount of knowledge concerning them. Prophecies, which before their fulfilment seemed of impracticable (from a human standpoint) accomplishment were exactly realized; and thus others are given (is it to test the faith of Abraham’s seed?) in relation to the future, which will be verified in like manner, no matter whether believed or not, simply because God will indeed perform “a strange work,” “a new thing,” and while engaged in it. He is abundantly able to “cover in the shadow of His hand,” so that (Isa. 43:2) “when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee” (or as Delitzsch: “When thou goest into fire, thou shalt not be burned, and the flames shall not set thee on fire”).

PROPOSITION 151. This Kingdom is identified with “the new heavens and new earth” of Isa. 65:17 and 66:22, of 2 Pet. 3:13, and of Rev. 21:1.

Having shown that “the new heavens and new earth” of Isaiah and Peter are identical, another step in the discussion is requisite, viz., to prove that the same is also denoted in Rev. 21:1, or, that one and the same state is meant by the three prophets. This becomes the more necessary since many attempt to invalidate our doctrine by denying their identity, separating them, and making them descriptive of different eras of time. Thus e.g. some make the heavens, etc., of Isaiah and Peter something of the past and present, while those of John are still future; others make Isaiah refer to the Millennial era, while Peter and John follow that period; others again make Isaiah and Peter relate to the Millennium and John’s heaven, etc., succeed it. We believe that they all refer to the same thing and to the same time; and for which belief the following reasons are assigned (comp. Prop. 148):

Obs. 1. It is not necessary to repeat the arguments which show the connection of Isaiah and Peter. This has been done in the immediate preceding (e.g. 148 and 149) Propositions, to which, in justice to us, the reader will please refer. The views of the Jews, the correspondence of language with their belief, the reference direct to Isaiah by Peter, etc., must, in order to make the line of argument complete, be duly considered. To one party of our opponents, let it be said, that conceding as they do a Pre-Millennial Advent of Jesus and His reign during that age, they must explain how this is to be reconciled with Peter’s delineation of the scoffers and their language, which cannot be thus applied to accord with their theory, or with their expressed views of the approach of “the Day of God.” But the connection of Isaiah and Peter will appear more fully and distinctively by noticing how John corroborates it.*

Obs. 2. Before showing the latter, the reader ought to determine that the separation of John’s account of “the new heaven and new earth” from its direct relationship to the Millennial age in ch. 20, or the finding it recorded after the account given of that era (and upon which so much stress is laid by some), is no proof whatever that its realization must also succeed that period. This is so fully granted by many of those who differ from us, that it should not, in itself, be used as an argument against us. It eminently deserves (to avoid confusion, etc.) a separate and distinctive description, which, connected by parallel utterances, sufficiently, as a comparison evinces, identifies the period of its coming.

Obs. 3. Again, as one party seeks to make its view that of the early fathers, Barnabas and Tertullian (see Prop. 148, Obs. 4), it may be as well to state, that the references made by Barnabas and Tertullian do not relate at all to the non-identity of these new heavens and earth. They simply declare, what we also hold, that a complete restoration of all things will not be fully witnessed until the close of the Millennial period. On the other hand, we have the most positive proof that so far as “the new heavens,” etc., of John is concerned, they believed it to be fully correspondent with and embracing the Millennial era. Thus e.g. Tertullian (B. 3, Ag. Marcion, ch. 24) says: “For we also confess, that a Kingdom is promised us on earth: before that in heaven, but in another state, viz., after the resurrection, for it will be for a thousand years in a city of divine workmanship, viz., Jerusalem brought down from heaven; and this city Ezekiel knew and the Apostle John saw,” etc. After declaring that this is the city for the saints at that time, he closes: “This is the manner of the heavenly Kingdom.” Barnabas, in his argument respecting the covenant being fulfilled in the seventh chiliad, makes the latter the Sabbath, the “blessed rest, when we have received the righteous promise, when iniquity shall be no more, all things being renewed (Rev. 21) by the Lord,” etc. Whatever views the Fathers may have entertained respecting succeeding ages and even

changes, it is apparent from their writings that they made no distinction between Isaiah, Peter, and John on this point, but quote from all of them directly or inferentially as pertaining to the same period of time. They speak of the perpetuity of the state introduced at the Millennial era, of the eternal duration of the Kingdom then established, and of the everlasting blessedness then bestowed, and in such comprehensive terms that this “new heaven and earth” enters into the eternal ages without being destroyed or passing away. Admitting their liability to error, yet, if sustained by Scripture, a logical consistency, which is to their credit, supports that general unanimity among them.

Obs. 4. The matter, however, must be decided by a direct appeal to the Scriptures, and as this decision is dependent upon time, when Rev. chs. 21 and 22 will be fulfilled, it is in place to point out the reasons why they must be linked with the Millennial period. (1.) The phrase “new heaven and new earth” corresponds accurately with Isaiah’s and Peter’s language. This is so much felt that some have made Isaiah’s heaven typical of the other. (2) But that it is no type, and will not be superseded by the heaven of Peter or John, is evident from the announcement that the heaven of Isaiah when once created will not pass away (Prop. 148, Obs. 4). God appeals to that heaven as indicating His unfailing faithfulness (Isa. 66:22), and the inhabitants (Isa. 65:18) are to “be glad and rejoice forever in that which I create;” thus disposing of the typical theory, teaching the perpetuity of the heaven and earth introduced at the Millennial era, and informing us how to understand the fleeing away of the heaven, etc., in Rev. 20:11 (Prop. 148, Obs. 4). In reference to the last passage, in addition to its being parenthetical, given to identify the Person on the throne and convey an idea of irresistible power by what He had already performed, it may be said that the action described accords with what really transpires (as Millennial predictions show), when the Millennium is introduced; that from the creation of the new heaven, etc., at the Millennial era, owing to its perpetuity, “no place was found for the old;” that it is not asserted that the new Millennial heaven fled away, but simply “the earth and heaven;” that if it is maintained that the Millennial new heaven, etc., flee away, giving place to another, then we have a violation of the order laid down by Peter, who tells us that the present heaven and earth are to be changed, not for Millennial ones, and then afterward for another substitution, not a thousand years after the Sec. Advent, but at the Sec. Coming. He only recognizes one such creation after the present one, and in this sustains the perpetuity ascribed to the Millennial heaven by all the prophets, who with one voice describe at the coming of the Mighty One a glorious restitution which is perpetual in its nature. Taking also the view presented under Props. 147 and 148, that the phrase “heaven and earth” embrace the import, according to Scriptural usage, of government, dominion, and their supporters, it follows (as will be more fully shown under Prop. 159) that such a substitution after the Messiah’s Kingdom (which is everlasting, etc., and established at the ushering in of the Millennial era), cannot take place. (3) If “the new heaven and new earth” of the Millennial era shall pass away, then the language of Rev. 21:1, that “the first heaven and the first earth were passed away,” would not describe it, seeing that that of the Millennium is not—admitting the very statements of our opponents—“the first,” for they have the changing of the present (first) heaven and earth into a new Millennial, and then the changing of this second one into another “new” one. The mention of the word “first” guards us against the typical application, and shows which heaven and earth is changed. (4) The phrase “and there was no more sea,” which is supposed to present a serious objection to our view, indicates that the Millennial heaven and earth of Isaiah is denoted. It is gratuitously assumed that because “sea” is sometimes used in its literal sense, it must be literally understood here. But—however the literal to some extent might, for aught we know, accompany it—we find in Dan. 7:2; Ps. 65:7; Rev. 13:1; Ps. 93:3, 4; Hab. 3:8, and numerous places, flood and sea, mighty waters, etc., employed to denote the agitation, unsettled condition, revolutionary tendencies, anarchy, warlike and turbulent commotions of nations. Take this meaning, so emphatically exhibited in prophetic usage, and it is predicted that during this period the nations (showing also that they survive) are disposed to peace under the Theocratic reign of Jesus, thus happily corresponding with many descriptions of the Millennial state which make this peculiarity, freedom from war, etc., a distinguishing excellence. King Jesus “at His appearing and Kingdom” will introduce such an order of things that the turbulence of the sea will be unknown, and war between nations will cease. (5) In Rev. 19:7, 8, 9, just before the one thousand years, it is said that the marriage of the Lamb hath come, and His wife hath made herself ready, etc. This conclusively shows that Rev. chs. 21 and 22 are retrospective, and that they do not describe a new order of things after the Millennium. Would it not be strange, when “the marriage is come,” and “the Bride is ready,” to postpone the marriage a thousand years? Why does the Spirit assert the former, if we are not to understand that the marriage with (Rev. 21:9) “the Bride, the Lamb’s wife,” is then consummated, without so long an intervening period? With the Early Church and a long line of worthies, this notion of an interval (derogatory to the Bridegroom and Bride) after the Coming of the Bridegroom (at Sec. Advent), must be rejected as untenable. (6) By comparing Rev. chs. 21 and 22 with the Millennial prophecies, as e.g. Isa. chs. 60 and 54, keeping in view the connection of the latter with the Advent and the marriage, we are at no loss to see why, under the teaching of inspired men, the Early Church so universally held that all these prophecies portrayed a New Jerusalem state here on the earth in the Millennial age. It seems almost strange that any other opinion can be entertained, when the Spirit employs precisely the same language, presents the same ideas, etc., in all these prophecies. If the passages alluded to are compared, such is the similarity of blessing, of events, of deliverance, etc., that they necessarily must—if there is propriety in language—be applied to the same period of time. It will not answer to admit, as some do, that the same state is indeed described, but that only the eighth age or eternal state after the Millennium is meant by John, for then John, using Millennial phraseology, ought to have specifically discriminated or intimated such a transference of idea; besides this, according to the theory of such, it is utterly impossible for them to receive Isaiah as describing the state mentioned by John without mutilating and expunging (as e.g. Isa. 60:12; and Isa. 54:15, etc.) passages, which, taking their own admissions, are inconsistent with an era after the Millennial. The fact that the prophecies

cannot thus be taken in their entirety, descriptive of one period, although employing the same language, etc., is against our opponents; for denying their complete resemblance and identity, they plunge into difficulties from which there is no escape. To perfect this identity, the same blessings enjoyed in the New Jerusalem state are also attributed to the Millennial era; such as the tabernacle of God with men, wiping away all tears, no more death, no sorrow, crying, and pain, making all things new, the glory of God, the open gates, the brightness that needs no sun, the river and the tree of life, no more curse, the throne of God and the Lamb, the beholding of His face, the name in the forehead, no night, the reigning, etc. (7) The period of inheriting is at the Sec. Advent (when the Mill. age commences, and this inheriting, in Millennial phraseology, is also found in connection with Rev. 21:7, thus accurately corresponding with the promises to the saints that at the Sec. Coming they shall obtain the New Jerusalem. Such is the impression made by Rev. 3:11, 12; Gal. 4:26; Heb. 12:22, seeing that the crowning, etc., is invariably linked with the Advent. This again is corroborated by Rev. 22:10–15 where the city is spoken of as something immediately connected with the Advent of Jesus, which the righteous shall enter, etc. He comes, and gives the right both to the tree of life and to the city. (8) While the New Jerusalem is manifested in this new earth, “the nations” are permitted to enjoy its “light,” etc., agreeably to other Millennial predictions, as e.g. Isa. 60. Those who make the city symbolical of and embracing the saints, and then make these “nations” the same saints, involve themselves in a confusion of ideas. That these “nations” are the same as those specified to exist in the Millennium is apparent from the simple fact that they still require “healing.” The saints who inherit the city, with other blessings, are incorruptible, immortal (1 Cor. 15), and need no healing, while the nations being mortal have continued necessity to partake of “the leaves of the tree for the healing of the nations.” The latter condition only corresponds with the one delineated in Mill. prophecies. (9) The identity of the Theocratic element, the reign of Christ and His saints, the same grandeur and glory of the Kingdom, the exaltation of the married wife (Prop. 118), when “the desolate one” is again remembered in mercy; in brief, our entire argument bearing upon the Kingdom, clearly shows that the Kingdom of the Messiah, in the same period of time, is delineated by all of these prophecies—only one of them, Rev. 20:1–7, specifying a thousand years (upon which really this division is founded), not as a limit to the Theocratic Kingdom, but as the limit of Satan’s binding and of the non-resurrection of the rest of the dead. (10) But we are told that the continuance of the seasons during the Millennial age is incompatible with the conflagration predicted by Peter and the state described by John. But here again is a beautiful consistency between Rev. 21:23 and Isa. 60:19; for the former expressly limits the “no need of the sun, neither of the moon” to the city, indicating by the reference itself that they indeed exist, but that such is the brightness of the city obtained through its august Theocratic Ruler that it does not need that of these luminaries; while the latter has reference to the same locality, being confined to the restored Jewish nation, Jerusalem its capital city (with which the New is associated), with Jewish and Gentile saints united with it, so that the same effulgence of the city, proceeding from the same great source, is represented as extending (not over the whole earth, but) over the holy land. The continuance of sun and moon is also intimated in the next verse. Besides this, the objection takes too much for granted, seeing that the design of Peter’s fire is nowhere asserted to be to eradicate the seasons; that the seasons, or rather sun and moon, are given a permanency equal to the existence of the earth, of Messiah’s Kingdom, and of God’s faithfulness in promise, that if the seasons cease, it must be based on the utter destruction not only of this earth (and the substitution of an entirely new and differing one), but of the solar system, all of which requires no serious refutation. Besides this seasons are mentioned in the “every month” of Rev. 22:2. (11) The perfect agreement of Rev. 21 and 22 with Isa. 60, etc., in describing “the nations” and “the kings of the earth” at this period of time can only be predicated upon a complete similarity of view in time respecting its occurrence.

Obs. 5. Now, in justice to our subject, and to meet, according to our design, all forms of objections, a point must be noticed, which, if we were to consult simply feeling and the esteem with which we regard differing brethren, otherwise might be passed by. Our allusion is to the opinion entertained by some (as e.g. Waggoner) that Christ and the saints are not upon the earth during the thousand years, but come to it and reside on it after those years are expired; to the view held by others (as e.g. Butler), that Christ and the saints go to the third heaven, and reign from thence in the Millennial period (so also Hess, who concedes, however, that “the monarch of this so flourishing Kingdom would indeed, as in the days of His resurrection, appear again visibly on earth, when some more important end requires He should”), making the New Jerusalem a continuation of the same, etc.; to that of others, who (as e.g. Melville), think that when the Mill. age is introduced the saints shall be caught up to meet Christ, and that both the saints and Jesus will be in the New Jerusalem, not upon the earth, administering the Kingdom then set up; to that of others, who (as e.g. Shimeall) believe that when the Mill. age begins, Christ and the saints will be “in the air, as the capital of His universal earthly empire” (to avoid the charge of caricaturing, see p. 316 of his *I Will Come Again*) the New Jerusalem state following the Millennial; to that of others, who (as e.g. some of the editors of the old series of *Proph. Times*), believe that when the Mill. age is ushered in Christ and the saints will be in the New Jerusalem, but separated and distinct from the earth—in brief, suspended above it. Writers from these respective classes have much to say concerning the “aerial thrones,” and “the general superintendency” conducted from “the air” or “the heavens,” etc. The identification of “the new heaven and new earth” of Isaiah, Peter, and John, being a representation of what is done, not in “the air,” or in a place separate and distinct from the earth proper, or in the third heaven, but here on the earth, is a confutation of all such theories. More than this, a correct apprehension of the Kingdom as covenanted to David’s Son and as predicted by the prophets positively forbid such a withdrawal in part or whole of David’s Son and His brethren from the very place specifically promised (not “the air,” but “the earth”) to Him and His saints. The Early Church, more consistent, knew nothing of such a separation of Jesus from His Davidic throne and Kingdom, which only was, and shall be, located on earth, and of such a reign of

saints “in the air” or “on high,” somewhere instead of being “on the earth.” Brethren may honestly think that they are honoring Christ and the saints, or that they are making (as Shimeall) Millenarianism more palatable for others, but they will allow us to say, with equal honesty, that planting ourselves firmly upon the oath-bound covenant which expressly locates this very Kingdom, and upon the utterances of the prophets which places the Kingdom and the King here on the earth, at the of the restored Jewish nation, etc., we hold that a disjoining, a separation of that which God has joined together, evinces, at least, a lack of faith in the very order and connection which the Word gives. Admitting that a diversity of view in regard to the details of doctrine is to be expected and allowed, yet upon this subject, which virtually leaves the Davidic throne and Kingdom (on the earth) without an occupant and head (transplanting Him to the “air” or Third Heaven, etc., where David’s throne and Kingdom never existed), it is proper to insist, in plain terms, upon that view which alone meets the conditions imposed by covenant and prophecy. One writer (J. B., Proph. Times, Aug. 1868), even in distinguishing between the Mill. age and the following New Jerusalem period, asserts: “We have reason to believe that the real throne of God will not be on the earth during the Millennium.” All such opinions arise from not clearly apprehending what the throne of the Theocratic King is, and where it is located. Having shown and proven in previous Propositions that God’s throne (not the Divine Sovereignty, Props. 79, 80) was on the earth, that it was incorporated with the Davidic, and that when the Davidic is restored, as sworn to and solemnly predicted, God’s throne—the Theocratic throne—is again restored for the God-man, the appointed Theocratic King to occupy, it seems to be faithless to doubt the locality (Prop. 122) of this throne. When the tabernacle of David, now in ruins, is rebuilt, when the glorious things spoken of the splendidly restored Theocratic rule are witnessed—does covenant or prophet give the slightest idea that this embraces anything outside of, or in the atmosphere above, the earth? If the transfiguration (Prop. 158) really gave a correct representation, it follows that we have the King and the three classes upon the earth. The inheritance of Christ is on the earth; the inheritance of Abraham and his seed is on the earth; the reign of Christ and of His saints is on the earth; the tabernacling of God again with man is on the earth; the Kingdom under the whole heavens is on the earth; a Paradise restored, with a God present in the Person of Jesus Christ, is on the earth; a renewal, a restitution, a regeneration, a world to come, a day of the Lord Jesus, etc., etc., is on the earth—nowhere do we find the least teaching, direct, that any of these things shall be witnessed and realized outside of this earth, or that saints are to be, in any way, separated therefrom. Such theories result from pure inference, and the main passage produced from which it is drawn, is the one relating to the resurrection and translation of the saints, who are “to be caught up in the clouds (or as some, in clouds) to meet the Lord in the air,” from which it is wrongfully assumed that the Lord and the saints remain in the air. We might just as logically say that Christ is still in the cloud that received Him; while they themselves do not constantly keep Him “in the air,” for as the prophecies demand a personal manifestation of Jesus on the earth, some allow that the King will occasionally come to the earth to fulfil those predictions. No! no! Simple in faith, unlearned in many things as the primitive church may have been, yet it was far too strong in faith and learned in the Scriptures to advocate opinions which restore a garden of Eden for Adam and Eve, and then carefully place Adam and Eve in “the air” or up “on high,” where the paradisiacal restoration does not affect them; which repeals a curse from the earth, but translates those who had borne the curse to another place instead of making them “return” as the prophets do, to see and enjoy its repeal; which establishes a Messiah’s Kingdom, but carefully keeps the Messiah aloof from it; and which, as one party, brings the New Jerusalem to the earth; but suspended up on high somewhere in the atmosphere, where its gates are open for the kings of the earth to enter, etc. But we need not discuss the matter—our previous Propositions having done this—for these same writers when (for the time forgetting this theory of separating Jesus and the saints from their inheritance, etc.), opposing the prevailing notion that David’s throne is in the third heaven, use the very arguments that equally refute their own notion of its being “in the air,” or some other place. Thus one (Shimeall) forcibly says: “The sum of the whole matter is simply this: David has no throne in heaven.” (May we ask, Had he one “in the air?”) “And Christ, though born a King, and crucified as a King—the King of the Jews—yet ‘the Kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heavens,’ has never yet been given to Him or His saints. But there stands the immutable oath of God to David, that Christ as His ‘Son according to the flesh’—mark, not according to the Spirit—shall sit on His throne.” Precisely so; for any other view detracts from the simplicity, beauty, and sublimity of our system of truth. Hence, we have no sympathy with that view which would make the “air” more holy than the renewed earth; and the remaining “in the air” less “gross and sensual” than being on the redeemed earth, the theatre of Christ’s glorious work, and the place (His dwelling-place in Zion), where the Second Adam enters the restored Eden; we would rather, if it is a simple belief and even childlike, contemplate our King as actually and truly personally present, reigning in His covenanted land, throne, and Kingdom, wrested from Satan, dwelling in His “Rest” and “Inheritance,” and thus manifesting, in the very place of His rejection, sufferings, and death, His Davidic—real—Sonship and Lordship. And we love to think of the saints enjoying, in the very place of their former trials and sorrows, the blessedness of perfected Redemption, of completed restitution. Instead of detracting from the honor of David’s Son and of the saints, it is certainly adding to the same and to God’s glory to advocate the carrying out of the covenanted promises, the plan of restitution, which restores man truly and literally to his long-lost Eden and through a personal Second Adam—present in this Eden—recovers a lost dominion on the earth.

PROPOSITION 152. This Kingdom is connected with the perpetuation of the human race.

This follows, of necessity from the preceding Propositions. The Kingdom, as covenanted and predicted, imperatively demands it; for it could not in its strictly Theocratic order exist without the restored Jewish nation, with which it is inseparably connected. The Theocracy is no type but a reality; its restoration is not an ideal matter, but one of actual occurrence. Hence the re-establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom always specifies or takes for granted the continuation of the race. This results not merely from its covenanted relationship, but from its very design, which is the salvation of the race in bringing to it the government, etc., that it needs.*

Obs. 1. Complete Redemption requires the perpetuation of the race after the Sec. Advent. Down to that Advent the race, as such, is not saved; this is so clearly announced that it needs no proof. Yet it is a truth that the Redeemer will restore all the forfeited blessings, that He will bring salvation to the world, and that He will destroy all the works resulting from evil. This is admitted in general terms by our opposers, but in the restitution of those forfeited blessings they leave out one of the most precious, viz., the perpetuation of the race in a state of innocency and holiness—and thus constitute an imperfect Redemption of man. They forget that before the fall the command was given to “multiply and replenish the earth,” and that the fall prevented this earth from being peopled by a race, holy, God-fearing, and serving. If restitution indeed means a restoring to its former state and condition, and if it includes a restoration of the very things lost by sin, then, if complete, as the word insists it will be, it must embrace this long-lost, long longed-for intended benefaction. The command of God given to Adam and Eve before the fall to fill the earth with a holy progeny, but sadly marred by the corruption entailed by sin, will yet be fulfilled in their descendants, since His Divine pleasure respecting the real status of the race is evidenced in the injunction, and His Divine purpose, thus indicated, cannot be frustrated by man’s fall. The interrupted design of making the race itself holy God will yet carry out, and not leave Satan glory in a defeat. The oppressive burden borne by the race and productive of fearful suffering shall be graciously removed from it, so that God’s merciful end to fill the earth to its utmost limits with a righteous people will yet be realized. “I am the Lord, I change not,” is a Divine attribute, which is God’s glory; and hence looking back to see what He Himself intended this race of man to become, we find in His expressed intention the Divine Will in the matter; and of Him it is said: “My counsel shall stand, and I will do all in my pleasure”—“I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it.” Therefore, we believe, in humble reliance upon the unchangeableness of God’s purpose, that a holy, happy race shall yet possess this earth, and that it will be perpetuated precisely so far as God had intended it should be before man fell. Olshausen (Com., Pref. p. 117) expresses this so tersely that it is worth attention: “The proper fundamental idea of the doctrine of God’s Kingdom upon earth (which) is so simple, that we cannot understand how its truth could ever be doubted, until we remember the farragoes of nonsense which have been propounded under its sanction. This simple radical idea is merely, that as, in regard to an individual man, God, by the Saviour, redeems not merely a particular part of him, his spirit alone, his soul alone, or his body alone, but the whole man, his body, soul, and spirit, so the redeeming power of Christ has for its object the deliverance of the entire human race, and of the creation in general, from the yoke of sin.” God’s purpose is delayed for a time—which to finite man appears long, but to God is “as a day”—until the Saviour is provided, and the proper material has been gathered even out of the fallen race, for the leverage requisite to lift the race out of its sunken condition. The provision of the Saviour, the process of gathering out “the peculiar people,” who are to be the source of blessing to the race, proclaims that there is only a brief—to God—interval or interruption, of which He avails Himself to make His own triumph and glory the more conspicuous and permanent. And it is this very feature, which, perhaps more than any other, magnifies and exalts the inexpressible greatness, majesty, and glory of Redemption in Christ. For, instead of gaining here and there “those that believe” out of the nations, saving “the few out of the race while “the many” are lost, confining Salvation to the number of the saved gathered until the Sec. Advent, and leaving the race with its multitudes in the hands of Satan (thus giving the latter, as some one has aptly said, the victory in point of numbers), God in Christ, employing those that are saved as instrumentalities (comp. e.g. Props. 154 and 156) perpetuates salvation in the deliverance and perpetuation of the race until a countless host of righteous ones arises, a multitude of swarming generations of redeemed ones appear to replace the gap made by sin. God, instead of casting away the perpetuation of the race in holiness—as a thing of nought—and remaining satisfied with “the fragments” gathered, regards this as “a precious stone,” which He carefully polishes and sets with renewed lustre in His crown as of priceless value. This immeasurably exalts the work of Christ, the purpose of His incarnation, sacrifice, present exaltation and glorious reign, the greatness of the design, and the grandeur of the Salvation that He Himself contemplates to accomplish. It invests Him with a perfection as Redeemer and a sublimity as a King, mighty to save, that no other view can possibly bring to Him.

Obs. 2. While thus firmly holding to and advocating the perpetuation of the race after the Sec. Advent in a condition similar (not attained at once but gradually) to that before the fall, yet, to avoid misapprehension, it is necessary to define our position more accurately. Holding to a restoration of the race to that which was forfeited by sin, our opinion is guided mainly by the account preceding the fall. Able writers (as D. N. Lord, Rev. Newton, etc.), contend for an eternal, everlasting perpetuation of the race, perpetual and strictly never-ending, and rely exclusively upon the words rendered “eternal,” “perpetual,” “forever,” etc. The argument thus presented looks plausible and weighty; sufficiently so, that while not fully accepting of it, we at the same time do not deny it. The reasons which influence us to this caution are the following: The words depended upon (as eternal, perpetual, etc.) have sometimes, as critics of the most diverse sentiments state, a limited meaning, denoting simply a long duration, or a duration coeval with existing orderings or dispensations. The fact that actual eternity, never-ending succession, is meant, must be derived from a more detailed

statement, in which this is asserted. Now, it is not stated that if Adam had not fallen his posterity would have gone on perpetually and forever increasing. This is only inferred. The announcement before the fall is simply to “multiply and replenish the earth,” and the inference might be made (as some theologians suggested), that at some remote future period, when the earth was filled with inhabitants, a general glorification would cause the multiplication of the race to cease, etc. If never-ending generations had been promised to Adam, then indeed the argument in favor of this view would be valid, for restitution would then embrace it. Then again, coming to the close of the Bible, where the fact is admitted of generations witnessing and enjoying the light and glory of the New Jerusalem state, and the decided impression is made for ages even, yet nothing specific is asserted of never-ending generations. Our position is this: We are satisfied to end the discussion where the Bible ends it, viz., with a portion of the race glorified and the race itself redeemed from the curse, passing on to higher stages of blessedness, and entering into the eternal ages in this happy condition. If Adam forfeited never-ending generations—if this was part of God’s original design—then the restitution will restore and carry it out; but if not, then only that wonderful increase commensurate with God’s design will be produced. Here we stop: that the race is perpetuated after the Advent is true; that this will continue on after the thousand years (which only limits Satan’s binding, etc.), is most certain; that it even may continue on forever may, for aught we know, be also correct (seeing that some language can scarcely be interpreted otherwise), but as to the latter, not feeling positive, we stop with “the many generations” of Isa. 60:15. The doctrine is not essential in our argument in that form, for if we show, as the Bible does, a completed restitution of all things, that is all that is required to perfect our system—the rest can well be left for the succeeding or eternal ages to develop. Desirous, on the one hand, not to limit the mighty power of God, and on the other hand not to pass beyond that which is positively (not merely inferentially) asserted, we proceed, with this expressed caution, in our argument, with the simple remark added, that such a posture accords best with the ideas of the primitive church on the subject. So far as the ordering of God in the matter is concerned, we are willing cordially to accept of the same, whatever it may be.*

Obs. 3. The early Church, consistently with the doctrine of the Kingdom advocated, taught that after the Advent and after the resurrection and glorification of the saints, the Kingdom then established—being the Theocratic-Davidic restored under Messiah, David’s Son—would have the Jewish nation and spared Gentiles for its willing subjects. This, after the references made to their belief, needs no additional proof. Attention is called to it for two reasons. The first is: that, unless such a faith is Scriptural and was given under the teaching of the men who organized the primitive churches, it is unaccountable that a belief in so fundamental a point which involved the doctrine of the judgment—in brief, the most momentous interests of man—should have been so extensively circulated and embraced without opposition, and a counter statement, from the Church. The second is: the unjust means resorted to (and even practised at this day) in making out that these early Fathers do not carefully distinguish between the glorified saints (who neither marry nor are given in marriage, and hence of whom no multiplication of the race is asserted) and the men in the flesh, but that they teach that the glorified saints, as well as the others, continue in the marriage relation and produce the generations that follow. The falsity of this accusation has been so well met by honest men who are no Millenarians, that a citation of the fact will be all sufficient to exonerate us from holding to an opinion which is not to be found in the writings of any of the Millenarian Fathers, or of their successors. Our apology in thus specially directing the reader to this point, is the circumstance that books are written and circulated at the present time reiterating this often refuted charge. Dr. Lardner (*Lardner’s Works*, vol. 2, p. 691, etc., Bickersteth’s *Guide*, p. 190, etc.) gives an impartial account of the ancient faith in this respect, saying on this point: “But that they (i.e. the Fathers) received marriage, and the fruits of marriage, to belong to any of the raised saints does not appear to me a clear point.” Then referring to Origen and Jerome, as expressing and insinuating this charge, he adds: “But Irenæus and Lactantius, who were Millenarians, do not express themselves in that manner; what they say is, that at the time of the first resurrection there will be found some good men living upon the earth, and that of them, in the space of a thousand years, shall be born a numerous race, a godly seed, over whom likewise the raised saints are to reign, and by whom they are to be served.” So also Bish. Bull, quoted by Prof. Bush (*Mill.*, p. 14), and many eminent writers, having no sympathy with our views, declare themselves, vindicating the Fathers and our doctrine from so gross a charge. Mede, well posted in Patristic lore, informs us by telling Dr. Twisse (see Bickersteth’s *Guide*, p. 191) “how wrongfully the ancient Chiliasts, and Lactantius by name, are charged to hold that the saints which rise from the dead shall marry and get children; whereas he expressly affirms it only of those who shall be alive in the body when Christ comes, nor did any of the rest of the Fathers, Justin, Irenæus, Melito, think otherwise,” If even one or more Millenarians could be found (they are not discoverable, and hence no one that has ever brought the charge has presented a single quotation directly taken from a Millenarian writer advocating such a view) who have taught this—this—the mistaken opinion of one or more individuals—should not be charged upon us as a class, or upon our system of doctrine as a natural sequence following from it, when the immense majority and overwhelming mass of testimony are against it. This is a cheap way (but costly) of exciting hostility against a party—an appeal to ignorance and prejudice which only exposes the weakness of those who resort to it. Many of our opponents, we are happy to say, are too manly, intelligent, and righteous to yield to such caricaturing of a faith held by some of the noblest men that ever trusted in and labored for Jesus. As to the alleged charge of “carnality,” “grossness,” and “sensuality,” arising from the dwelling of the glorified saints and men in the flesh in the same Millennial new earth, this has been so fully answered in another place that it needs no reply here. If this is God’s ordering; if the saints occupy the exalted positions assigned to them as Kings and Priests, ruling and ministering over the restored race; if the glorified saints are associated with the Mighty King in a glorious Redemptive process; if they are specially, in view of this relationship, the inhabitants of that New Jerusalem that comes down from God, out of heaven upon this

earth; this is amply sufficient to justify it.

Obs. 4. Briefly, it would be interesting to trace in what manner this early doctrine, once so prevalent—that the Jewish nation and Gentiles in the flesh would survive the Advent, and the fearful judgments then poured out upon the nations, and would form the subjects of that world-wide dominion under Christ and His resurrected brethren—was gradually undermined and finally almost rooted out. What was said in another place, in a general way, respecting the decline of Millenarianism before the incoming flood of hierarchical and papistical doctrine, will also apply here, but yet this specific point finds a solution in the rise and progress of distinctive doctrine, to which it stood in opposition. Passing by the misstatements of Origen, Jerome, and others (which Mede and others justly expose), let us confine ourselves to a few exegetical and doctrinal phases which had a decided influence in this direction. The unfolding of the present prevailing view of the Judgment Day and of Christ's Coming only to act in a judicial capacity, the plainest of philological errors (fastened by monkish writers upon the neck of the Church), viz., "the ending of the world," instead of "the ending of the age" or dispensation (as all critics now admit, in accord with the early Church)—these, and similar perversions, converted the Eschatology of the multitude into a palpable contradiction to that previously entertained. Then followed what before the Church, owing to its cherished doctrine of the Kingdom (which was unsuited to the hierarchical tendencies), utterly repudiated, viz., the closing up of all earthly things (some including even the utter destruction, and some the annihilation of the earth), the ending of time, and, of course, the non-perpetuation of the human race. Strange that even the Sibyl (Sibylline Oracles, B. 3), speaking of the future age, should preserve greater consistency than professed theologians in saying: "a race shall be restored as it was in the ancient times." This change thus produced, gradually but firmly incorporated into the belief of the Church, was but feebly defended at first, and owed its continued and intrenched position to the fact that the party who adopted it became the popular one, obtaining, through civil patronage, the exclusive control of the doctrinal position of the Church, and crushing, by the weight of assumed authority, all opposing views. Looking over the Scriptural basis alleged in support of so radical a departure from the primitive faith, it is found that the main leading Scripture adduced in its favor is Matt. 25:31–46. Around this passage, as on a pivot, all others are made to revolve. Having examined this (Prop. 134), it may be dismissed with the remark, that it is only more recently, driven to it in self-defence, that this departure from the early faith is sought to be defended in a systematic form by our opponents. It is necessary—for the sake of completeness—to refer to the line of argument adopted. In addition to the passages usually presented in old works, we have the following reasons assigned in its behalf by Dr. Brown (Christ's Sec. Coming), who is regarded as the ablest of our opponents. The reader will notice that they are all based on mere inference, for no one has ever yet found a passage within the Bible that directly teaches that the multiplication of the race ceases after the Advent of Christ; the inference being suggested by a preconceived notion of the Judgeship of Christ, the Judgment Day, and the extent of the conflagration mentioned by Peter. Thus Dr. Brown informs us that "the Church will be absolutely complete at Christ's Coming," and implies from this that after that no others will be saved. Aside from our direct arguments in various Propositions which prove that such a conclusion is erroneous, it is sufficient to say that our doctrine itself embraces the completeness of the elect (i.e. those gathered out and accounted worthy to become kings and priests), who become "the first-fruits," "the Church of the first-born" associated with Christ in rulership, etc. The Scriptures teaching such completeness, which is consistent with the Plan of the administrations of the Kingdom, do not at the same time declare that no others—after this specific number of chosen ones are gathered—shall be saved. To say this is adding to the Word of God, and is not to distinguish between things that belong to different dispensations. In the next place we are told that "Christ's Sec. Coming will exhaust the object of the Scriptures," that "the Word" and "the Ordinances" "shall then absolutely cease as means of grace and salvation to mankind," and from such an extravagant postulate the deduction is made that none will be saved after the Sec. Advent. The early believers, instructed by inspired men, must have been indeed very foolish—yea the apostles themselves must have greatly misconceived the object, the gracious design of Christ's Sec. Coming—when they believed it to be a coming "unto salvation," and urged all to look and pray for it—not as "the goal of all revelation, its furthest horizon, its last terminus," but in order that the glorious predictions of the prophets of revelation might be realized. The assumptions so far-reaching defeat themselves by being too sweeping; for admitting even that some things in the Scriptures are only adapted to one period of time (i.e. preceding Advent), that is no reason for assuming that when the Theocracy is re-established great changes will not occur in the manner of the divine administration, making new revelations, etc., necessary (Prop. 167) to adapt the world to the reign then inaugurated. The climax is reached in the next assertion, that "the sealing ordinances of the N. Test. will disappear at Christ's Coming," and inferring hence that none can be saved after that period. But how does he know that they will "disappear," after Christ's declaration that He would drink of the fruit of the vine with His disciples in His Kingdom, and when at the very time the Jewish nation is converted, seeing Him whom they pierced, an allusion to water is made? Suppose even that they do "disappear," is not God able, if another dispensation is to follow, to institute, if it be requisite, a new order of arrangements to carry on the work of redemption? Artfully as the objections are made, they virtually limit the ability of God to effect the changes that may be required in each succeeding dispensation. The remaining reasons derived from the intercession of Christ ceasing, the work of the Spirit for saving purposes ending, etc., are answered in other places more in detail, so that it is needless to dwell upon them. Let us turn to another writer, far removed from Dr. Brown, and a representative of a totally different class, who, while accepting of a literal first resurrection, etc., denies the perpetuation of the Jewish nation and Gentiles, Waggoner (Ref. of Age to Come) assuming that when Christ comes this dispensation ends, and is not followed by another, but by the eternal age, hence argues that there will be no salvation for the race, all probation being ended. His main argument is derived from the universality of the language employed respecting the condemnation

of the law (viz., that all the wicked will be condemned by it), and the belief of the Gospel (viz., that all that believe shall be saved). Hence, there are only two classes, while we are charged with creating a third class, neither condemned by the law nor saved by the Gospel. This, however, is a misapprehension of our faith in the matter; for instead of creating a third class, neither wicked nor righteous, we have the Jewish nation converted by the appearance of the Messiah, and the spared of the Gentiles also receive and cordially embrace the truth as it is in Jesus. The universality of language does not by any means forbid the future conversion of nations under the administrations of King Jesus; for the wicked shall perish at the Coming of Jesus (as a class, those who are given up as incorrigible—even among the Jews), and yet some, who are willing to become repentant and obedient, shall be saved. This is illustrated by the universality of expression that all men shall die, etc., and yet we find some that will not die, being translated. This indicates the danger of building a doctrine purely upon inference drawn from such language. Universal as it is, yet some exceptions may occur under it, being in correspondence with the Divine intention. For, even in the present dispensation, infants, small children, and heathen form an exception to the generally applied principles. Believing in a coming dispensation, as taught, we are not concerned in explaining the modifications that may occur (and reconcile them with what men may infer), of which we are not the judges, but leave them as they stand recorded with our hearty acceptance, also believing that they will be found in accordance with the Spirit of antecedent dispensations. That probation is found in “the new heavens and new earth” is evident from e.g. Isa. 65:17 seq.; that “the inhabitants of the earth will learn righteousness when God’s judgments are in the earth” (Isa. 26:9) is frequently declared; and that the removal of evil, etc. from the suffering nations is linked with the resurrection (as e.g. Isa. 25:8 comp. with 1 Cor. 15:54) is sustained by the general analogy of Scripture. Let such brethren be reminded, that back of all such inferential proof as they present, is the Davidic covenant, the Pre-Mill. Advent, resurrection, etc., which must first be duly considered, before such an incomplete Redemption is accepted, vitiating even the restoration of the promised Theocracy. We would rather keep in view those fundamental and positive teachings—too much overlooked, owing to their simplicity—which land us, after some preparatory stages (including this dispensation), right at the opening door of the race’s grand destiny; which bind the predictions from the earliest to the latest prophet into one connected chain of evidence testifying that the Kingdom of David’s Son is established here on the earth for the express purpose of unfolding and carrying on the eternal purposes of God respecting the race, for a time (“a moment”) delayed by the fall of man and the procedure required for redemption.

Obs. 5. In deciding this subject the student ought to receive the testimony of the converging witnesses, contemplated independently in various propositions. The mass of corroborating proof in behalf of our position is so great that we can only briefly allude to some of it, leaving the reader to refer to the places indicated for a more detailed statement. The Pre-Millennial Advent (Prop. 121) at once decides the question; for if Jesus comes before that age is introduced, then, as a matter of course, men in the flesh live after His Coming during that period. This the prophecies inculcate. That it is Pre-Mill., as the early Church held, has been proven. Thus also the Pre-Mill. resurrection of the just (Props. 125–129) implies the same thing, in view of the Advent linked with it as the resurrecting agency. And, as stated, so plainly is this connection made that the resurrection is allied with Christ’s obtaining the sovereignty over the nations of the earth, as e.g. Rev. 11:15–18. Indeed, the Davidic Covenant (Prop. 49), which has not—since the overthrow of the Kingdom—been fulfilled down to the present day, but which we have shown is to be verified at the Sec. Advent, alone proves the necessity for such a continuation of the race, seeing that without the restoration of the Jewish nation (Prop. 111, 112, etc.) it is impossible to re-erect it as covenanted. The manner in which that Jewish nation is restored (Prop. 113), under the personal auspices of its Mighty King, whom the nation shall again see and with deeply repentant hearts acknowledge, is additional evidence that the race is perpetuated after the Second Advent. Taking any other position vitiates the election (Prop. 24, etc.) of that people, and makes God’s promises to them, and His covenant with them, a nullity. Denying this perpetuation, forces our opponents to make prophecies and promises relating to the Divine Purpose conditional, which (Prop. 18) introduces weakness and uncertainty—if not more—into the Word. Prophecies, too, which are admitted to be unconditional, as e.g. Dan. 7, notwithstanding they are linked with a Coming of the Son of man, which Jesus Himself refers to the future, are made, owing to their embracing in the Kingdom, “under the whole heaven,” “people, nations, and languages,” to be fulfilled in the present dispensation because of the implied and granted perpetuation of the race. Let any one turn to the prophecy of “the married wife” and “the barren woman” (Prop. 118) and see the increase predicated of the latter after the marriage with the former and the restoration of the latter to God’s favor. Can a consistent interpretation be placed upon the passage without admitting the early doctrine? Take the faith of the pious Jews (Prop. 20, etc.), of John the Baptist (Prop. 39), of the disciples sent out to preach (Prop. 43), and can this continuation of the race embraced in that faith be discarded without convicting them of gross error and folly? Take the preaching of Jesus (Prop. 44, etc.) and the postponement of the Kingdom until His Sec. Advent (Props. 58, 66, 68, etc.), and it is impossible to conceive of a Kingdom, such as preached and postponed, that does not include this very feature. This can only be rejected at the expense of denying that the same Kingdom which was overthrown (Props. 32, 33) shall again be restored (as prophets predict); of transforming the throne and Kingdom into something very different (Prop. 122, etc.) from that which the grammatical language indicates; of ignoring a renewed (Prop. 50) covenant and substituting another in its place; of misinterpreting the design (Prop. 86) of the present dispensation; of materially changing the force (Prop. 106) of Christ’s temptation; of exalting the deliverance of inanimate (and animate) creation (Prop. 146) over that of the race; and of weakening the analogy of Scripture. “The world to come” (Prop. 137), in its Jewish usage, adoption, meaning, and specific appropriation to the covenant promises, clearly teaches the continuation of the race in “the habitable world” still future. So also the comprehensiveness of “restitution” (Prop. 144), of “regeneration” (Prop. 144), of the dominion of the

Second Adam (Prop. 82), of “the transfiguration” (Prop. 153), of the reign of the saints (Prop. 154) cannot be consistently explained without including the perpetuation of the race. “The day of the Lord Jesus Christ” (Prop. 138) and “the morning” of that day (Prop. 139), at “the end of the age” (Prop. 140), unmistakably includes this feature (and shows that Waggoner’s theory that Christ comes and then withdraws with His saints for a thousand years is untenable—for such a withdrawal is nowhere asserted, but His presence in this day and at this morning in His “inheritance,” “the purchased possession” is announced). Our doctrine does not make God’s effort at direct rulership over a nation in the flesh a failure (Prop. 201), but shows how God, out of this very unpromising condition (resulting from man’s sinfulness), raises up agencies by which this rulership shall yet be manifested in overwhelming grandeur and majesty. In vindication of this, we point to the Judgeship of Christ (Prop. 132)—as explained and defended—to the Judgment Day (Prop. 133)—as represented in the Word—to the Millennial predictions (Prop. 119, etc.), received without transposing or mutilating, and from these we learn, that nations in the flesh after the Second Advent and their perpetuation, are requisites to insure the proper fulfilment of Holy Writ. The glory of that Judgeship, the blessings of that Judgment period (in which the earth and its nations are to rejoice), and the happiness of that Millennial era, can never be realized without these. The “unchangeable priesthood” of Jesus Christ (Prop. 155), as well as the priestly office of His associated rulers (Prop. 156), certainly implies that there must be generations of men who are to be benefited by that priesthood extending into “the ages,” seeing that it is founded on the adaptation and relation that it sustains to those (not glorified saints who themselves become “priests”) whom it is designed to benefit. The intercession is not limited and made intermediate between the two Advents. Thus also, the work of the Spirit for saving purposes is not confined to this dispensation (Prop. 171), etc., but extends into the age to come, where its greatest manifestations—in glorifying the saints, in converting, etc., the nations—are yet to be witnessed. It is—in view of this preponderating evidence given through different phases of the subject and preserving a unity of purpose—simply faithless to suppose that the conflagration of Peter (Prop. 149 and 150) is to prevent the fulfilment of this perpetuation of the race. The identification of “the new heaven and new earth” of Isaiah, Peter and John (Prop. 151) confirms our position, seeing that it proves the identity of the Millennial era with its perpetuation of the race, with that of the New Jerusalem state. Such, enumerated with the utmost brevity, are some of the reasons which incline us to accept of a doctrine which logically results from covenant and promise; which even “the uneducated and ignorant” (as one calls it) primitive Church could not fail—owing to its nearness to apostolic teaching—to grasp; and which, instead of dishonoring God, or His Christ, or the glorified saints, brings honor and glory to the Father, Son, Spirit, and “the first-fruits” out of the nations, and ultimately to the nations themselves deliverance from the oppressive burden borne for thousands of years. Even some of our opponents, in view of the sublime opening which it unfolds in the future, have, at least, conceded that it is “a magnificent theory;” it is more, for it is the truth of God.

Obs. 6. Keeping under consideration the reasons already presented favoring the perpetuation of the race, attention is directed to various passages which proclaim the same truth. Allusion has been made to the contrast found in the beginning and ending of the Bible. After this dispensation has closed and another age of “the ages” (Prop. 139) has been ushered in, and the New Jerusalem state is experienced by the saints, in strict accordance with Isa. 60: “The nations of them which are saved,” the honor and glory of “the nations” are mentioned (Rev. 21:24, 26). which is only applicable to then existing “nations” on the earth, seeing that the saints gathered out of all nations are never designated by this plural form of “nations.” The saints are elected out of nations and in their aggregate form “the peculiar people” or “nation,” to whom the Kingdom is given, while these nations are spoken of as saved in their national capacity, indicative of another dispensation. Taking even the interpretation of our opponents of the city as representing or symbolizing the saints, the nations walking in the light of this city must be people separate and distinct from the city itself. This is, as we have already stated, corroborated by “the healing of these nations,” obtaining access—like the saints before them—to the tree of life restored to this paradisiacal earth, thus obtaining immortality as Adam would have done had he not fallen. (This is indicative that all obtain their immortality by the same process, and that the process of salvation continues.) And, the language is so worded as to imply progressive or successive healing as may be required by the growth of these nations. It is singular how oppositely opinions are expressed; for one (Priest’s View) who spiritualizes the Millennial prophecies and yet acknowledges the first resurrection to be literal (but carefully places the resurrected ones in the third heavens), is forced to admit that these “leaves” are for the healing of the mortal nations then living, and in his application proceeds, beyond even Millenarians, to make out that there is no death in the Mill. age (which is contradicted by Isa. 65:17 seq., etc., and the final removal of death after the thousand years, Rev. 20:13, 14). The fact is, that such passages briefly expressed presuppose a previous acquaintance with the prophecies which proclaim that some will be spared. Turn to Isa. 66, and it is declared that when the Lord comes to plead “by fire and by His sword with all flesh” etc. (v. 15, 16), He will “gather all nations and tongues” (as in Rev. 19; Matt. 25; Joel 3, etc.), and after punishing this gathering it is expressly said that some will escape (v. 19), who shall be sent to distant nations to declare God’s glory to the Gentiles. Then the restoration of the Jewish nation is asserted, and in connection with it this weighty assurance, “for as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain.” Here we have, then, after this terrible coming to Judgment, after this gathering of nations, and after the creation of this new heaven and new earth, the spared Jewish nation and the spared Gentiles. An increase is predicated of the Jewish nation, and the promise belongs to them. as the context shows, in their national capacity. Again: Isa. 24 describes the fearful ordeal through which the earth is to pass before “the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem,” etc., and in v. 6 it is said: “Therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned and few men left” (a remnant is also alluded to in v. 13), showing that some will be spared. This is followed by the reign here on earth, and in

the description of it (next chapter) nations are included. In addition, the song that is to be sung in the land of Judah (ch. 26) corroborates this statement. That some are spared is also seen in Isa. 10:19, 20, 21, when “the consumption decreed shall overflow in righteousness;” in Ezek 36:36, where some of “the heathen are left” when the Jewish nation is restored and the “land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden,” etc.; in Ezek. 39:21, 22, 23 and Ezek. 38:23, when God will, by the overthrow of the last confederation (comp. Rev. 19, etc.), make Himself “known in the eyes of many nations” and “heathen” who have escaped; in Isa. 45:20, when “the escaped of the nations” shall see “Israel saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation,” etc.; in Ps. 69:35, 36, as a result of Christ’s work, “God will save Zion and will build the cities of Judah, that they may dwell there and have it in possession,” etc. The restoration of the Jewish nation, at the very time that God will “raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen” and “will build it as in the days of old” (Amos 9:11–15), is followed by the rebuilding of the waste cities, the perpetual occupation of the land, and the possessing “the remnant of Edom and all the heathen” who shall then be converted. In Rev. 15:4 (comp. Rev. 14), after the gathering out of a select number, i.e. the elect, we are told that the fearful plagues which follow down to the ushering in of the Millennium are not designed to exterminate the race remaining, but to bring them into obedience, “for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; for thy judgments are made manifest” As intimated, it is impossible—taking Isa. 60 to describe one period of time, and noticing the manner of introduction, the events connected therewith, the inexpressible glory that is experienced, etc.—to locate that passage to be fulfilled before the Second Advent, seeing that the condition of nations and of the earth is asserted to be the reverse of all this down to that Coming. In this Scripture we have the restoration of the Jewish nation, other nations, many generations, and increase, specifically mentioned. The same is true of Isa. 61:4–11 and Isa. 62:1–5. In no other way can the longevity of Isa. 65:20–22, taking place in “the new heaven and new earth, be explained; for “as the days of a tree shall be the days of my people,” etc., can only be predicated of such a prolonging of man’s life that it shall be like the duration of a tree—a return to the original condition. While the one who is condemned to premature death manifests not only a rule over subjects in the flesh, but an actual return to the former Theocratic punishment. The same longevity is expressed in Zech. 8:4 with a joyful increase, so that “the streets of the city shall be full (comp. Isa. 44:4, etc.) of boys and girls playing,” etc., and this occurs when “I (the Lord) am returned unto Zion and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem shall be called, A city of truth and the Mountain of the Lord of hosts, The Holy Mountain.” And added to this is a rebuke to those who will not credit it in the words: “If it be marvellous (hard or difficult) in the eyes of the remnant of this people in these days, should it also be marvellous in mine eyes? saith the Lord of hosts.”

Obs. 7. So numerous are the testimonies and allusions, that attention can only be directed to the most important. Zech. 14 presents us a powerful argument in our favor, seeing that not only the Coming of the Lord and of His saints and the establishment of His Kingly authority “over all the earth” is distinctly announced, but that the continuation of the Jewish nation is designated, and then it is asserted (v. 16) that some shall be “left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem” and shall acknowledge (owing to the judgments inflicted) the supremacy of the King, and tender worship unto Him. This corresponds with the increase of Christ’s government (Isa. 9:7), which also follows a “burning and fuel of fire,” and a sitting “upon the throne of David” (thus restored). This agrees with what is recorded in Isa. 59:21 that His Spirit and words shall perpetually abide with the nation, and its “seed” and “seed’s seed,” when “the Redeemer shall come to Zion and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob.” This accords with Ezek. 37:25, when at the time the nation is restored in its undivided form and “my servant David shall be their prince forever,” then the nation shall dwell in the land “wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children and their children’s children forever.” (Comp. Jer. 32:39, 40; Jer. 33:7–14; Joel 2:27–30, etc.) The unity on this point running through Scripture is surprising, and the repeated declarations on the subject seem to be given as if to meet the lack of faith in such predictions. Take Ps. 102, and notice the continuation of nations, not only after the Lord “shall appear in His glory” when “the set time to favor Zion is come,” and “when the people are gathered together, and the Kingdoms to serve the Lord,” but after the heavens and earth are changed “as a vesture,” then “the children of thy servants shall continue and their seed shall be established before Thee.” The connection makes this conclusive. That most expressive Ps. 72 (keeping in view the Pre-Mill. Advent) describes the extended dominion of David’s Son over all the earth, all nations, “throughout all generations” (making them of the city to flourish like grass of the earth), so that the idea of successive generations of men assumes great prominence in the prediction. So also Ps. 45, which describes the fall of the king’s enemies, the King in His majesty with the Queen and the King’s daughters and virgins manifested, significantly adds: “I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations,” etc. (Comp. Ps. 145:13; Isa. 34:17; Ps. 146:10; Isa. 51:8, etc.) Admitting (Obs. 2) that “everlasting” and “forever” are sometimes employed in a limited sense (the actual duration being determined by the nature of the thing to which it is referred), and that when applied to the race of man it includes that period—whatever it may be—in which the race shall produce its successive generations; admitting, too, that the future is made up of succeeding “ages,” and even designated “eternities” (so some critics), yet such is the comprehensiveness of the language employed, the vastness of design aimed at indicated by details and the direct association with the re-established Kingdom of the Messiah, that, only inclined to go as far as “the all generations,” etc., whatever they may be in number—an immense increase must necessarily be denoted by the use of such terms. The “perpetual generations” in the covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:12–16) not only denotes that God will not again, for He will remember “the everlasting covenant,” destroy all flesh upon the earth in His wrath, but that there will be a vast, enormous succession of generations of men. This is corroborated by the covenant made with Abraham (Gen. 13:14, 16; Gen. 17:5–8), which embraces, not only successive generations and a multitude of nations, but so numerous that

they shall be “as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered,” evincing such a host (comp. Jer. 33:22) still to come into existence as shall surpass the ordinary powers of enumeration—a condition very different to that hitherto occupied by the Jewish nation, decimated and downtrodden as it has been. All such promises are bound to the period still future, when (Ps. 89:4, 29, 36, 37, etc.) David’s throne is re-established unto “all generations;” when (Luke 1:32, 33) “the Lord God shall give unto Him (i.e. Jesus, Mary’s Son) the throne of His father David and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever (through the ages),” so that there will be (Eph. 3:21) “to Him glory in the Church by Jesus Christ” (so Barnes, Com. loci, says literally) “unto all generations of the age of ages,” or “unto all the generations of the eternity of eternities, or the eternity of ages.” or (as Bloomfield, loci) “through the succession of all generations unto the latest period of eternity.”*

Obs. 8. It may be appropriate to notice some objections that are urged against this view. The author of *The Kingdom of Grace* (p. 9) gives such a variety of them mingled together that we reproduce them with our answers given parenthetically. He opposes our using (!) the prayer, “Come, Lord Jesus, even so, come quickly,” because we then pray God to end this dispensation (we look for one more glorious): to let no Gospel be preached to sinners (it is successfully proclaimed to Jews and Gentiles and the saints are priests); to multiply no more trophies of victorious grace (we immensely increase these trophies by the salvation of the race); and to finish the number of the elect (true, in order that the vast project of redemption may be carried on through the agency of these same elect). To prove this, he attributes to us what we do not teach, as e.g. that the wicked will be all destroyed, so that there will be none to whom the Gospel shall be preached (the incorrigible will be, while those repentant under God’s judgments will be spared); that as only Christ and glorified saints will be on the earth during that period (which is a mistake), there will be no more death (correct as to saints, and as to those who may afterward be glorified, but not as to one class) nor propagation of the race (after quoting in other places Millenarian authors who directly teach the same). Hence we are guilty of intentionally praying “that the Gospel dispensation may quickly end, and that the number of the elect may be limited and cut off, rather than increased” (which is not our language or idea, for we pray not that the Gospel shall end, but the dispensation, and not that the number of the elect may be limited, but that the number God has determined may be speedily completed; and this, in order that God’s redemptive purposes may be carried out). This, he remarks, is opposed to what Paul says, “I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ” (that is, “the Gospel dispensation”—which certainly is an interpretation of the Gospel that needs no refutation), “for it is the power of God unto salvation” (neither are we ashamed of the Gospel of Christ because it brings us salvation, perfected, in His Kingdom); and concludes by telling us that when we pray for the Saviour to come, we ought to mean and pray for His Coming at death (this is spiritualizing away the Second Advent as “the blessed hope,” and putting in its place a penal characteristic). We have thus allowed the objections of one to appear in their involved manner, and thus briefly answered them, to indicate the nature and practice of a class of books circulated. Others are advanced of a similar character. Thus e.g. a prominent Divine, arguing against the saints and mortal men living in the same “new heaven and new earth,” gravely asserts that “the supposition is self annihilating,” because “the one class with glorified bodies and the other with natural, cannot inhabit the same world;” and then adds: “If this is the Kingdom of heaven, how can the flesh and blood of fallen man inherit it?” The first part needs no refutation, seeing that the matter solely depends upon the teaching of God’s Word, while the latter part is a confounding of those who inherit (i.e. the glorified saints, who actually receive a rulership in the Kingdom) with the subjects of the Kingdom. The objection, so often repeated, that it would be degrading for Christ and the saints to dwell on the same earth where nations in the flesh reside, has been several times noticed and answered, so that it requires (comp. Prop. 203) no additional remarks. Brethren should be careful how they designate that pure Theocratic arrangement—once established—to be manifested in David’s Son and spoken of as one of great glory and power, “a degrading” position, lest they be found to be lowering, treating with disrespect, the Divine ordering and the Kingdom of Jesus. The exaltation, as well as the specific work and design contemplated, is an ample vindication of such a dwelling and reigning on the earth, an earth, too, lifted up from its present condition of suffering and degradation. This, while displaying God’s wonderful condescension, love and mercy, in being willing to act in the capacity of an earthly ruler, at the same time immeasurably exalts the worth of man in the scale of being, and the astonishing greatness to which the race itself will be elevated. But of all the objections, probably the one most confidently advanced by some, is the following, viz., that if such a propagation of the race continues after the Second Advent, the earth will not be able to contain the vast multitude, that there will be “no standing room,” etc. This is simply imitating the spirit of the lord who disbelieved Elisha’s prediction of plenty in Samaria; denying the ability of God to perform what He has promised, or that His wisdom and power is equal to any and every emergency. If the fact is revealed, the manner of its accomplishment may be safely left with the Almighty. Unbelief is not the measure of the fulfilment of Holy Writ. Even if there should be successive generations eternally (which we neither affirm nor deny), reason can suggest ways by which the difficulty could be removed, viz., as supposed by various writers, in successive translations, transference to other worlds, etc. God may have ways utterly unknown to us. In the re-creation, when “I make or create all things new,” the earth itself may be, for aught we know, enlarged to adapt it for the ages to come. Admitting creative agency exerted, we can assign—as the universe indicates in its infinity of phases—no limit, for the physical conditions that we faintly see revealed in other planets and stellar systems may be partly or entirely engrafted upon this earth. Who can tell e.g. that it may not shine forth in that day with rings like Saturn, etc. With the increased fertility of the earth, with God’s ability, if need be, to supply manna, with successive translations, with God’s power to meet necessities that He may cause to arise, with an objection relating to the exceeding distant future—so distant that it does not concern us—concerning which, owing to its remoteness, God has given no detailed information—it is unwise and faithless to reject revelation for mere assumption, and assumption, too, reflecting upon the

Divine attributes. Much that was said respecting the extent of the conflagration (Prop. 150) will also apply here. The simple question to be decided is the one, whether God has thus predicted the multiplication and perpetuation of the race? if this is determined in the affirmative, then all such objections have no weight when placed in the balance against that Word. Instead of suggesting difficulties and impossibilities when God promises an astonishing display of His wonder-working attributes, we are content to receive and believe the promises that Messiah's Kingdom shall yet be set up at His Sec. Coming—a Kingdom adapted to the character and wants of man (to the redeemed, the individual, society, and the nation), in which “every knee shall bow of the heavenlies, of the earthlies, and of the undergrounders” (so Sirr, First. Res., p. 104), “and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father;” in which Jesus, seated upon this judgment seat or throne, shall indeed be “Lord both of the dead and the living;” in which “the Church of the first-born,” the exalted “first-fruits” shall witness a mighty redemptive harvest following in the revolving ages; and in which, Ps. 113, the glorious Hallel shall be sung, reflecting praise, not only upon the Lord on account of His majesty and dominion over all nations, and in exalting the poor and needy to be Princes, but in making “the barren woman to keep house (Marg. read to dwell in a house) and to be a joyful mother of children.”

PROPOSITION 153. This view of the Kingdom with its two classes (viz., the translated and dead saints, glorified, forming one class, and mortal men the other) is forcibly represented in the transfiguration.

The transfiguration, not only in view of its being so notable an occurrence, but of its being a typical or real representation of Christ's Coming in His Kingdom, is worthy of separate and special consideration.*

Obs. 1. Notice its introductory. “About eight days before” (Luke 9:28), Jesus told His disciples what they must do in order that they might be rewarded when the Son of man should come “in the glory of His Father with the holy angels” (Mark 8:38), or, “in the glory of His Father with His angels” (Matt. 16:27), or, “in His own glory, and in His Father's, and of the holy angels” (Luke 9:26). This, undoubtedly, refers to the Second Advent. Now, keeping in view the idea thus advanced, and, mark it, addressed to Jewish hearers who invariably linked the Coming of the Son of man in glory with the prediction of Dan. 7:13, 14 (respecting the glory and Kingdom then manifested), our Saviour proceeds now to give His disciples (with their Jewish interpretation of Daniel uncontradicted) an assurance that He will give some of them a specimen of this Coming in glory. In Matt. 16:28 follows: “Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here (Mark: some of them that stand here; Luke: there be some standing here) which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His Kingdom (Mark: till they have seen the Kingdom of God come with power; Luke: till they see the Kingdom of God).” That this Coming in His Kingdom does not refer to the Church (so Barnes, Storr, etc.), is evident from the connection which the language sustains to His Coming at the Second Advent, the time of judgment and rewarding presented in the context, and from the fact that the Coming is to be witnessed only by “some,” i.e. a few, then present. To interpret this as an invisible Coming at the destruction of Jerusalem (Prof. Bush, Whitby, etc.), making out a fulfilment of Dan. 7, is forced and unnatural, being a violation both of the preceding and succeeding context and the Jewish interpretation of Daniel as held by the disciples and evidenced by their preaching. As Olshausen has well observed (Com. loci) that “the immediate connection of these words (in Matthew) with the foregoing context, in which the Coming in His glory refers so unmistakably to the Parousia, does not admit of this explanation (viz., as describing powerful manifestations of living Christian principle), without reference to the personal return of Jesus.” The translator of Olshausen, Dr. Kendrick, adds the following pertinent note: “I think it can scarcely be doubted that ‘the Coming of the Son of man in His Kingdom’ refers here to the following scene of the transfiguration. The words ‘shall not see death until they see the Son of man,’ refer not to length of life, but to privilege; some shall have the privilege of beholding Him in His glory even before they die. So some ancient commentators. The transfiguration is thus regarded as a type of the Saviour's future glory in His Kingdom.” Schmid (Bib. Theol. of the N. Test., p. 220) explains the passage to refer to “His return as Lord and King of His Kingdom on earth, in the clouds of heaven for judgment.” Lange says that Chrysostom and many others believe this to relate to the transfiguration; and Lange, Meyer, and others think that it has respect to His future manifestation of, or state of, glory. That it unquestionably refers to the transfiguration is conclusive by the use of the phraseology, “the Son of man coming in His Kingdom” (which was only employed, Props. 81, 83, 130, etc., in reference to His personal Coming, etc.), and by the fact that immediately following, a few days after, occurred the transfiguration, which even our opponents admit (as Bloomfield, Com. loci) to be “a figurative representation of Christ's final Advent in glory to judgment.” Avoiding the idea of its being “figurative” (for it was real), the scene enacted in the transfiguration is a representation of the very appearance that the Son of man will assume when He comes in glory at His Second Coming in His Kingdom. That all the disciples lived—did not taste of death—until long after the transfiguration (so Whitby) is no objection to its reference to that scene, because all but three did die without having “the privilege” of seeing it. The indistinct allusion to the three disciples who should witness this Coming of the Son of man—the manner of specifying it without mentioning the names of the parties who should see it—binds this passage in the strongest possible manner to the following transfiguration, because the disciples thus favored were expressly charged to keep it a secret until after Christ's resurrection. Hence, this very Coming to be seen being intended as a strictly private or secret matter, explains the indefinite language of Jesus both in reference to the persons and the time, to avoid the questionings, etc. (Jones, Notes loci), that would assuredly take place,

had He been more specific. This is only another of those indirect, most delicate, but most powerful, attestations to the truthfulness of the Evangelists. And, as Judge Jones has well suggested, owing to this indefiniteness of language (which must have surprised the disciples at the time), we are indebted to the fact that the Evangelists who state it are also careful—to remove all obscurity—to narrate in immediate connection—as the best comment—the promise and consequent fulfilment.

Obs. 2. Another feature as introductory ought to be considered. Just previous to this promise that some should see Him as He would come in His glory, the confession had been made by Peter that Jesus was “The Christ of God” (Luke 9:20); “The Christ” (Mark 9:29); “The Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:16). In these words are contained not only a reference to His Messiahship as the promised King, but (as in Matthew) to the Theocratic (Divine) relationship that this ruler as the Anointed One sustained. (Comp. Prop. 205). It is God again condescending to act as Theocratic ruler in the person of this Jesus. The phraseology denotes the Theocratic Rulership as associated with the restored throne and Kingdom of David. There is no doubt concerning this according to Jewish usage, etc. Having dwelt largely upon this Theocratic ordering in other propositions, it is only necessary to repeat that, identified as this Kingship was with the Jewish nation, the term “Christ” was an equivalent to the phrase “King of the Jews” as seen in the significant superscription of the cross, and in Herod, the Priests, and Scribes making “the King of the Jews” in the question of the wise men identical with that of “Christ.” Notice carefully, that Jesus cautions His disciples to tell no one that He was “The Christ;” that this injunction is given after the death of John, the Baptist, after the representative men of the nation took counsel together to destroy Him, after His rejection by the leaders of the nation and the refusal to repent; that the postponement of the Kingdom had already been determined, as evidenced by Jesus, immediately after this confession, referring to His approaching death—through the Elders, Chief Priests, and Scribes—and resurrection. The mention of His death in connection with His “Christship,” as a matter of course perplexed (as the narrative shows) the disciples. To give an assurance that He was still “The Christ,” although He would “be killed,” He now promises to “some” such an evidence of His being “The Christ,” that they could no more doubt its reality and its ultimate visible fulfilment on earth. If “Christ” only means, as multitudes inform us, that Jesus is “the anointed One to save sinners,” can any one assign a reason—just and proper—why the disciples should be charged to secrecy respecting the title. But denoting as it does that Jesus is the Theocratic King, the appointed One to rule over the Jewish nation both as David’s heir and God’s Son (God thus ruling in and through Him), we see a reason why He should not, at that time, be proclaimed “The Christ,” viz., that this would be in effect announcing Him as “the King of the Jews,” which, in view of His rejection, the postponement of the reign, the contemplated sacrifice, the unnecessary collision, charges, accusations, etc., that would be evolved, it was not prudent or advisable to adopt. Now, although this “Christship” was to be kept a secret for wise purposes, and to avoid the animosity of His enemies and the jealousy of the Roman power, yet Jesus promises to give a favored few such a manifestation of that same “Christship” that it may be effectual in sustaining them, amid the terrible trial that was coming, and in preparing them, and through them, believers, for His removal from the earth. The disciples saw Jesus, but not as “the Coming One” in His Kingdom; they only saw Him in His state of humiliation; but the former is a reality as well as the latter, and the confession of the former having been elicited, Jesus now graciously proceeds to verify the former, so that hereafter, when withdrawn for a time, the apostles may proclaim the glorious truth that He is indeed “The Christ”—“The King of Israel.” This very withdrawal of Jesus, the fact of His death publicly by crucifixion, the unbelief of the Romans and Jews in His resurrection, etc., being thus a protection (although as history informs us, Prop. 73, the application served to arrest the attention of the Roman Emperor) to the preaching of His “Christship”—for then, as now, the vast multitude have no faith in its legitimate meaning (Prop. 184)—as applied to Jesus, and none in its ultimate fulfilment as the title itself imports. The trial of the nation being ended by the death of John the Baptist, and by the conspiracy against the life of Jesus, and now the trial of the Son of man and that of His devoted followers coming on, in this extremity something extraordinary—something out of the usual course of events—is needed to indicate the truth which the approaching death seems to crush, and that need is supplied in the wonderful transfiguration.

Obs. 3. The transfiguration itself is a real occurrence, as the entire narration fully demonstrates. Passing by the mere unfriendly supposition of Strauss that it is a mythical fabrication of the love of the marvellous to eclipse the account of Moses, or, the simple ignoring of it, without explanation, as unworthy of credence (a summary way of disposing of Scripture, which certainly taxes reason), or the attributing it to an “optical allusion,” in which thunder, lightning, mists, and an excited imagination play their allotted parts, let us briefly consider what some have called “The Dream of Peter” (Furness, etc.), or a kind of visionary appearance (Palfrey), a scenic representation which appeared mentally or in some other way to the disciples, but had no real existence—so that Jesus, instead of being really transfigured, only appeared to be so in a dream, or kind of vision. The ablest defender of this view, probably, is Dr. Neander, who (Life of Christ, Sec. 185) admits, however, that it may be “an objective fact,” i.e. a real, outward transaction, but, if so, it took place in view “of some unknown object for it,” of which we must “confess our ignorance” Being thus at a loss—from his Church-Kingdom standpoint—to account for its occurrence, if a real manifestation, he inclines to adopt the theory of its being “a subjective psychological phenomenon,” i.e. that it was only a mental conception, a vivid dream or vision induced by the impressive circumstances in which the disciples were placed, viz., by the prayer of Christ. Thus one of the most sublime exhibitions of Christ is transformed by this eminent man into a dream. He admits the difficulty how, if a vision, a mere mental affair, the three disciples obtained it at the same time and in the same form. Strauss, Renan, and others are more consistent and logical in their rejection of the whole matter as mythical, than Neander and others are in receiving it, and then divesting it of all force and propriety, by

constituting it a kind of dream. If only a dream, why, as Neander queries, should all three at the same time dream it; why then forbid its revelation to others; why present it as a matter of historical fact; why specially assert that they beheld it “when they were awake;” why should they, from an upright position, fall upon their faces with dread, and what need of the Saviour to encourage them; and why introduce Peter as speaking? The style of narration, the particulars given, the design intended—all forbid such a caricaturing or belittling of that sublime representation. Having just shown that the preceding context contemplates that “some” of the disciples then present should “see,” with their own eyes, “the Son of man Coming in His Kingdom,” and finding that “six days after” three of these same disciples did see this transfiguration, which represented Jesus in His glory as “The Christ,” we are fully prepared to find that these witnesses are positive in asserting that it was a real transaction, as e.g. John (Jno. 1:14) “we beheld (Gr., we distinctly saw, so Bloomfield, etc.) His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.” Barnes (Com. loci) says: “There is no doubt that there is reference here to the transfiguration on the holy mount. To this same evidence Peter also appeals, 2 Pet. 1:16–18. John was one of the witnesses of that scene, and hence he says, ‘We beheld His glory.’ ” John thus vindicates the reality of the transaction, and sustains the three Evangelists in their representation of it. Then Peter (2 Pet. 1:16–18) mentions the place, the voice and saying from the Father, and emphatically declares that those who were on “the holy mount” at the time “were eye-witnesses of His Majesty.”*

Obs. 4. The transfiguration, following the announcement that “some” should, before their death, see “the Son of man Coming in His Kingdom,” is a representation of the Kingdom in some of its aspects, viz., in the glory of “the Christ” or King, in the presence of (who also “appeared in glory,” Luke 9:31) the translated and dead saints, and in the witnessing of that glory by mortal men. It was a temporary display, an outward manifestation or revealing of the majesty and glory that belongs to Jesus when He comes at the Second Advent in His Kingdom with His saints to reign over the nations. That this is the correct idea appertaining to this astonishing transaction is evident by regarding Peter’s reference to it. He (2 Pet. 1:16–18) says: “We have not followed cunningly devised fables” (as so many now allege) “when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His Majesty,” etc. Notice that he calls this transfiguration scene, “the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ,” thus identifying it fully with Matt. 16:27, 28. This is unquestionably, then, linking it with the still future Advent as a striking exhibition of the glory that shall be revealed—which is confirmed by Peter introducing this allusion to prove that Christ would thus again come, and by his uniting such a Coming with (ch. 1:11) “the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” and with His Coming, the new heaven and new earth (ch. 3:4, 13) of prophetic promise. (See also the references to this Coming in first Epistle.) Let us survey these several aspects. First and supreme stands forth the transfiguration of Jesus, changed in form, so that “His face did shine as the sun and His raiment was white as the light” (Matthew); “His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them” (Mark); “the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistening (Luke).” Here is the Theocratic King arrayed in light and glory, His face shining with brightness like that of the sun and His garments dazzling in their whiteness. Thus (comp. Rev. 1:13–16, etc.) will the Mighty Christ appear when He comes to re-establish the Theocracy. Next we have “two men” (Luke 9:30), Moses and Elias, who also appeared “in glory.” The Coming of Christ in His Kingdom is usually associated with that of the saints, His brethren, who are co-heirs with Him in the same glory. Hence, to give a representation of His Coming—His appearance when Coming—in His Kingdom it was eminently suitable to have—to fill out the picture—the saints, glorified, also represented. This is done; and in view of the fact that at His Second Advent these are made up of two parties, viz., the dead saints and the living saints translated, these two, Moses and Elias, are purposely chosen as a correct exhibition of the two parties—forming one class—who shall then appear “in glory” with Christ. Moses represents the body of saints who have died, but who will also be glorified with Christ; and as he was in converse with the glorified Saviour, so will they also be in nearness to Him. Moses and Elias both appearing “in glory,” seems to indicate the same glorification of body. Elias represents another body, who, like himself, shall not fall “asleep,” but shall be translated without experiencing the power of death. These two, the dead and the living, who shall be glorified at the Coming of Jesus, are graphically portrayed in 1 Cor. 15:51, 52, and 1 Thess. 4:15–17. These not only see His glory, but partake of the same, 1 Jno. 3:2; Phil. 3:21, etc., for of them it is said: “When Christ” (notice, as “Christ”), “who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory, Col. 3:4. But in addition to these, we have, to meet the prophetic announcements and to fill out the representation, three persons, Peter, James, and John, unglorified, mortal men living on the earth, who see this glorified Christ and His glorified associates, and are so deeply impressed, so delighted with the exceeding glory revealed, that through the spokesman Peter, the emphatic declaration is made: “Lord, it is good for us to be here.” Thus, if willing to receive it, will it be at the Second Advent, when Christ, “The Christ,” comes in His glory and with His brethren gathered and glorified, then shall the spared Jewish nation and Gentiles, as prediction after prediction in glorious language portrays, rejoice and exult in the marvellous glory that shall be manifested. Jesus personally appears in His Kingly aspect; the saints personally are present in their glory; the disciples personally behold and admire the astonishing splendor and “majesty” of the scene. Jesus is here, “the Coming One” (a phrase well understood by the Jews), as He will exhibit Himself “in His own Kingdom;” the saints form “the first-fruits,” who, as the predicted “kings and priests,” reign with Christ in His Kingdom; and the mortal men are the servants or subjects (as even the tender of the three tents indicates) who gladly receive this glory, and are willing to abide under its radiance. The conversation respecting the approaching death at Jerusalem indicates that this was a temporary assumption of glory, in order to be, if we may so express it, a counterpoise to that which virtually—to the Jews—seemed to end the fondly anticipated Christship of Jesus, giving a most direct proof that the covenant and prophets would yet be fulfilled. The voice of the Father, lovingly acknowledging (having

previously in answer to prayer brought about this supernatural change in David's Son) the Christship of Jesus and the power thus committed unto Him, binds the whole together into an earnest, actual reception of glory, which, thus represented, shall characterize David's Son and Lord when He comes to restore the fallen throne and Kingdom, and reigns indeed and in truth the manifested Christ. The presence of the Father and some kind of avowal, or, confession, or acquiescence is requisite to meet the requirements of prediction (comp. Prop. 83) concerning the Coming of the Messiah in His Kingdom (as e.g. Dan. 7; Ps. 2, etc.), and thus perfect the representation of the real Theocratic position of Jesus. Surely, when considering how many particulars this transfiguration meets, how it demonstrates in the most forcible manner "The Christ;" how it supplies additional evidence of the ultimate manner of procedure in the Redemptive scheme, it is folly to ascribe all this, compressed into a few brief sentences, to the natural descriptive powers of "uneducated and ignorant" men, or to make it out a trivial, unimportant affair not worthy of our special attention. Viewed, as we have done, in the light of the great, leading doctrine of the Kingdom, it stands forth, pre-eminently, as a Divine confirmation of the Theocratic Kingship of Jesus, of the glory of His saints, and of the happiness of the nations who shall witness it—a fact so striking and corroborative of the ultimate Redemption of saints and of the race, that Peter seizes upon it as a grand proof that Jesus shall come unto so great Salvation.

Obs. 5. In this connection it may be well to consider the disputed passage, Matt. 10:23: "Ye shall not have gone over (marg. end or finish) the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Under the influence of the Church-Kingdom theory, this Scripture has received the most varied interpretations. Barnes (Com. loci) gives the most prevailing, when he makes the Coming of the Son of man to mean "the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the Jewish economy." This is contradicted by the fact, well expressed by Olshausen (Com. loci), that the Coming of "the Son of man" "has a definite doctrinal signification—it always refers to the (Parousia) Second Coming." The phrase, so expressive of His humanity, indicates a visible, personal Coming, which was not exhibited at the destruction of Jerusalem. Beside this, all excepting John were deceased before the city was overthrown. This direct reference to a personal Coming is also opposed to the conjectures that it denotes the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (which was the sending of the Comforter by Christ) or to Christ's presence in the Church (which is never designated as the Coming of the Son of man). Others, seeing that the phraseology involves a personal presence, suppose that (as Lightfoot) His resurrection is denoted; but this is always spoken of as a rising from the dead, not as a distinctive Coming of the Son of man. Others make it to mean: "You will not need to hasten through all the towns of Judea, in the persecution which you are to meet with; I will be with you again ere that," but, as Olshausen remarks, this is against fact, for "Jesus does not come to them, but they come back (Luke 9:10) to Jesus; besides, it is a harsh interpretation not suitable to the spirit of the language." Olshausen's own view is, that there is a blending of the subsequent mission of the disciples with the present one, reaching down through their successors to the Second Advent. This interpretation is ably advocated by Sirr (First Res., pp. 61, 62), who paraphrases, "Ye shall not finish the reformation of the cities of Israel, ye shall not perfect these cities, till the Son of man be come." But this is evidently seeking after a meaning, and making up one to suit the case, for the language appears to be specifically addressed to the disciples, is at variance with the expressed itinerary of the disciples through the cities of the Jews (which was the work then actually in progress), and is not applicable, owing to the contemplated downfall of those cities. There are only two interpretations which reconcile, fully, this passage with the Peculiar phraseology contained in it, and, especially, without doing violence to the implied personal Coming. The first is that of Newton, Wilson, etc., viz., that the Son of man alludes to His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, which occurred subsequently (Matt. 21:1–11). This is represented as a typical Coming of the Son of Man, being (v. 5) a fulfilling of the prophet, "Behold, thy King cometh unto thee," etc., and was so regarded (v. 9) by the multitudes. This took place before the disciples had made the tour of the cities, and meets the conditions of the passage. The second is that the transfiguration, which also occurred after this saying, is in all respects a fulfilment of the passage—the Coming of the Son of man in His personal appearance being accurately represented by the transaction as we have just delineated. This Scripture, therefore, which has been so persistently used in advocacy of the Church-Kingdom theory, etc., is susceptible of a far more consistent and scriptural explanation from our standpoint than from that of our opponents.

Obs. 6. Before concluding, it is well to contemplate an additional circumstance, which conclusively shows that the transfiguration was both a reality and a representation of the future Advent. The veritable appearance of Elias at the transfiguration suggested the question of the disciples (Matt. 17:10), "Why, then, say the Scribes, that Elias must first come?" Jesus had just proven Himself to be "The Christ;" Elias had been seen with Him, and Peter had, in view of the offer he made to erect a tent for him, hoped that he would remain and fulfil what Malachi (4:5, 6) had predicted of him. But Elias disappeared, for "when they lifted up their eyes, they saw no man, save Jesus only," and this removal prompted the question. All this sustains the real occurrence of the wonderful prefigurement of the Second Advent. Notice, however, not only what suggested the question but the reply of the Saviour. The Scribes held (comp. Justin's Dial. with Trypho., ch. 8) that Elias would be a forerunner of the Messiah when He came to re-establish the Kingdom; the disciples saw him, not as forerunner, but coming after Jesus came, and then instead of remaining he departed from them. They wish to know whether the Scribes were not in the wrong concerning this opinion. The answer is given that the Scribes taught correctly, for "Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly cometh first" (as the Scribes say), "and" (when he shall come) "he will restore all things." That is, the appearance of Elias in the transfiguration and his departure does not make that doctrine of the Scribes nugatory. Then follows the allusion to John the Baptist: "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already and they knew him not, but have done

unto him whatsoever they listed." The intent of this is sufficiently plain from Luke 1:16, 17, viz., that "he (John) shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias;" that is, he should be a forerunner of the Messiah like unto Elias who is also predicted to be such. But a deep reason underlies this likening of John to Elias. Let the reader turn back to the propositions pertaining to the preaching of the Kingdom, and he will find abundant proof showing that John actually tendered the Kingdom on condition of repentance to the Jewish nation. He thus came as Elias will come, having the same spirit and power, and, if the nation had received him, would have accomplished what Elias is to perform. The more modern notion that John was in all respects the Elias predicted in Mal. 4:5, and that no other need to be expected from the language of the Saviour here, was unknown to the early (Brookes, *El. of Proph. Interp.*, p. 90, says "down to Jerome"), Church. One of the earliest Commentators, the martyr Victorinus (*On the Apoc.*), asserts that Elias will yet come in the future, quoting Mal. as follows: "Lo, I will send to you Elias the Tishbite, to turn the hearts of the Fathers to the children, according to the time of calling, to recall the Jews to the faith of the people that succeed them." Tertullian (*On the Res.*, ch. 22), Commodianus (*Instruct.*, Sec. 41) and others, make Elias still future, an idea being developed that he would be a contemporary of the Antichrist at the last times. So deeply rooted was this opinion, derived from the primitive Church, that even Augustine (*City of God*, B. 20, ch. 28) advocates the personal Coming of Elias and the conversion of the Jews before the Advent of Christ to judgment. Modern commentators have revived and defended this early view, as e.g. Olshausen, Judge Jones (*Notes*), Ryle, Hitzig, Maurer, Ewald, Alford, Steir, Fausset, Mal. 4:5, 6. It not being our purpose to discuss this point, but only to indicate its relationship to the Second Advent, a brief mention of the reasons why John the Baptist is not to supersede, or make unnecessary, the still future Coming of the Prophet Elias, must suffice. (1) John, an inspired man, directly affirms, in answer to the priests and Levites (Jno. 1:21), that he was not Elijah, which he could not have done, if he was the one predicted by Malachi 4:5. (2) John was a harbinger of the Kingdom (i.e., he tendered it, and in this sense is Elias), but the Jews rejected the offer of the Kingdom, and he did not "restore all things" as Elijah the prophet, more successful, will do. (3) John did not come "before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," which in Malachi is associated with that terrible period when the wicked shall be burned up as stubble, etc., a day which, awful as it is to the ungodly, is designed (not, as some assert to make out a case, for the destruction, but) for the deliverance of Jerusalem, as is seen by Joel 2:31 seq.—and which is linked with the Second Advent. (4) That John is only Elias in a certain sense is apparent from the indefinite language of Matt. 11:14. "All the prophets and the law prophesied until John, and if ye will receive (it), this is Elias which was for to come." On this verse Olshausen observes that the clause "if ye will receive (it)" with a comparison of all the passages "clearly shows that the Redeemer called him so (Elias) only in a certain sense, viz., because he wrought in the spirit and power of Elijah, as Scripture says, Luke 1:17." (5) John coming in the spirit of Elias is rejected, and thus is not the Elias, because Jesus Himself, of whom he is the forerunner, is also rejected by the nation, while the forerunner of the manifested "Christ" is successful with the nation; the mission of both John and Elias being to the same nation. (6) Those passages must not be interpreted according to the Jewish standpoint then entertained, viz., that there was but "one captivity under Babylon, but one return from Babylon, one Advent of Elias, one Advent of the Messiah and that His Advent of glory and power in His Kingdom. Whereas, in fact, two oppressing Babylons were foretold, and two returns from captivity, two Advents of Elias, and two Advents of Messiah, and yet but one Kingdom." (Jones's *Notes on Scripture*, foot-note, p. 179.) The rejection of the Kingdom and its postponement serves to explain the apparent difficulties and adds most forcibly to the inspiration of the Word, evincing a preservation of unity in the most delicate of Divine purposes. Such a remarkable preservation of agreement, indicative both of God's willingness to make John the Elias, if the nation had repented under his preaching, and of God's foreknowing that John would be rejected and that another Elias was therefore appointed to come, is beyond the ability of "mere fishermen" to concoct, bearing as they do a relationship to the deepest purposes of God. The two Advents, the one in humiliation and the other in glory (the latter transiently represented in the transfiguration), forms the key for apprehending these extraordinary statements—preserves consistency in prophet, John, and Jesus—satisfactorily answers the question of the disciples, and directs us in accepting of the transfiguration as a reality, pointing onward to the glory to be revealed at the Second Advent, for which glory the Jewish nation shall have Elias sent to them on a special and successful mission.

Obs. 7. This distinction existing in the coming Kingdom (as intimated e.g. under Props. 86, 114, 118, 124, 130, etc.) and evidenced, in the King, the glorified saints, the converted and believing Jews, and the accepted Gentiles, is even presented to us in the tabernacle and temple. While it is true (so Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 411) that the typical interpretation of the tabernacle can easily become absurd when pressed (as in the case of parables) to every minute particular, yet it is also true, as the Apostle declares (Heb. 8:5), that the tabernacle was made according to a pattern furnished, and that there is deep significance in it, being "a shadow of good things to come" (Heb. 10:1). Now, aside from the ceremonial and sacrificial aspects, the reader is reminded that the Tabernacle was Theocratically associated, and therefore relates to the Theocratic ordering. It was (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 96) "partly to be a palace of His Presence (God's) as King of Israel, Ex. 40:34, 35." As "the tent of assembling," "the habitation" of the King, etc., it foreshadows the future, especially in its three grand divisions: (1) the habitation proper consisting of the sanctuary and the holy of holies or holiest of all (the partition between which is abrogated for the priesthood in the Christ); (2) the outer court for the Jewish nation to assemble; (3) the external space for Gentiles. If at all typical of the future Theocratic ordering, it certainly refers to the threefold nearness to the King as exemplified in the glorified kings and priests who are associated with Him, in the Jewish nation which is His special inheritance, and in the Gentiles who joyfully acknowledge this Theocratic supremacy.*

This subject, necessarily alluded to in many places, is worthy of separate consideration. It is foreshadowed in the ancient Theocracy; for, while the supreme legislative power was vested in God, other rulers or judges (see e.g. Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 42) were appointed under His direction, by whom the laws were administered, etc. Let the Davidic Kingdom be restored as predicted, and, in the very nature of the case, to verify the promises, the Theocratic king will also have His associated rulers assuring the most perfect administration of the laws, and securing the most perfect government, productive of peace, prosperity, and happiness, such as the world has never yet witnessed. The Word emphatically teaches that those thus chosen, accounted worthy of this rulership, are the saints. They are "joint heirs" (Rom. 8:17) with the Christ, who graciously divides, without marring His own superiority and supremacy (but rather exalts it thereby), His own inheritance with them. What Jesus, the Christ, inherits, has been abundantly shown, viz., this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, in which His exalted Rulership is to be manifested. Hence, to inherit with the Christ, has a most deep and precious significance, indicative of joint rulership with Him in His coming Kingdom. To be inheritors with Christ in His Kingdom evinces the astonishing wisdom of God in the Plan of Redemption, that without doing violence either to His moral government or to the free agency of fallen man, He raises up and purifies a material which, when the time comes, is employed in perpetuating the purity, holiness, etc., of a Divine-Human government again restored with untold grandeur to a needy, groaning world.*

Obs. 1. Before assigning the Scripture bearing on the subject, let us caution the reader, whatever his views may be relating to it, not to disparage our doctrine concerning it, lest peradventure he be found detracting from the honor promised to the righteous. We have been deeply pained to find, even among eminent men, such language held respecting this doctrine of the joint rulership of the saints with Jesus Christ on earth, that is simply presumptuous, designating it as "degrading," etc., and as far less honorable and desirable than the indefinite, unexplained reign assigned by themselves, and which they suppose God will bestow in some spiritual Kingdom in heaven or in the universe. This reigning, whatever it is, is the Lord's appointment and not ours; and hence to ascertain its true meaning, that which God has said concerning it ought to be diligently compared. And when the plain grammatical meaning undoubtedly teaches just such a reign as we advocate, it ill becomes the believer in the Word, even if he rejects the teaching, to speak or write disrespectfully of it. Surely the position in which we place the saints (reigning jointly with Christ), and the design of such a reign (the delivering of the world from all the results of sin, and filling it with blessing and glory), should protect our doctrine from extreme charges, which tend to materially lessen the promises of God, and virtually to reject—as unworthy of credence—the honor of the Messianic Kingdom. Taking for our guidance the principle of interpretation thus far adopted, we firmly hold that God's promises are to be fulfilled just as they read; that He means what He says through the Spirit, and intends to fulfil it; and that such meaning is ascertained, not by engrafting another upon it, but, by that which the words in their plain grammatical connection indicate. Taking such a position, it follows, of necessity, that a veritable kingship or rulership must be received. How else can we explain the phrases to "reign with Him," "to sit on His throne," "to be ruler over His goods," "ruler over many things" "to have power over and rule nations," to be "crowned," to be "Kings" and "Judges" and "Princes," "to inherit and possess a Kingdom," etc. If these do not denote a real, substantial elevation to rulership, great exalted honor and authority in the Coming Kingdom, then language itself has no precise, adequate meaning. This the words plainly denote, and, however much we may feel that such a position is far above our deserts, the astonishing grace of God will bestow it. Grace adopts us as sons, and as such we become "heirs of God," and consequently "joint heirs with Christ," and then, as an ancient writer (Sel. from the Prop. Scriptures, Anti-Nicene Lib., sec. 44) expressed it, "all the faithful are called kings, brought to royalty through inheritance." In the Frag. of Cassiodorus (Anti-Nicene Lib.), com. on First Epis. of Peter, ch. 2:9, we have, in accord with this idea: "That we are a chosen race by the election of God is abundantly clear. He says royal, because we are called to sovereignty, and belong to Christ," etc. The faith of the primitive Church in an actual reign of the saints, derived from the grammatical sense of the Word, is so well known, that it needs no special illustration.

Obs. 2. Let us notice next, when this reigning is to take place. It is remarkable that we are indebted to the Origenistic opposition to Millenarianism for the introduction of the theory that saints are now reigning in the Church—driven to it in the effort to spiritualize away Rev. 20:4. Augustine has been already quoted (Prop. 90, Obs. 2, and see in same Obs., by way of contrast, Barnabas) as one of the advocates of the view. This is an opinion indorsed by many, and in the past has led even to many a deed of violence and blood. For, it is a fact well attested by history, that, under the notion that the church is the Kingdom of God, the Romish and other churches, as well as sectaries and heretics, have claimed that believers, the saints, are now authorized to reign, bear rule, lay down laws, execute them, punish, etc. Instead of endeavoring to refute this interpretation of most precious promises relating to the future and not, as alleged, to the present, let Augustine himself perform this work, when for the time he overlooks his own theory of reigning, as follows (*City of God*, B. 20, S. 17): "Who is so absurd and blinded by contentious opinionativeness, as to be audacious enough to affirm that in the midst of the calamities of this mortal state, God's people, or even one single saint, does live, or has ever lived, or shall ever live, without tears or pain—the fact being that the holier a man is, and the fuller of holy desire, so much more abundant is the tearfulness of his supplication," etc., quoting as proof a number of Scriptures. In another place, he refers to the saints as "pilgrims," "bearing burdens," some "feeble minded," others "weak," some "tempted," others "overtaken by a fault," all

“needing grace” and “assistance,” being “healed while still they sojourn in this earth.” etc. Now, the condition of the saints, as represented by himself, is utterly opposed to the notion of their reigning as promised; and it is a fact that no true believer has ever yet expressed himself as conscious of thus reigning as predicted. Having shown the inconsistency of such a notion previously (Prop. 90, etc.), it is unnecessary to dwell upon it. The time when this reigning is to take place is specifically mentioned. Being “joint heirs with Christ,” they “inherit the Kingdom” “at His appearing and Kingdom.” Consequently, it occurs at the Second Advent, and after the first resurrection. As all these points have been made clear in previous propositions, it is only necessary to add that the early Church invariably linked the reigning with the resurrection of the saints, as e.g. Polycarp (Epts., ch. 5): “He has promised to us that He will raise us again from the dead, and that if we live worthily of Him ‘we shall also reign together with Him,’ provided only that we believe.” This is so plain that it is expressly asserted that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.” To inherit a Kingdom, if it has any propriety of meaning, undoubtedly denotes the reception of kingly authority or rulership in the Kingdom—for thus it is also explained by parallel passages which follow. But this Kingdom—this rulership with Jesus—cannot be inherited by mortal men, it requiring immortal beings who resemble the mighty Theocratic King; for the heirship with Jesus, the Identity of associated rule, the unspeakable honor, etc., which can only safely be confided to persons previously prepared for it; the duration, the perfection, design, and results of the reign—all demand this previous resurrection and glorification.

Obs. 3. The place where this reign is to be manifested is expressly stated: “We shall reign on (or as Stuart, over) the earth.” In the very nature of the case, if they inherit with David’s Son, the restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, it must be a reign here on and over the earth. It is after the Coming of the Son of man, after the rise and progress of the fourth beast, the ten horns and the little horns, and at the destruction of these Gentile and Antichristian powers (Dan. 7:22) that “the time came that the saints possessed the Kingdom,” and that “the Kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.” It is taking an unwarranted liberty with covenant, prophecy, and promise to locate this Kingdom and reign in any other place than this earth; and yet multitudes venture to assume it, believing themselves, under a spiritual interpretation, not only justified, but that they are actually exalting the Word by so doing. Many who advocate a kind of reign here on the earth in this dispensation, also affirm that the ample, complete fulfilment is only realized in the third heaven, not seeing that the reigning is united with the Second Advent, the resurrection of the saints, the setting up of Christ’s Kingdom, the renewal of the earth, etc.; and that such a supposed reign is utterly antagonistic to the description given to us of the saints during this intermediate period, viz., a time of waiting, etc., until the blessed moment comes of inheriting, of being crowned, etc., at the Advent. The locality of reigning is so unmistakably indicated by the Kingdom that Christ reigns over (with whom they inherit), by the Pre-Millennial Advent and resurrection, by various propositions presented, that a mere mention of the fact is sufficient under this heading.²

Obs. 4. As preliminary to the reigning, if it is to take place at the time and in the place designated, we ought to expect a definite statement of the saints coming at the time, and to the locality specified. This is plainly given, as e.g. in Zech. 14, at the personal Pre-Millennial Advent, “the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with Thee.” (Comp. Joel 3:11; Matt. 24:30, 31; 2 Thess. 2:1; 1 Thess. 4:16, 17, etc.). It is significant and in perfect harmony with the requirements of our doctrine, that in the delineation of the last events which precede the ushering in of the Millennial era, the harvest of the saints is gathered before the fearful vintage (Rev. 14:14–16); and when the “King of kings” comes (Rev. 19:11–16) “the armies” (i.e. the redeemed, so Barnes, etc.) accompany Him. A mere statement of the accurate presentation of details requisite to complete the account of the commencement of this reign is all that is necessary.*

Obs. 5. In giving the proofs verifying such a reign of the saints, so abundant is the precious material that we find a difficulty in properly arranging it. Let the following order suffice. 1. This rulership of the saints is contained and promised in the covenant made with Abraham. Thus in Gen. 17:6 and 35:11 the promise is that “kings shall come out of thee.” If this promise is limited to the few past literal kings of the Jewish nation, well may the contrast offered by infidels be considered, viz., that a promise coming from the Almighty God, which on the face of it indicated great kingly authority and was only fulfilled in kings who in power and dominion were far inferior to the great monarchies surrounding them, is scarcely a promise commensurate with the greatness and majesty of God. Admitting that the sinfulness of the Jewish nation dwarfed this promise in the past, yet God’s covenanted promises, to which His oath is attached, are not to be defeated by the perversity and sinfulness of man. For this would at once argue weakness and imperfection in the Supreme Being, viz., that foreseeing the failure of the proportions due to such a promise coming from Him, He should affirm it by oath. The Apostle Paul had no idea of such a failure, for from this very promise in the covenant he declares “that the promise to Abraham was, that he should be heir of the world” (Rom. 4:13). The inheriting of the earth by the meek, and the inheriting of the Kingdom, are equivalent phrases designating the same destiny, rank, and power. This company of kings are to proceed from Abraham, in virtue of his being thus chosen, and hence results the imperative necessity, as has been already demonstrated, of our being grafted in, adopted, and reckoned the children of Abraham, that we, as Gentiles, but now recognized as belonging to the elect nation, may inherit with him, or become kings and priests. This promise is repeated in another form (Exodus 19:6) and amplified by Peter (1 Peter 2:5, 9) as still future, God being engaged in the process of gathering out the people who shall appear as this Kingdom of royal priests, fulfilling the Divine purpose (Isa. 43:21): “this people have I formed for Myself; they shall show forth My praise.” 2. It is in view of this Divine purpose of raising up a Kingdom of kings and priests (i.e. a Kingdom unexampled

in its manifestations of regal splendor and glory), that the most positive declarations are made. Thus in Rev. 5:10, speaking of the redeemed, it is added: "And hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." That this embraces actual, real rulership is so apparent that even those most inclined to spiritualize admit it, as e.g. Barnes (Com. loci.), who at least says that "the redeemed will be so much in the ascendancy that the affairs of the nations will be in their hands," a state of affairs that will not, according to Scripture, be found down to the Second Advent. In Rev. 3:21. it is stated: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame and am set down in My Father's throne." This emphatically teaches that the saints share or participate in the rule of the Messiah, for in no other way, without violence, can the words be applied. Matt. 24:46, 47, has "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when He cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that He shall make him ruler over all his goods." (Compare the being "faithful over a few things" and becoming "ruler over many things," Matt. 25:21, the "authority over ten cities," etc., Luke 19:17, and "if we suffer with Christ, we shall also reign with Him," 2 Tim. 2:12). Such language is based on the idea that the reward bestowed upon faithfulness is an elevation to a position of superiority evidenced by the exercise of authority and rule. Such are (Rev. 1:6) "made kings and priests unto God," raised (so Barnes loci), to "exalted rank and dignity," or (as Prof. Stuart, Apoc. loci) "constituted a kingly order, the members of which are all like priests, i.e. holy and consecrated to the service of God and in the possession of elevated dignity." If we take the rendering offered by Bengel (Gnomon) and Stuart of the last named passage, viz., that "the whole body of these priests form a Kingdom," and read it "made us a Kingdom," it increases, if possible, the force of the expression, seeing that the Kingdom is represented as contained, centred in royalty itself, as e.g. Dan. 2:38. 3. Saints are "the heirs of a Kingdom," James 2:5, which they inherit at the Second Coming of Jesus when He is revealed as King, "in His glory," and "shall sit upon the throne of His glory," Matt. 25:34. Reference is again made to this in order that the reader may consider that "heirship of a Kingdom," and "the inheriting of a Kingdom" embraces much more than a mere admittance into and enjoyment of the blessings of a Kingdom. It evinces the coming into such actual possession of a Kingdom as is alone met by the idea of a participancy in government and of regal authority. Thus the language is understood when used among men; and the Spirit never would give a promise which, expressed in a definite usual form, denotes this, and yet mean that we should regard it as exaggerated, and therefore we should soften the implied dignity down into what might suit our humility or fancy. 4. A class of passages which describe the actions of the saints associated with Christ, can only be received as indicative of an actual acquired rulership. When Jesus the Mighty King comes He is represented as commencing His rule by terribly overthrowing His enemies (Prop. 115); now the saints come with Him (Obs. 4), and they too are exhibited as engaged in and performing the same kingly acts. Thus Rev. 2:26: "And he that overcometh and Keepeth My words unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken in shivers, even as I received from My Father." Our opponents on this passage make all the concessions that our argument demands, for they concede (as Barnes, Com. loci), that it means that the saints "would partake of the final triumph and glory of the Saviour, and be associated with Him," and in reference to the time of fulfilment: "All that is said here would be applicable to that time when the Son of God will come to judge the world, and when His saints will be associated with Him in His triumphs." It is true that Barnes, and others, endeavor to shift this passage to a rewarding in the third heaven, but the futility of it is evident from its describing a scene and events taking place upon the earth. So also the Psalmist (Ps. 149:5-9) makes "the saints joyful in glory" at the appearance of "their king" and declares: "Let the high praises of God be in their mouth and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written:—this honor have all His saints. Praise ye the Lord." Jude (14, 15) likewise invites the King and the saints in their Coming "to execute judgment upon all," etc. Thus the Spirit, in attributing to the saints the same irresistible authoritative action which belongs to Jesus Christ in His regal character and manifestation, certainly teaches that they obtain associated rulership, glimpses of which even seem to flash out of the song of Deborah and Barak (Judges 5:13, 31). 5. Jesus Himself is styled (Rev. 1:5) "The Prince of the Kings of the earth," i.e. as Commentators inform us, "the first in rank." So also in Rev. 17:14 and 19:16, He is called "The Lord of lords and the King of kings." The phraseology implies a recognition of this precedence. But if applied, as usual, to earthly monarchs in this and former dispensations, it loses some of its force by the fact that the claim here set up has not been acknowledged, for wickedness and rebellion have characterized most of such kings. The language is expressive that those kings over whom He is the Prince, the Leader, etc., receive Him as such. This therefore can only be referred to the saints who are mentioned in immediate connection with those passages, and in one expressly denominated "kings," in another designated His "armies," and in the third "the called and chosen and faithful." Admit the elevation of the saints to the dignity of kingship, Christ being the Mighty Leader and King, and we at once recognize the beauty, force, and sublimity of the claim, and how joyfully this will be acknowledged by the kings themselves. For then the title really assumes its intended dignitary form, seeing that a body of exalted kings and lords are associated with and under Him in His Theocratic government. This is strikingly corroborated in Heb. 1:9, where, after the direct reference to the throne and sceptre of the Son, it is added: "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows"—that is, above the kings who are nearly related to Him. Barnes (Com. loci) comments: "Above thine associates; that is, above all who sustain the kingly office," and after correctly opposing Doddridge's supposition that these fellows were "angels," adds: "The more natural construction is, to suppose that it refers to kings, and to mean that He was the most exalted of all." These "fellows" are evidently "the co heirs with Christ," He being the chief inheritor, the Sovereign among them. The title given to the Messiah by Micah 5:2 (see Horne's Introd., vol. 2, p. 271) is indicative of His being the supreme commander as distinguished from subordinates. The Psalmist expresses his hope (Ps. 94:10) of renewed rulership at the very time that the enemies of the Lord shall perish in being then "anointed with fresh oil"—

phraseology equivalent to kingship. And when the kings thus associated with the Mighty One “hear His words” and exercise their rule, it will be fulfilled that (Ps. 138:4) “all the kings of the earth shall praise Thee, O Lord (which is not done down to the Advent, but must be after, as seen Rev. 19).” 6. It is in view of this promised rulership that so much is said concerning the exalting of “the horns” of the righteous. The “horn” was extensively used as emblematic of regal power, rule, or dominion, as e.g. Jer. 48:25; Dan. 8:5. 6, 20–22, etc. It is an apt speaking symbol of power and authority. Now it is repeatedly declared that the time is coming when (Ps. 75:10) “all the horns of the wicked also will I cut off, but the horns of the righteous shall be exalted.” Hence the promise to the righteous one is: “his horn shall be exalted with honor;” and let the reader ponder the words that follow (because the saints when they receive this honor come with King Jesus “to execute the vengeance written”), “the wicked shall see it and be grieved; he shall gnash with his teeth and melt away; the desire of the wicked shall perish.” Therefore it is that in Ps. 89, where the most positive assurance is given that the Davidic covenant, long delayed, shall be fulfilled in David’s Son restoring the throne and Kingdom, it is appropriately added: “in thy favor our horn shall be exalted.” 7. Another class of passages, in strict accord with this idea of acquired authority, tell us that the saints are to be crowned, as in 1 Cor. 9:25; James 1:12; Rev. 2:10, etc. The time of bestowing this crown coincides with the time previously stated, as e.g. 1 Pet. 5:4, “When the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” So Paul also expected (2 Tim. 4:8), the crown to be given only to himself and others at the “appearing” of the Lord Jesus. The emblematic “crowns of gold” of the Elders (Rev. 4:4) are indicative of their sustaining a kingly office. 8. Hence, we are prepared to find the saints even called “princes,” etc., because of such received honor. This has been seen already in the title of “kings and priests,” but in addition to these other expressive names are bestowed. In the 113th Psalm at the time the Barren Woman (Prop. 118) becomes the “joyful mother of children,” God “raiseth up the poor out of the dust and lifteth the needy out of the dunghill, that He may set him with Princes, even with the Princes of His people.” In the 47th Ps., when “the Lord most High” is the “great King over all the earth,” and “He shall subdue the people under us and nations under our feet,” then “the Princes of the people are gathered together, even the people of the God of Abraham: for the Shields (Sep. strong ones; Horseley, protectors; Vulg. strong gods; meaning, so Clarke, kings or rulers), of the earth belong unto God: He is greatly exalted.” Even Ps. 110:3 is supposed by some (as Dr. Clarke, Com. loci) to bear the rendering: “Thy princely people in the day of thy power,” etc. (with which may be compared Justin Martyr’s: “With Thee shall be, in the day, the chief of Thy power, in the beauties of the saints,” etc.). And various commentators, instead of applying Isa. 32:1 to Hezekiah, interpret it (correctly), as referring to the Messiah: “Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness and princes (some read, as to princes) shall rule in judgment.” 9. The more indirect allusions growing out of the purpose intended are numerous. Saints are to occupy the same place, i.e. “the heavenlies” (see Prop. 107, Obs. 3), now usurped by Satan. Recalling how the future, anticipated by hope and most firmly grasped by faith, is spoken of as present, “the heavenlies in Christ” (Eph. 1:3 and 2:7, comp. with Eph. 3:10 and 6:12) will be fully realized in this rulership. In Ps. 72:3 in the description of the Messianic reign, “the mountains shall bring peace to the people, and the little hills, by righteousness,” which some commentators (as e.g. Clarke, Com. loci) explain to denote that princes and inferior governors or rulers bring peace. Anciently kings or rulers were called shepherds, and this is referred to in Isa. 23:4 in connection with the reign of the Messiah. In Isa. 60:17 that God “will make thy officers (“who should be appointed to rule,” so Barnes, who follows Sep., which gives “Rulers”) peace and thine exactors (magistrates, so Barnes, etc.), righteousness.” Reference may be made to this feature in Jer. 33:26, and in Ps. 94:15, as some render it (as e.g. Clarke Com. loci): “Until the Just One shall sit in judgment, and after Him all the upright in heart.” Receiving what writers on the figurative language of the Bible inform us, that “a star” denotes a ruler, this idea attached to various promises, as e.g. Dan. 12:3, would increase the comprehensiveness of the same. The most delicate allusions are but too frequently overlooked, owing to our keeping this reign of the saints too much in the background. Thus, e.g. in Prov. 8:14–16, after showing that “sound wisdom” gives “strength,” it is added, “By Me (i.e. in possessing Me) kings reign and princes decree justice. By Me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth.” This can be only true of the saints, for as the history of the world shows, comparatively few such pious kings have existed; but the passage receives due force if we admit that the time is coming when all who have “sound wisdom” shall be “kings, princes, and nobles.” The same delicate reference is contained in the saints being then associated with “the hand” (emblem of power), of the Lord, in their riding upon “white horses” (emblem of victory, used by rulers), in becoming “pillars” (as used e.g. Rev. 3:12—emblem of chief supports), in becoming lordly “cedars,” “trees of righteousness,” etc. (emblems of the nobles of a kingdom, so Horne’s Introd., vol. 2, p. 469), and even in “the mounting up with wings like eagles,” indicative of exaltation.

Obs. 6. Another proof is worthy of separate consideration, viz., the passages relating to the judging of the saints. Having shown (Prop. 133), what the Judgeship of Jesus Christ is, when He comes to judge the world, viz., that it designates His regal kingly rule, it is corroborative of the correctness of our doctrine that the saints are represented as associated with the Lord Messiah in judging. In Dan. 7:22, in connection with the Advent of the Ancient of Days, the Coming of the Son of man, the overthrow of the enemies of God, “judgment was given to the saints of the most High;” this itself is explained as possessing the Kingdom, dominion, etc., in verses 22 and 27. Having given in detail the Scriptural idea of “judging” it will suffice to present the opinion of a scholarly opponent. Thus Prof. Bush (Mill. p. 129), in interpreting the phrase “judgment was given to them” (Rev. 20:4), advocates by various references the Scriptural usage, and then says: “Numerous passages to the same effect might be readily adduced, from which the inference can scarcely fail to be drawn, that by judgments being given to those that sat on the thrones, is meant, that they received authority to reign and govern, or the right of exercising judgment according to the Hebrew sense of the word ‘judge, which is equivalent to that of ‘reigning,’ or putting forth the judicial and executive acts of the governing power.” Fairbairn (On Proph. p. 450), admits that “the

thrones set for judgment” and “the reigning” indicates “their (i.e. saints) kingly power,” which is exercised in authority and rulership over the nations. Now keeping in view the Jewish idea of a Judge (i.e. a Ruler) let us regard 1 Cor. 6:2, 3, “Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that ye shall judge angels?” The sense of the passage is plain, viz., that if destined to the promised kingly rule over the world (as predicted by the prophets, etc.), that if even angels shall be subjected to that kingly exercise of power (for the angels are subjected to “The Christ,” and being associated rulers, with Jesus, they even will willingly yield obedience to the “co-heirs”), they ought to be sufficiently worthy to exercise some authority even now in such matters pertaining to the saints. It is in view of this determined rulership that Jesus (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:29, 30) promises specially to the apostles: “Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye shall also sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” Here the restoration of the Theocratic order is not only intimated, and the Messianic reign stated, but the apostles are to be elevated to regal position of “Judges” or Rulers. It is in opposition to the spirit of the passage, parallel Scripture, and usage, to explain this (so Priest in View of Mill.), as fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, or (so Prof. Bush, Mill.), as verified by the “Christian Church in the midst of which the apostles are to be conceived as enthroned, and continually exercising judgment by means of their writings embodied in the sacred canon,” or (so Lightfoot), as exhibited in the ministerial authority with which the apostles were invested. (See Prop. 145, on Regeneration.) Such interpretations are rejected as untrustworthy and a lowering of the promise by those who have no doctrinal sympathy with us. Thus e.g. Bloomfield (Com. loci) refers the fulfilment to the Second Advent after the resurrection of the saints, and supposes that the high exaltation” of the apostles is denoted. Barnes (Com. loci) locates the realization of the promise at the same period, and after stating that “to judge denotes rank, authority, power,” as evidenced in “the ancient judges of Israel,” adds: “And as earthly kings have those around them dignified with honors and office, counsellors and judges, so Christ says His apostles shall occupy the same relative station in the great day.” Comment on such concessions is unnecessary; but it may be interesting to notice how those who reject our doctrine find it difficult to retain an interpretation without inconsistency and even contradictions. Taking one of the most guarded writers, Neander (Life of Christ), he informs us (sec. 70) that the apostles “were to lead the Kingdom (i.e. the Church) as His organs,” and as confirmatory of this mission quotes in a footnote Matt. 19:28, and Luke 22:30, “ye shall also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” He here, as also in Sec. 51, applies this judging to the present dispensation. But when he comes to Sec. 228 he then interprets it (correctly), as referring to the period “when the Son of man should appear with dominion corresponding to His glory in the renewed and glorified world,” saying that “the word ‘judging’ includes the idea of ‘governing’ according to its ancient acceptation;” for “the idea of a participation of believers with Christ in the government and judgment of the future world is bound up with the whole mode of representing the Kingdom of God in the New Testament.” With all his efforts to make something “symbolical” out of it, he gives us all the admissions that we desire, even in the sentence: “There are to be ‘judges’ and ‘judged,’ ‘rulers’ and ‘ruled,’ but in an exalted sense—in the new form of the Theocracy as well as in the old.” Such is our doctrine.

Obs. 7. The witticisms that some eminent men have attempted to pass at the expense of “the mother of Zebedee’s children” (Matt. 20:20–29) recoil upon themselves, inasmuch that in denying that there are positions of honor and rulership in the Messianic Kingdom, they evince far less knowledge of the subject than she possessed. Instead of this mother entertaining low and grovelling views respecting the Kingdom, she evidenced her appreciation of its glory and her understanding of the predicted rulership in it by making her request. Making due allowance for her motherly feelings, yet we can accord no sympathy to her apparently selfish purpose of securing the elevation of James and John to a position superior to that of the others. The narrative, as recorded, confirms in the strongest manner that while incorrect and blamable in preferring the request in behalf of her children, she was not wrong in supposing that the Messianic Kingdom, when erected, shall contain various stations of honor or degrees of rulership. Let the reader consider the following particulars, and such a confirmation will inevitably appear. (1) The time when this request was made is but a short time before the death of Jesus, and, consequently, after He had frequently spoken of the Kingdom. (2) This mother made the request through (evidently Mark 10:35) the solicitation of James and John, the latter having not only had the Kingdom explained to them by Jesus, but had even gone out and preached it to the nation; hence they ought to have known something concerning it. (3) James and John had just previously heard from the lips of the Saviour (Matt 19:28) that the apostles would be rewarded in the Kingdom with a rulership on twelve thrones; hence the request itself is indicative of this acquired knowledge of rulership and of their faith in its ultimate attainment. (4) James and John had also witnessed the transfiguration, and, therefore, had more exalted views respecting the Messianic glory (see Prop. 153, on Transfiguration). (5) Jesus, instead of denying that such gradations of rulership will exist in His Kingdom, expressly announces that they will be manifested, (a) by making them dependent upon suffering in His behalf, and (b) by asserting “but to sit on My right hand, and on My left, is not Mine to give, but (or, except to those) for whom it is prepared of my Father,” thus showing that such posts of honor shall exist, but will be awarded to those accounted worthy of them. What follows is better illustrated by Luke 22:24–30, when they (disciples) had “a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest.” Now, corroborative of our doctrine we have those points presented: (1) This strife indicated (while exhibiting a wrong spirit in the apostles) what views they held concerning a future rulership in the Kingdom. (2) Referring to Gentile rulers, Jesus tells them (because they anticipated the speedy setting up of the Kingdom and did not recognize its postponement, etc.) that instead of becoming such rulers now they must be servants. They were to be only the heirs of a Kingdom. (3) He does not rebuke the views of rulership held, but confirms them by these particulars: (a) By showing how one could become “the greatest” and “the

chief”—viz, by serving; (b) by referring to Himself, who, although the King—the Mighty Chief—of the Coming, still future Kingdom, now also served; (c) by then specifically, in view of the foreseen service they would render, telling them, “I appoint unto you a Kingdom,” i.e., you shall inherit a Kingdom, receive power of rulership; (d) “as My Father hath appointed unto Me,” i.e., it will be as real, substantial an exercise of power, although subordinated to mine; (e) “that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom,” i.e., you will be so exalted in special honor as to occupy, because of your stations, places of dignity near Me; (f) “and sit on thrones,” i.e., elevated to Kingship; (g) “judging the twelve tribes of Israel,” thus explaining why they are to be enthroned, viz., to govern the restored Jewish nation, which will again be manifested in its tribal divisions (comp. e.g. Isa. 1:26, 27). It is impossible, taking these statements entire, and comparing them with the general analogy of the Word and with the Messianic Kingdom, as it must appear in its covenanted form, to form any other just conclusion than the one we are advocating. We may rest assured that “the saints of the Most High” (marg. “of the high places” or “things,” i.e., to which they are destined and which they shall occupy) “shall take the Kingdom and possess it forever, even forever and ever,” Dan. 7:18. (Some, however, read “the supreme holy ones,” and in verse 22 “the supereminent saints.”) Isa. 49:7 will yet be verified in a high sense “kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful and the Holy One of Israel,”

Obs. 8. The wonderful Plan of God is shown in gathering out an elect body which shall, in the Coming Theocracy, be associated with the Christ in rulership in order to promote the redemptive process of the race, and to fill the earth with the praises and glory of the Lord. Instead of being defeated in His Theocratic purpose, God has been steadily making preparation for its sudden and overwhelming appearance. Bh. Newton well remarked concerning these risen and glorified saints that they “have the principal share in the felicities of Christ’s Kingdom upon earth.” They form a chosen body, a peculiar distinctive people who alone inherit the Kingdom (for flesh and blood cannot inherit), while the Jewish and spared Gentile nations form the willing subjects of the Kingdom. Being thus a select corporate body to whom the Kingdom is given (Props. 60–65 and 90, 124, etc.), who alone are crowned as the kings and priests of the restored Theocracy, we find deep reasons for the astonishing expressions recorded of the union, oneness, and fellowship with the Father and Son. The taunt employed in the early Church (evidently derived from this doctrinal feature) that Christians were a “genus tortium,” a class elevated above others, is, after all, but sober truth. Those royal prerogatives, belonging exclusively to them, are sometimes presented in phraseology which requires a little reflection to apprehend. Thus e.g. in Eph. 1:23 the Church is “His body, the fulness of Him,” etc., which, as many interpreters have stated, is expressive of the fact that in some way the Church is to fill up or complete the dominion of Jesus Christ; He being the Head and the saints the Body (thus forming a perfected dominion), a close and vital union subsisting between them. Calvin on this passage remarks: “This is the highest honor of the Church, that the Son of God regards Himself as in a certain sense imperfect unless He is joined to us.” This is only consistently explained by the doctrine of this co-heirship in dominion, by which the saints form with Christ the perfected Theocratic order of inaugurated rulership. The preceding context corroborates this interpretation, because the apostle had just referred to the calling of the saints, their redemption, the dispensation when all things should be gathered together in one, the inheritance, the redemption of the purchased possession, saying: “That we should be to the praise of His glory who first trusted in Christ,” and “that ye may know what is the hope of His calling and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints.” Thus intimating not only the elect condition of believers and that they should in a special manner promote “the praise of His glory,” but that the glory obtained by them by heirship would augment the glory of the Christ. The filling up or completeness of Jesus Christ mentioned here, and alluded to in other places, can only receive its due force and full meaning when regarded in the light of this doctrine; it then obtains a richness and propriety that must bring admiration and joy to the heart of the believer. This reign of a corporate body of rulers, with the engrafted Gentiles as fellow-heirs, is the finishing of the mystery (Eph. 3) mentioned by Paul. Therefore, it is that the lengthening out of this dispensation is represented as so gracious and merciful in God, in order that these destined rulers may be duly gathered even from among the Gentiles. And an amazing feature in the Divine Plan, evincing unbounded grace to us Gentiles, here presents itself; the Jewish nation, the elder, having rejected the offer of this Kingdom at the First Advent (Prop. 57), the Kingdom, as an inheritance, is to be given to others grafted in (Prop. 61, etc.), the younger. Hence the distinction between “the married wife” and the restored “barren woman” (Prop. 118), which even the Psalmist alludes to (Ps. 45:16) “instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth.” What Lamartine says of worldly rulers (Girond., vol. 1, p. 53), viz., that “a throne even in fragments will not admit of participation,” may be true of human nature as at present constituted, but does not apply to these accounted worthy of co-heirship with Christ, owing both to the infinite superiority of the Theocratic King and the perfect glorification of these rulers, who can never give place to the failings and imperfections of frail humanity.

Obs. 9. The Kingdom itself is purposely delayed for thousands of years (long to man, but brief to God), in order to raise up this body of rulers to sustain it when manifested with a purity, dignity, power, stability, and glory worthy of a Theocracy. If the question be asked, why did not God establish the Theocracy in such a form in the time of Moses, or of David, or at the First Advent, the answer, as testified to by history, is apparent, viz., that man was not prepared for it. The essential element to sustain and give it its immortal, enduring characteristics had not yet been prepared and gathered. Looking at the predictions and promises, at the Kingdom as it shall appear, we see at once that a Theocracy with such a Ruler—God man—and with such associated kings and priests requires, in view of the intelligent freedom of man and his bias to sin, a period of preparation, a set time in which an elect, peculiar, royal people may be gathered. God could, as asserted, have raised up this body, if necessary, even “out of stones,” but He chooses rather in

forbearance and wonderful patience to raise them up out of depraved man, not by compulsion or a forcing of the will, but by the application of His own truth to their self-consciousness and free will. Those who accept of this truth and manifest such acceptance by faith and obedience, become "the heirs of the Kingdom," are adopted as members of this body; all others are rejected as unworthy of inheriting the Kingdom of God. The Almighty, foreknowing the requirements of the Theocratic, determined order, has also predetermined (hence, in some Liturgies the prayer that God would speedily complete the number of the elect) the number of those who shall be associated with David's Son in the establishment of this Kingdom; and until this number (known only to God) is completed, the Kingdom itself will not be revealed. Such a Theocracy, in the nature of the case, cannot suddenly appear, without previous preparation, and is not the product of compulsion, but cheerful obedience to God. But when the last elected one is gathered, when the preparatory measures are all completed, then comes the sudden revelation of the Majestic King and His associated kings upon an awe-struck world. The re-establishment of the Theocracy is no longer left dependent upon previously gathered material to establish its efficiency and enhance its glory.*

Obs. 10. Should the inquiry be started, by what principle of justice these elect saints are so highly honored above the righteous of the Millennial and succeeding ages, the answer is given in the Word in the principles announced, and in the difference of the dispensations, as e.g. Rom. 9:16, 17; Luke 22:28, 29; Rom. 11:28, 29, etc. For such extraordinary glory these saints must be trained in obedience and suffering, in temptation and trial, just as the King Himself has been. The subjects of this restored Theocracy, owing to the binding of Satan and the unspeakable blessings of the Messianic reign, will not be subjected to the same privations, temptations, and crosses that those now are who are schooled for their future appointments. The condition of those who succeed these in the Millennial age is vastly improved, faith being aided by the sight of grandeur and glory, suffering being removed, and aid and strength being imparted by this very rulership. This future Kingship is really the secret cause of that chastening that oftentimes is now so grievous. God designs that by our trials we may become fitted and prepared for the position in the Coming Kingdom. The elementary principles of holiness, wisdom, self-denial, love, zeal, etc., are to be implanted, forming the basis of the elevation intended, and qualifying us for the high and noble designs of this determined rulership. God does not take "the beggar from the dunghill to set him with princes," until He has passed through a preliminary training, including, in many instances, this state of poverty itself as part of the discipline necessary. When elevated to this kingship, it will be found that the state of probation, the constant contact with and conflict against evil, was most admirably adapted to qualify these rulers for their stations; not only as to their own personal relationship to each other, but likewise to bring them into sympathy with the nations of the earth. The physical and moral evil encountered, the valuable experience obtained, the relative change realized, the characteristics developed and confirmed, these, with the abundant additions of the Spirit, qualify them for the honor of kingship and priesthood, making them intelligent and wise kings, sympathetic and loving priests. Suffering, etc., prepared the blessed Master for His Theocratic position, and the disciple is not above the Master in this respect, but must fill up the measure of His sufferings, inasmuch as he shall also be allied with Him in the joy and glory of reigning. While the happiness and glory of David's Son is thus promoted by His obedient suffering, the same is also greatly enhanced by another principle, viz., by the bestowal of blessings and glory upon others in virtue of His own exaltation; now the same is stated of these rulers, for while obtaining blessedness and glory in view of their faith and obedience, the same is made an instrumentality for communicating happiness to others and promoting blessings throughout the world. Whatever of good, etc., may be in self, it is also made subservient to the good of others. This principle runs through the past dealings of God, is incorporated with His Theocratic ordering, and will be, as Millennial predictions abundantly show, manifested in this regal Judgeship. This Theocracy is designed for blessing the world, and exhibiting the majesty and glory of God.*

Obs. 11. This exaltation to a joint Theocratic rulership with David's Son is an honor so unspeakably great that it should most deeply affect the heart of the believer. To be associated with the "King of Kings," to be enthroned with the Mighty One, to be a Ruler with such an august Personage, this, indeed, is dignity and grandeur far beyond that ever attained by mortal monarch. Made Christ-like through the power of the resurrection, with angelic power and more than angelic glory in virtue of relationship to Jesus, they "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars forever and ever (Dan. 12:3), or "as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father (Matt. 13:43). So great is this honor and so productive of happiness, that the Spirit employs the most striking figures to indicate the same. They are "My jewels" (Mal. 3:17) i.e. God's own peculiar, prized treasure; they "come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy" (Isa. 35:10); they shall "be glad also with exceeding joy" (1 Pet. 4:13); they shall have "in Thy presence fulness of joy and at Thy right hand (place of authority) pleasures forever more" (Ps. 16:11). The least in this body of kings and priests is far greater than John the Baptist, Matt. 11:11, for then will be verified the declaration, Ps. 91:11: "I will set him on high, because he hath known My name." It is "a manifestation of the sons of God," a multitude of royal personages, forming the ruling power of an earth-wide dominion; the very number of them, all arrayed in magnificence, swelling the splendor of the court of the great King, thus presenting a scene of glory that shall be the praise of the world. The very services rendered by these kings and priests aid materially to exalt and endear them to the nations over whom they rule; for not only their authority shall be recognized, but their love, favor, and friendship. Royalty, however splendid, when distant, cold, and heartless, loses its attractions, but when brought near to the masses for purposes of beneficence, immensely augments them. The results, too, of their rule will augment their exaltation in the eyes of the nations. Greatness in Sovereign power is measured by the degree of success and the stability attained; this measure applied to the reign of the saints only evinces the more the grandeur of a reign which fills the nations with peace, plenty, and happiness, and the whole

earth with the worship and the glory of the Lord. Each individual king now realizes—whatever his station—that (Prov. 4:8, 9) “wisdom shall bring thee honor,” and “a crown of glory shall she deliver thee.” And then shall the prediction of Ps. 89:15, 16, 17 be abundantly fulfilled, taking Dr. Clarke’s translation: “Oh, the blessedness of that people that know the joyful sound (i.e. the sound of the trumpet on the morning of the Jubilee). They shall walk vigorously in the light of Thy countenance. In Thy name shall they exult all that day (viz., time of jubilee), and in Thy righteousness shall they be exalted,” etc. (See Ps. 68:13.)

Obs. 12. As charged by Jesus Himself, who saw the destined honor of His brethren, we should despise none of God’s little ones. Every believer, who runs the race successfully, is heir to a kingdom, heir to a substantial kingship. He is a prince in his minority, although perhaps struggling with poverty and without owning a foot of land, or house to shelter himself and family. He may be despised and overlooked by the rich, or by his neighbors, and yet he is destined to a position far higher and more honorable than that occupied by the proudest, richest, greatest monarch that ever lived. This is sober truth based upon precious promises that God intends to fulfil. That God now regards the poor Christian as far superior to a wicked king, however great and noble of birth, is apparent from Eccl. 4:13, 14. This passage cannot be appreciated unless we understand “the prison” alluded to as referring to the grave (shown to be a scriptural usage in Props, on the Resurrection). “Better is a poor and a wise child (being pious) than an old and foolish king who will no more be admonished (i.e. remains wicked). For out of prison (i.e. the grave) He cometh to reign (according to promise); whereas also he that is born in His Kingdom becometh poor.” At least, the pious, although not born to an earthly Kingdom, shall, by virtue of their union with Christ, inherit a Kingdom after the resurrection, while a wicked king, born to a kingdom, shall lose his crown; for, rejecting the one tendered to him, he shall never obtain another. From the testimony of the Word we learn that God will gather these princes and kings more from the ranks of the poor and the ignorant than from those of the rich, mighty, and worldly wise, simply because the former are more disposed to receive and obey the truth than the latter. All are equally invited, and many rich, learned, etc., have gladly availed themselves of the distinguishing privilege thus accorded to us, above those who shall follow us, in succeeding dispensations, of becoming heirs of such an inheritance.*

Obs. 13. The wicked shall see the glory and feel the authority of these saints. This is abundantly evident from the action of these saints at the Second Advent, ruling the nations with a rod of iron, etc. It is unnecessary to repeat what has been made clear under other propositions, and we only refer to this again to call the reader’s attention to the effect that it will produce upon the wicked. Thus, e.g. in Ps. 112:9, 10, when the horn of the righteous is exalted with honor, “the wicked shall see it and be grieved, he shall gnash with his teeth,” etc. The wicked shall see this at the beginning of the Millennial era and again at its close. It will be a dreadful sight to them to see the saints thus honored with power, riches, dominion, and glory—triumphant heirs with Christ—and themselves defeated in their wickedness, fallen under Almighty power, trembling at the outpouring of the long-delayed wrath of the Lamb, and filled with forebodings of an impending and inevitable doom. No wonder the Spirit, all-foreknowing, tells us that they will “gnash with their teeth,” for agony and despair with deep, untold remorse must be theirs when they contrast the exaltation of saints with their own unhappy one, and then remember that just such honor and blessedness and rank was freely, lovingly, and most urgently pressed upon them, but they—loving evil rather than good—foolishly and even contemptuously refused it.*

Obs. 14. One grand cause of the amazing power of these kings and priests has already been explained under our repeated references to the supernatural. They shall receive the promised Baptism of the Holy Ghost and Fire (Prop. 171). It is for this reason that Jesus promised His disciples that they should perform greater works than He had done while on earth; and that all things that they would ask for would be granted, etc. This has never yet been realized. There was a partial fulfilment in the case of the apostles and their contemporaries, but even then their works did not exceed the miraculous power exerted by the Master. It is a mere begging of the question to say that, although miraculous power has ceased, greater power is really given, because charity, etc., is rather to be chosen, according to the apostles, as a more excellent gift. For, if the greater gifts are thus given, as alleged, why should not the lesser be witnessed? The truth is, that the more excellent gifts are such because they relate to, and are an indication of, moral character, while miraculous power, intrusted to believers, is not exclusively dependent upon spiritual attainments, but can be conferred independently of them. The weakest as well as the strongest can exert the power, if communicated. But the time is coming when this same miraculous power shall be given to those who have made themselves worthy of it in a higher degree than ever yet experienced—those spiritual attainments forming the ground of conference—for Christ’s promises are all true and will be verified. The inchoate fulfilment is evidence of the more ample one when the apostles and believers inherit the Kingdom. This feature explains, therefore, that matchless and irresistible power with which they stand invested at their manifestation.*

Obs. 15. God’s equity is vindicated by this reign of the saints. We do not now allude to the restoration of forfeited blessings, for this has been mentioned before, but to the simple fact that the very place, here on earth, which was the scene of the saint’s pilgrimage, the Church’s struggle, the martyr’s suffering, the believer’s fight of faith under trial, shall become the witness of the saint’s elevation, the Church’s honor, the martyr’s triumph, the believer’s reign. God’s justice and grace has crowned all with the kingship and priesthood, thus vindicating His assurances of ultimate uplifting in the very earth where humiliation was experienced in reliance upon His Word. It is no small thing that the saints shall be kings where they once were poor and needy; that they shall be happy Princes where once they suffered; that they shall be rejoicing Nobles where once they sorely wept and prayed; and triumphant Rulers where once they were tempted, tried, persecuted, and afflicted. When this reigning is thus experienced, how will God’s ways be vindicated

before the enraptured saints and an astonished world.*

Obs. 16. Indeed, this subject serves to throw light on the difficult subject of Divine Providence. For it indicates that evil cannot, and will not, ultimately triumph; its limits are definitely fixed. Owing to the proposed Theocracy being postponed until a number of chosen ones are gathered, and in view of these elect ones being tested in order to develop the character required by their subsequent Theocratic relationship, evil is allowed to the righteous as a source of trial to qualify them for their future positions, while prosperity and domination is given to the wicked for a time only, and then the triumph of the latter shall forever cease. The believer amid evil is sustained by the consciousness of Divine approval, the adaptation of Divine truth to his moral wants, the habit of devotion and its receptive action, the implantation and cultivation of Christian graces, and the well-grounded hope, corroborated by experiences, that all things work for his ultimate good. The final restoration of the Theocracy with its blessed results vindicates the present ordering instituted as a suitable preparatory state and discipline.*

Obs. 17. This reign of the saints, with its exalted and unending results, in such a Theocratic relationship, affords an additional answer to the astronomical objection of Paine and others. Aside from the questions of moral and civil government, the honor, etc., of God thus upheld, the interest which He manifests in intelligent creatures (His own workmanship), etc., which it fully meets, the happiness, immortality, employment, and Divine union which these kings enjoy—eternally, too—indicates that however great the condescension and grace of God in procuring it, this salvation exemplified in this form is, according to our highest and noblest conceptions, worthy of the Almighty, redounding to His praise and glory. It is a wonderful adaptation to existing circumstances, bringing forth a display of Divine attributes and a condescension upon the part of the Almighty, which lifts humanity into the sphere of the Divine.*

Obs. 18. The notion that the kingly office of Christ is continued and perpetuated in the ministry is shown to be erroneous. To make out a fulfilment of kingship and priesthood, as promised, and to exalt the ministry, Popery has incorporated this feature, which is also characteristic of some portions of Protestantism inclined, more or less, to hierarchical tendencies. The doctrine of the Kingdom, of the covenanted Messianic reign and that of the saints, is utterly opposed to such unscriptural deductions, making a kingly sacerdotal caste in the Church. The early Church, and Millettarians ever since, has been against such extravagant and injurious assumptions. Hence it is that Neander and other Church historians, when tracing the rise and progress of those lofty sacerdotal claims, this sad change from a church equality grounded on a common relation to Christ to a separate distinct mediatory royal priesthood, pass by the advocates of our doctrine, and clearly show that this change arose through the opposers of Chiliasm. In the very nature of the case, our doctrine could not encourage such usurpations of position and authority, when it distinctly ascribed the fulfilment of all such promises to the Second Advent of Christ in a still higher sense. On the other hand, this pre-determined rulership indicates how we ought to regard the efforts of a class who, to bring about the promised Millennial glory, dream of a period of time when all persons shall be forced in an equality of position, rank, and possessions. This Kingdom and reign—the result of God's wisdom and His choice as the best adapted for the world—show that it is a wild theory of ignorance (although presented in attractive garb), arising from an overlooking of the present depravity of man and of the ultimate Divine purpose in elevating humanity.

Obs. 19. It has been supposed (as e.g. Noel in Brief Inquiry, ch. 8) that Deut. 32:8, 9 (of which the Sep. gives the following: "When He separated the nations, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels") compared with Heb. 2:5, and the intimations of present angelic rule and interference, as given by Daniel (see Barnes on Dan. 10:13), etc., is "a type and model of the sovereignties of the elect Church." His idea is, that the world is now in a measure controlled by angels, but the world to come is to be controlled by the glorified saints. Under such Scripture there may be an allusion to this future rulership of the saints, even to the extent intimated, viz., that the stations, etc., were determined in the division and settlements of the nations. At least, considering the foreknowledge of the Almighty, and that, as in the case of the Jewish nation in its tribal divisions and settlement such divisions occurred, through His overruling Providence, there is nothing in such a supposition but what magnifies God's knowledge.*

Obs. 20. It would be exceedingly interesting to give the statements of others concerning this Kingship, but, out of the large number, we have only space for a few by way of illustration. Rothe (Dogmatic, p. 2, p. 60), referring to "the Chiliastic Kingdom," says: "Especially does Paul describe it as a reigning of believers 'together with Christ.' The Apoc. exhibits this co-regency as the chief element of blessedness in the Chiliastic Kingdom. The redeemed reign with Christ, sit on His throne, have power over the nations, and participate in the destruction of the enemies of their Lord. Priests and kings, they receive white robes, garments of light, and in these walk about with the Redeemer. They obtain the hidden manna, eat of the Tree of Life, wear the crown, and possess the white stone with the new name, which none know but they who have it. They are pillars in the temple of God to go out no more, and over them the second death has no power." Richter's Erklärte Haus Bibel, Tom. 6, p. 1134, remarks: "They (of the first resurrection) shall, thereby, at the same time, rule as kings with Christ, according to Divine right. But where do they dwell, and where do they exercise their office? Not indeed any more secluded in heaven, and hid in God, but openly manifested, because then, for them, heaven is upon earth and earth is heaven. They are like the Risen and Glorified Saviour, with a spiritual body, no more bound to the limits of space. They reign and minister with Christ, because Christ Himself shall then be openly the King-Priest over the whole earth (1 Cor. 15:24; Ps. 47; Ps. 72; Isa. 65:17). As certainly as Christ, the Risen One, was among the not yet risen, during forty days, so certainly shall the many who are risen with Him be, like Him, among those who are not raised." Birks (Lects. during Lent, p. 187) says: "The

scene of the martyr's sufferings shall witness their exaltation. They who have been ejected outcasts in a world of rebels shall be crowned with honor and dominion over a world redeemed from the fall. The glorious equity of God shall thus be no less conspicuous than the triumph of His grace; and men and angels shall join in that adoring song: 'Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, O Thou King of saints!' **

PROPOSITION 155. This Kingdom exhibits Jesus, not only as the King, but as "the Priest."

A Theocracy, in the very nature of its government, requires a priesthood to minister in sacred things. It is a Kingdom in which the Church and the State are united, and hence both are represented in the officials. In the restored Theocracy this priesthood is represented differently from that one once connected with it. The High-Priest and the king were separate personages, but to preserve unity in the coming Theocracy, the priesthood and kingship are united in the same Person. Hence, the Messiah is designated a Priest as well as a King in His official relationship as the Theocratic Head.

Obs. 1. The High-Priest was God's representative on earth. If any grave question affecting the interest of the Theocracy was to be decided, he was the one who obtained an immediate decision from Jehovah. In the restored Theocracy as Priest and King, Son of David and Son of God, are the same person, all important questions, requiring an answer, are decided by Himself. God and man are in union, and represented by this High-Priest. (Comp. Props. 81, 199, 200.)

Obs. 2. The Scriptures, when speaking of the priesthood of the Messiah, makes it something that shall evermore continue. Thus in Heb. 7:21–25 we read: "The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." "But this (Priest), because He continueth forever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore, He is able also to save them to the uttermost (marg. read evermore; some critics, forever) that come unto God by Him, seeing that He ever liveth to make intercession for them" (comp. ch. 5:6, 10 and 6:10; Ps. 110:4). Here the Priesthood of Jesus is inseparably connected with the continuance of Jesus Himself, just as our whole argument demands.*

Obs. 3. This Priesthood is a royal one, i.e. it is firmly, inseparably united to His royalty. Hence Zech. 6:13 says of the Messiah: "He shall sit and rule upon His throne, and He shall be a Priest upon His throne." When this Messianic throne is established, has been abundantly shown and proven under various Propositions (comp e.g. Prop. 83, 122, 131, etc.). His covenanted (Prop. 49) throne is established at His Sec. Advent, at which time He sits on His throne, bears rule, and exhibits Himself on that throne as the "great High-Priest." Therefore in Ps. 110, when "the rod of His strength shall come out of Zion," He shall "rule in the midst of His enemies," "strike through kings in the day of His wrath," "judge among the heathen," "wound the heads over many countries," have a "willing" and "holy people" "in the day of His power," and in the morning (all of which is distinctively related to His Sec. Advent), then, at that time, the priesthood is also manifested, for then is to be fully verified: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec," or, as some render it, "A priest for the ages (to come) after the order (manner) of Melchisedec," i.e. a king-priest.*

Obs. 4. Now, He is a Priest (Heb. 8:1) on the Father's throne, and when He is on His own throne (as David's Son, Rev. 3:21) He continues Priest, simply because His great sacrificial act, performed once for all, ever stamps Him as a Priest—a successful and acknowledged High-Priest. Gratitude, love, reverence, honor, blessing, salvation—all regard Him as the Priest, and so long as these endure the priesthood of Jesus remains a reality. When He tendered His priceless offering, when He ascended to heaven and interceded for man, this only indicates that He is the worthy Priest who shall come again—for His work as Priest ever remains, and is inseparably connected with His official station. As Priest He secures for us (Heb. 9:12) "eternal redemption" and not a mere temporary deliverance, and, therefore, it becomes this Priest, as such, and thus recognized, ever to remain in immediate relationship with this redemption.*

Obs. 5. Therefore, the continuity of His priesthood is identified with the perpetuity of His own existence (Heb. 7:24, 25): "But this man (Jesus) because He continueth ever (Gr. remains forever) hath an unchangeable priesthood." "He ever liveth to make intercession." It cannot be taken from Him and given to others, but as long as He exists, so long does the priesthood pertain to Him. He alone stands forth in all succeeding ages as the High-Priest. In an epistle specially devoted to exhibit "the unchangeable priesthood" of Jesus, it is expressly declared (Heb. 13:8): "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."**

Obs. 6. This blessed truth is reiterated in such a way as if purposely to meet the unbelief respecting it. Thus (Heb. 7:15, 16) it is positively announced, "that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Barnes himself (Com. loci.) has to admit, over against his own theory, that this means: "By an authority of endless duration," that it denotes a priesthood "unchanging in its character," "it was enduring and perpetual as a priesthood," but, after all, makes it such only to fit into his Post-Millennial scheme for this dispensation.*

Obs. 7. This priesthood, being after the similitude of Melchisedec, is exhibited in its completeness with. His kingship. Now, at His Sec. Advent He comes as King, and reigns as King; it follows, therefore, that He is also revealed as Priest. The two offices are united in the same person, and so long as the one endures the other must also remain. His Kingship is eternal (comp. Prop. 159), so likewise must be the priesthood.*

Obs. 8. If the saints are to be “kings and priests” in the future Kingdom (Props. 118, 153, 154), then it follows that the Elder Brother is also the same. This necessarily follows, because His brethren are co-heirs with Him to the same inheritance, honor, and glory. He is the great High-Priest, they are associated with Him as Priests. (Comp. Prop. 156.)

Obs. 9. Jesus, the Christ, ever remains “an High-Priest of good things to come” (Heb. 9:11), inasmuch as the Redemptive work, of which He is the Priestly-Head, shall continue after the Sec. Advent. This is seen in the finished Redemption of His brethren and in the blessings enjoyed by them; in the conversion of the Jewish nation, which obtains repentance and grace through His blood and intercession, after His Coming; in the mercy and happiness bestowed upon the spared Gentile nations after His Advent and conflict with Antichrist, which can only be predicated of His priestly influence; and in the perpetuation of the human race for saving purposes and the glory of God, which results from His continued efficiency as Mediator. He is the Priest of “the everlasting covenant,” and as such He not only provides the provision for its realization, but being its “surety” He remains personally interested in the same, and secures it for us.

Obs. 10. The Theocracy is designed to secure for us all the forfeited blessings. To do this, and bring in the predicted righteousness and glory, demands the personal supervision of our High-Priest. Full and complete deliverance from sin and evil, so far as this earth and this race is concerned, is only promised to exist one thousand years (and a little season, Rev. 20) after the Sec. Advent. The priestly office will yet evidence its sufficiency in wresting from Satan His victory, and in ultimately crushing out all sin and all its sad consequences.

Obs. 11. Such a continuing High-Priest evidences the spirituality connected with this Kingdom. Our opponents stigmatize it as “carnal,” etc., but the presence and official station of this Priest sufficiently refutes such a charge. He is the great Presider over things relating to the Divine; He is the Head of all religious affairs; He is the Oracle of God’s truth; He is the final and infallible arbiter in all questions. Through Him and in Him, the Father is always approached, and worship, and reverence, and praise to the Godhead always ascends in His name.

Obs. 12. When we consider the greatness and majesty of this High-Priest, the incomparable and all-sufficient sacrifice offered, the exaltation and power, God’s special choice and not man’s, bearing the people on His loving breast, His immense superiority over all other priests, His confirmation by oath and perfection, His Holiness, then we can rest assured that His priestly work will be fully accomplished, and that as the priestly agent He will ever, as such, rejoice in it.*

Obs. 13. It is only requisite to remind the reader, that this priesthood largely pertains to the humanity of the Christ. While the Divine united to Him gives it increased dignity, efficiency, preciousness, etc., yet we are told (Heb. 2:16, 17) that “He took on Him the seed of Abraham, wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that. He might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining to God,” etc. (comp. v. 14, etc.), and that “He sprang out of Judah” (Heb. 7:14). This priesthood is part of the exaltation of His Humanity—it is inseparably identified with it, and the entire reasoning of Hebrews associates the call and perpetuation of that Humanity, as David’s Son—in its earthly and glorified condition with the same. Thus united, we dare not separate them, lest we detract from the ever-enduring exaltation of Humanity itself, as seen in this High-Priest and His associated priests.

Obs. 14. The Primitive-Church view confirms our position. For several centuries after the First Advent, the ministers clearly taught the Pre-Mill. Advent, the conversion of the nations following, etc., thus continuing the priestly work of Jesus in mediation, intercession, and saving purposes. The present prevailing belief on the subject, founded on a Post-Mill. theory, was utterly discarded (comp. Props. 74–76). The teaching of men so nearly allied to apostolic instruction, should have some weight in a matter so important, especially when we find the same so fully substantiated by the present infallible rule of faith, the Scriptures.

Obs. 15. The views of eminent writers and commentators, corroborating this doctrine, tends to show, that in the estimation of such, it is a truth clearly taught, which should be unhesitatingly received. We append a few utterances.*

Obs. 16. This unchangeable priesthood, in connection with the ever-enduring priesthood of the saints, seems to confirm the opinion of those who hold to an endless succession of generations (comp. Prop. 152, on Perp. of Race). We would not deny the inference, because it possesses weighty reasons for its entertainment, and such a succession for many ages, at least, is clearly taught. But we can easily conceive of a continued priesthood, even if such a perpetuation of the race should cease, on the ground that the superior, the ruling power, will always minister in Divine things to the inferior, the subjected one. We leave this matter, as stated in Prop. 152.

PROPOSITION 156. The doctrine of the Kingdom enforces the future priesthood of the saints.

The promise is that the saints shall be both “kings and priests” (Rev. 1:6, and 5:10, and 20:6) in the coming Kingdom. Prop. 154 shows the civil relationship of the saints, this one relates to the religious, for, like Christ, the Theocratic King, they are both civil and religious rulers. The nature of a Theocracy demands, in view of the inseparable union of State and Church, such a leadership in order to secure the requisite purity and perfection.*

Obs. 1. A Theocracy, to preserve a manifested unity and enforce its authority supremely, requires the union of priesthood and rulership in the same persons. The inseparable union of Church and State, the Head of both Church and State being God Himself, demands both a religious and civil administration, and hence to insure the proper, equitable, and perfect combination of authority, and the essential enforcement of law and order, it is the highest wisdom to lodge the rulership and priesthood, not in two distinct bodies, but in one special raised up body. This wisdom, which commends itself to reason, is fully exhibited in the Divine ordering pertaining to the restored Theocracy.*

Obs. 2. Jesus in His Coming Kingdom is both King and Priest. This has been shown in detail, and is one of the most precious of truths relating to His future glory, the station of the saints, and the destiny of the race. Now, the saints being co-heirs with Him, participants of His honor and glory, partake of His Kingship and Priesthood. In this they “shall be like Him,” thus fulfilling the promises pertaining to the greatness of their joy, honor, and glory. Hence they are distinctively promised, not only the exaltation of kingship, but also that of priesthood. And, we may rest assured, “that both will be most amply verified, seeing that it is God who gives us the assurance.”*

Obs. 3. A Theocracy being a Divine-Civil Government, God Himself being the earthly Ruler, a certain pre-eminence is given to the religious above the civil. This is seen in the Theocracy as once existing, in the provisions made for its restoration (the religious qualifying for the ultimate civil), and in the simple fact that the Divine is fundamental to all other relations whatever. Hence we need not be surprised that prominence is given to this priesthood, as in Ex. 19:6, where God promises to raise up unto Himself “a kingdom of priests,” and in Rev. 20:6, where the being “priests of God and of Christ” is mentioned as a distinguishing characteristic associated with the reign.*

Obs. 4. In Ex. 19:5, 6 we have presented God’s desire to exalt the Theocratic ordering by making it “a Kingdom of priests,” i.e. a Kingdom so permeated by heartfelt allegiance to God, the Ruler, that it would be under the permanent authority of a holy priesthood, thus making the Divine a controlling element. A Theocracy in its purity demands holiness, an entire consecration to its Ruler. This idea remained unrealized, notwithstanding its tender to the Jewish nation, on account of disobedience. But this sinfulness of the nation will not prevent God from ultimately realizing in ample fulfilment His purpose as indicated. This will be done when the Theocracy is restored under David’s Son. In the mean time, to insure the complete realization, God is constantly raising up those who are destined to officiate as Priests in the coming Kingdom. These are specified, and the promise of Ex. 19:5, 6 applied to them, by Peter (1 Pet. 2:9) “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.” By the process of engrafting, these priests, being thus all the children of Abraham, are fully incorporated with the commonwealth of Israel.*

Obs. 5. “The first-born” of Israel were regarded as specially belonging to the Lord and consecrated to the Priesthood. Writers on the Jewish Laws (as Michaelis, Wines, etc.) have noticed this in detail. Thus Wines (Com. on Laws, etc., B. 2, ch. 8) says: “On the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, all their first-born males were sanctified to the Lord and destined to the altar. But the difficulty of obtaining from each family its first-born son, the difficulty of detaching them from their private interests, as citizens of such a tribe or such a town, rendered this mode impracticable. Moses, therefore, without in the least changing the original principle, substituted for this service the tribe of Levi, in place of all the first-born” (Lev. 8:2–5; Numb. 8:5–22, etc.). This substitution is represented as “a gift,” and as a constant reminder that the principle remained unchanged, that God’s claim still existed, a redemption price for the first-born was exacted. Owing to human imperfection and weakness, God’s just claim could not be carried into practical execution, and He only designs to teach us by this (1) that on account of dependence upon Him and His regal authority, a Divine service tendered to Him is, in virtue of His Divinity and Majesty, of the first importance in a Theocratic ordering; and (2) that this should be a sign or type of the realization of the ultimate Purpose of God, viz., that “the first-born” of the Church should become Priests in the incoming Theocracy.²

Obs. 6. The priests were specially charged (Deut. 33:9, 10 and 17:9–13; Lev. 10:11; Hos. 4:6; Mal. 2:7, etc.) to preserve and teach the laws, Theocratic, that were already given. They could not change them, or substitute others, for this would have reflected upon the wisdom. etc., of the Theocratic King, the mighty God, and would have introduced confusion and anarchy. The purity of a Theocracy demands such a position of the priests—a subordination to the Divine Majesty and the upholding of His enactments. In the restored Theocracy this again will be the attitude of the priesthood. When “the law shall go forth of Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem” (Mic. 4:2; Isa. 2:3, etc.); when the incoming dispensation (Props. 140, 141) shall introduce new revelations of God’s Will (Prop. 167), a renewed ordering (Props. 131), these priests, the first-born of the Church, will be the grand medium of

communicating the same. Then it will be true (Ps. 68:11) "The Lord gave the word: great was the company (army) of those that published it."

Obs. 7. The priests acted as Judges (Deut. 21:5 and 17:8–13, etc.), so that with the priestly, there was inseparably associated the civil character. They were by virtue of their priesthood in the service of the State and Church—they were, as a Theocratic ordering necessitates, ministers of Church and State. Thus will it be again, but with this vast difference; the priesthood, instead of being deposited in the hands of mortal, weak, and fallible men, is then committed to glorified and infallible ones, united by the firmest bonds that grace and salvation can bestow to the mighty Theocratic King.

Obs. 8. In ancient times there were various orders of the priesthood, the high-priests, the priests that officiated at the altar, and the various companies of assistants. Following analogy, and the hints given respecting the variety of station, rank, reward in kingship; observing the exclusiveness of the 144,000 and the position of the future martyrs; considering the possibility asserted in the Scriptures of attaining unto eternal life and yet suffering loss, etc., it is reasonable to anticipate that under the leadership of the great High-Priest there will be gradations of rank and order in this priesthood. Not all believers will be kings or priests (Props. 130, 153), but only those specially counted worthy of the honor. But such will be the honor and delight, the fulness of happiness and the recognition of grace, that even the most subsidiary position will be abundantly satisfactory, as expressed by David, Ps. 84:10. A diversity in unity, a variety of gifts and ministrations, a distribution of rank and office, enriches the communion and intercourse of the saints with each other and with the nations; it serves as the basis of a mutual impartation of benefit and blessing.*

Obs. 9. These priests tender the sacrifices of heart, lips, and life—"spiritual sacrifices" (1 Pet. 2:5; Heb. 13:15, 16, etc., showing how the word "sacrifice" is employed). The offerings that they bring are not bloody sacrifices, for these are superseded by the one offering (Heb. 10:12–14, etc.) of Jesus, but offerings indicative of allegiance, friendship, reverence, gratitude, praise, service. This has been so amply discussed that it needs no repetition (see Prop. 172). These priests conduct the public worship of God; they show forth His excellencies in Creation and Redemption; they stimulate to gratitude, love, prayer, and praise; they teach, proclaiming the truth as committed to them and exemplified in themselves; they advise and decide questions referred to them; they enforce, by the weight of their relationship to the Christ and by their authority, the Theocratic constitution and laws.*

Obs. 10. These glorified priests are an elect, chosen body (Props. 62, 64, 65) in person and office, representative of the majesty of the Theocratic King, raised to their exalted position and nearness officially to Him that they may be "to the praise of His glory." Their number, rank, duty, devotedness, etc., serve to glorify the Messiah (comp. preceding Prop., Obs. 8). They are specially designed to exhibit the Theocratic ordering—its authority, institutions, laws, privileges, blessings, etc.—forming a medium between its King and its subjects, its magnificent throne and the nations. The designation of priests indicates that they are a channel of communication between God and the nations, the latter being brought largely through their instrumentality into Theocratic order and unity.*

Obs. 11. All these priests are Divinely called and commissioned. Now, alas! men may intrude themselves into sacred offices utterly unfitted for them. The record of the past presents multitudes of painful instances, and infidelity seizes upon them, and the acts attributed to them, as legitimate results—notwithstanding their positive scriptural condemnation—of religion itself. But no such dishonoring feature can possibly be incorporated with this Theocracy, for every priest will possess undoubted authority, vouched for by his glorified condition and his divine relationship to Jesus and the New Jerusalem. If any one should even attempt (of which we cannot conceive a probability) to take the position of such a priest, Korah's Theocratic punishment would speedily follow.

Obs. 12. All these priests are secured by a previous training; they are tested and tried (comp. Props. 86, 135 and Obs. 9 and 10 in preceding one). Sufferings, temptation, and trial were essential to the full and perfect development of the great High-Priest Himself (Heb. 5:6–10 and 2:9, 10, 11 and 4:15), and such are requisite to form the characters of His associated priests. Their love to God and His Christ, devotion to the truth, affection for their fellow-men, etc., all the elements of a priestly official are imparted and developed. Hence two things necessarily follow: First, these purified ones are, through Redemptive grace and power actually experienced, bound to the King with a love so devoted and intense, so supreme and overwhelming that the interests and glory of the Church and State united in the Theocracy are perfectly safe in their hands. And second, they, like the High-Priest Himself, become sympathetic priests. Their past experience, indebtedness and elevation by grace, completeness in Christ, etc., all tend to make them specially accessible to the nations, and to cause them to manifest a deep interest in the welfare and happiness of all.*

Obs. 13. This priesthood is, therefore, destined to be, what those called strive after now, "a holy priesthood." This firmly cements the Theocratic ordering together into an enduring and perpetual Kingdom, seeing that its officials, perfected in holiness, are thus completely consecrated to God and His service. Holiness is the distinguishing characteristic of them, and is suggested, in view of the promises and duties associated with it, by the name. The priesthood is not given to persons liable to pervert or abuse the law itself, but to holy ones who honor and exalt the law.*

Obs. 14. This priesthood elevates humanity. How this is done by the High-Priest is shown under Prop. 204. The exaltation of the Redeemed to such nearness and association with Him in His offices and authority, evinces the highest position to which humanity can attain, and when the honors and dignities of kingship and priesthood are once enjoyed this will be witnessed and

acknowledged.*

Obs. 15. These priests are designed to bless the nations, for this is one of the objects of the Theocracy. (Comp. preced. Prop. Obs. 11.) Considering the beings to whom this is intrusted, with power to enforce and love to extend the same, nothing can be better adapted to secure the grand result intended.*

Obs. 16. These priests, being all “baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire” (See Prop. 171), are endowed with supernatural powers. Hence, now enabled to perform “the greater works” promised, they are admirably adapted by sympathy and ample power to minister to the wants, necessities, etc., of the nations, and to materially aid their Master in mitigating and removing the curse as the Theocratic dominion extends itself. It is not mere imagination to suppose that they will visit, and lay hands upon, the sick and dying, that they will dry up tears of anguish and grief, that they will administer comfort, consolation, mercy, and hope.

Obs. 17. Being glorified, fashioned after Christ, made “equal unto the angels,” neither space nor physical obstructions can prevent their ministrations. Having “spiritual bodies” (i.e. bodies subject to the will of the Spirit) they can assume visibility or invisibility, they can visit with ease and celerity through great distances, at pleasure. Thus endowed, they can (as Peter, etc.) discern the very heart, the requirements, the necessities of their subjects. Thus pressing want can never be concealed from them, worth can never remain unrecognized by them, and deception can never be practised upon them.*

Obs. 18. Hence it follows, that this priesthood, in a glorified condition, is entirely free from the trials and difficulties, the weakness and embarrassments, the temptations and errors incident to a present ministry. Specially under the Spirit, it is most reasonable to anticipate it as a most eloquent, powerful, and successful priesthood, who, with glorified tongues and sanctified hearts, with Christ-like power and authority, and imbued with love, wisdom, fervor, faithfulness, and holiness, will so present the will of the Father and Son that the hearts of countless multitudes will joyfully respond to it.

Obs. 19. This priesthood demands no personal sacrifices. Thanks to God, these are only preparatory. The terrible sacrifices, under persecution, bigotry, hatred, envy, malice, for the sake of the truth; the tears, the groans, the suffering, the blood, the life offered in behalf of duty and the welfare of others, are then things of the past. Blessing, happiness, fulness of joy, pleasures forevermore, are ever connected with it, and instead of being a source of sorrow or a burden, it is a source of never-ending gladness and an “eternal weight of glory.” What an encouragement to our weakness and feebleness now!

Obs. 20. Writers on the ancient priesthood inform us that they were “the literati,” “the learned,” “sages and professors,” “the chief instruments of a continuing and progressive mental, moral, and religious culture.” This will be eminently true of these priests, as indicated by intimations of increased knowledge, by their glorified condition, by their union with the Christ, and by their official station. Through them the nations of the earth may anticipate the most wonderful accessions to learning and knowledge of all kinds, because specially under the influence and guidance of the Spirit of Wisdom.

Obs. 21. This priesthood, as well as the kingship, shows that God in the Coming Kingdom has something for His saints to perform. Idleness and selfishness enfeeble and degrade; activity and imparting to others are elevating and joy-producing. It will still, then, be true, that “it is more blessed to give than to receive.” To be made instrumental of doing good to others is Christ-like, God-like. And this activity in honor of God, in behalf of others, in joyfulness to ourselves, is unceasing. Being glorified, there is no need of recuperation to remove fatigue or weakness, and, therefore, as expressive both of a constant activity and a never-decaying vigor, they are represented, e.g. as serving God “day and night” (Rev. 7:15–17).*

Obs. 22. These priests have no family connections, no private interests, no attachments to tribe or nation, no earthly relations of any nature which can interfere with their official position. Hence an exclusive devotedness to the interests of the Theocratic King and Kingdom must be predicated of them.

Obs. 23. This priesthood and their services indicates the spirituality of this Kingdom. The spiritual and the temporal, the heavenly and the earthly, the glorified and unglorified are combined in a Theocracy. The union of Church and State under such a leadership in behalf of the redemption of the race, plainly evidences this feature. The objection, therefore, urged against our view that we ignore the spiritual is easily set aside, seeing that with a glorified High-Priest and associated Priests the highest spirituality must result from the Theocratic ordering.*

Obs. 24. This priesthood, elect, tried, holy, etc., form one body with Christ. Now there is a lack of unity; diversity, and even antagonism, exists. The history of the past ministry records the sad story of divisions, proscriptions, excommunications, etc., among them. But now under this arrangement all this ceases, for these priests are all actuated by the same spirit, interest, and principle. Then the prayer of the Saviour respecting a oneness will be fully and amply realized; not merely exhibited by fraternal regards, but openly manifested in the one, exclusive Theocratic ordering. (Comp. Prop. 184.)*

Obs. 25. This priesthood will undoubtedly exhibit the praises of God and His Christ by singing and music. They enter into this Theocratic Kingdom “with singing” (Isa. 35:10), and in it they continue to sing (Rev. 5:8–10) as “kings and priests,” and this praise is

represented as exciting that of others (Ps. 66:1, 2, 3, 4). Music accompanies them, as the mention of harps suggests. Indeed the sublimest singing is exclusive and pertains to the 144,000 (Rev. 14:3). Music and singing has charmed, comforted, cheered, and elevated the soul; in mortal hands it has inspired devotion, thrilled the heart, aroused the deepest feelings, etc. What will it be in glorified hands, and coming from glorified lips! “Having the harps of God” (Rev. 15:2) and singing “the new song” (Rev. 14:3), “the song of Moses” and “the song of the Lamb,” indicative of redemption and its glories, the highest efforts of the past will be but feeble—mere child’s play—in comparison with the exquisite skill, enchanting voices, and tender, ennobling, sublime utterances of these harpers and singers.*

Obs. 26. The ancient priests were to be free from all bodily blemish. Religious purity was allied with physical purity. So it will be again, for these priests have their “vile body” “fashioned like unto His glorious body” (Phil. 3:21). Their personal appearance, beautiful and splendid, will accord with their official position. Even the clothing, the adornments, the fine vesture of the ancient priests were significant, and, we can readily believe in view of the intimations and promises, that these priests will be clad in a royal, magnificent manner, as evidencing their high station, and as impressing visibly their authority upon the nations. As Jesus the Messiah is represented in His glorified condition, so His associated priests will likewise appear, even to the raiment.

Obs. 27. The vast number of the priests, represented as an immense multitude, indicates both the majesty of the Theocratic King and the extent of His dominion. The number and splendor of officials, connected with earthly courts and surroundings, has much to do to elevate them in human estimation. The majesty of the Theocracy, the powerful and extensive, world-wide dominion, is exhibited most impressively to the nations by the number of the glorified priests. Just as an earthly court of eminent, wise, talented, and powerful persons aids in glorifying an earthly King, so the appearance, ability, character, etc., of a host of such materially assists to convey an idea of the grandeur of our King.*

Obs. 28. God’s equity is vindicated in that these priests officiate here on this earth, where they endured temptation, suffering, and trial. Here where they fought the good fight of faith, they become triumphant priests, thus following in the Master’s path (comp. Prop. 84). This increases their interest in the redemption of the world, when visiting the very places where their prayers ascended, their tears fell, and their labors were sustained.*

Obs. 29. This priesthood is perpetual. The Kingdom inherited is ever-enduring (Prop. 159), the kingship is perpetual, and the priesthood is inseparably united to both of these. Again, being co-heirs of Jesus, and His priesthood being a continuous one (Prop. 155), the saints necessarily are ever priests with Him. The perpetuity of such a high honor and dignity is a strong element of happiness; when once gained, nothing can deprive us of it, for it is an eternal possession; and, as shown already, no pressing of feeble old age, or sickness entailed, can cause its being surrendered to some youthful or more vigorous successor.

Obs. 30. The associations of such priests, their loving fellowship, must be a source of constant and growing pleasure. Composed of the noblest of earth, embracing the most eminent and faithful, intercourse with each other in duty or pleasure, in praise or social converse, in study or visitation, in public or private, must be, in the nature of the case, a delightful element of priestly happiness. Especially ravishing when among them we find formerly loved and dear ones, now clad with such dignity.

Obs. 31. This priesthood corroborates the first dominion, the pre-eminence, the supremacy of the Jewish nation (Prop. 114). For, being grafted in, and become part of, the elect nation, they now, being glorified, raised to irresistible power, and exalted with David’s Son “the King of the Jews,” materially assist in elevating the nation to its predicted position, and in bringing to it the glory promised.

PROPOSITION 157. This doctrine of the Kingdom enforces the future ministration of angels.

Believers now by faith come “to an innumerable company of angels” (Heb. 12:22, or “to myriads of angels in an assembly or joyful convocation,” Barnes, Com. loci). These angels were employed preparatory to the Theocracy, at the introduction of the Theocracy, etc., and it is most reasonable to believe, as taught, that they will continue to be interested in, and engaged in behalf of, the Theocracy when gloriously restored.*

Obs. 1. The supremacy and exaltation of Jesus, the Christ, over all angels (Col. 1:16; Eph. 1:21; 1 Pet. 3:22), their attendance on and service to Him at the First Advent (Luke 2:9–14; Matt. 4:11; Luke 22:43, etc.), their deep interest in things pertaining to Him (e.g. Eph. 3:10, 11; 1 Pet. 1:12, etc.), their connection with the events of the Sec. Advent (Matt. 16:21; Luke 12:8, 9, etc.), their worship of Him (Heb. 1:6; Rev. 5:11, 12), His power over them (Matt. 26:51, 52; Heb. 1:4, etc.)—these, as well as other considerations, show that at the restoration of the Theocracy, the Messiah shall swell His glory by that of the angelic host. Now let the student but observe the relationship that “the first-born,” “the first-fruits” sustain to Christ, and he will clearly see that this body obtain, in virtue of their union with Jesus as co heirs, a power over angels.*

Obs. 2. In the future will be verified Christ’s promise to Nathaniel, Jno. 1:51, “Verily, verily I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see

heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.” The futurity is evidenced, not simply from the fact that the past has never witnessed such a fulfilment, but by the “hereafter” and the “Son of man” referring to the period of the Sec. Advent, as seen in Luke 22:69, and Matt. 26:64. The evidence of its certainty (to which assurance the repeated “verily” points) is given in the assurance that it shall be openly manifested that others shall be witness of it. This wonderful commingling (foreshadowed by Jacob’s dream, Gen. 28:12) of the heavenly host with the Son of man and His associates in their glory, implies a continued ministration. It is not reasonable to suppose that angels who ministered to Jesus (Matt. 2:13, 19 and 28:2, 5; Acts 1:10, 11, etc.) and saints (Heb. 1:14; Gen. 24:40, etc.) on earth while suffering, who ever exhibited a deep and abiding interest in their welfare and in the progress of redemption, should cease to manifest interest and association when salvation is completed. We are assured of the contrary, e.g. in Rev. 5:11, 12; Luke 12:8, 9; Rev. 3:5. It is this manifestation, openly expressed, that forms an important feature in the glory of “the Christ;” and hence He refers to it as such, Matt. 16:21 and 25:31, 32; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26. The Theocratic ordering is not only honored but evidenced by such an association. The angelic ministration witnesses to the fact that “the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them.”

Obs. 3. Angels represented as the highest and noblest of beings, having access to the presence (“face”) of God, care for believers (Matt. 18:10) and, in virtue of the present and future of the repenting one, rejoice at the conversion of the sinner (Luke 15:10); they witness the struggles of our pilgrimage (1 Tim. 5:21; 1 Cor. 4:9 and 11:10), and they are fellow-servants of the prophets and apostles as manifested in their employment for the good of God’s people, and in bringing directions and revelations of God’s will (Gen. 19:15, 19 and 22:11; Acts 5:19, 20; Dan. 8:17, 19; Acts 8:26 and 10:3, etc.). In the very nature of the case, beings so exalted and personally employed in aiding in the developments of the Divine Plan relating to the Theocracy under Jesus and in securing its ultimate realization (e.g. Dan. 10:11–12; Zech. 1:9, 12, 14, 19 and 2:3, etc.; Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2; Rev. 1:1, etc.) must rejoice with great joy in the grand result obtained through Jesus’ sufferings, death, resurrection, and exaltation. It is then fitting that they should be present at Christ’s Coming, and that ascriptions of praise and honor to the King of kings should be given by them, seeing rebellion to God crushed, an entailed curse repealed, children of God resurrected, glorified, and exalted, the race itself redeemed, and a pure Theocratic government, with its inestimable blessings, inaugurated. Their holiness, wisdom, station, love to God and Christ—all must thus inspire them—an inspiration continuous and ever present.

Obs. 4. To be “as the angels of God in heaven” (Matt. 22:30), or to be “equal unto the angels” (Luke 20:36) may, as the context seems to indicate, only refer to the mode of existence (i.e. in reference to marriage, happiness, and immortality), but there is one passage which distinctly teaches a certain pre-eminency over, at least, some of the angels. In 1 Cor. 6:3 we read: “Know ye not that we shall judge angels?” which evidently means ruling over angels, just as “Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?” indicates clearly a ruling over the world. This is seen by a reference to Props. 133, 134, and 154, where the meaning of judging is given in detail. Now, such a governing power, bestowed in view of associated Rulership or Kingship with Jesus, is undoubtedly exercised in behalf of the administrations of the Theocratic Kingdom, and, consequently, must minister to the good, directly or indirectly, of its rulers or subjects. The realization can alone teach us the extent and the results of such a judging.

Obs. 5. In Dan. 10:13, 20; Heb. 2:5 it is intimated that angels are concerned in the present government of the world. Whatever views (Commentaries loci) are entertained respecting the exertion of their power, it is generally admitted that in some form or other they can exert, as thus taught, an influence favorable or unfavorable to nations as well as to individuals. Such a view is in sympathy with the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty, and, so long as the restored Theocratic Kingdom has not appeared, is in accord with the spirit and intent of the dispensations. But when the restored Theocracy under Jesus and His brethren appears, then the complete sovereignty under the whole heaven (Dan. 7:27) is given to them, and dominion over nations and individuals is exerted by them. This the predicted reign of “the Christ” and saints again and again emphatically declares, so that the angelic agency that may have been exerted in the past in national counsels and national movements is superseded (Heb. 2:5) by a direct visible agency exerted by Jesus and His body. But such angelic presiding over nations, even by “the chief princes,” only indicates how interested the angelic host must be in the development of the ultimate deliverance of the nations from the bondage under which they groan. The past agency insures a continued interest, and such sympathy and aid as may be in accordance with the Theocratic ordering.*

Obs. 6. One of the blessed ingredients of future happiness and glory will be the intercourse of the glorified saints with the angelic host. This will prove a never-ending source of blissful enjoyment. To converse with those who witnessed creation, who have been the trusted messengers of God in countless missions of mercy and love, who for ages have had the honor and glory of God at heart, who are so exalted in knowledge, wisdom, and power—this will be a privilege indeed. To familiarly associate with such beings, to visit with them earth or heaven, to be united with them in the strongest ties of a common devotion and communion, to interchange experiences of the past and present, etc., all this is an honor exceedingly great—such as never was found in the most splendid of earthly courts.

The Millennial predictions are descriptions of this restored Theocracy under David's Son. This has been abundantly shown under previous propositions. This Kingdom being overthrown, the throne and Kingdom of David being still desolate, the postponement of its restoration being fully stated and witnessed down to the present day, the events immediately connected with its restoration not having occurred, for these and other reasons the Millennial predictions necessarily relate to the future.*

Obs. 1. Hence the doctrine of the Kingdom refutes the theory of those who locate the Mill. era in the past. Grotius, Prideaux, Lightfoot, Brightman, Usher, Turretin (the elder), Ewald, Bush, Stuart, Davidson, and some others, hold to this theory. It has been so ably refuted by Shimeall (*I Will Come Again*) and others, including many of those who have written against us (as e.g. Brown, Fairbairn, etc.), that it is unnecessary to repeat the arguments. It may, however, be observed that their systems containing their views of the Kingdom led to some such departure, owing to the impossibility—without gross inconsistency—of reconciling a literal resurrection, the reign, etc., with their notion of the Kingdom. Surprise, too, is allowable in seeing able and talented men take a view which, one (Bush) of them himself admits, at first appears “revolting” (and hence has been but little followed). Telling us that in the plain grammatical sense there has been no fulfilment; that to find a fulfilment the prophecies must be spiritualized or curtailed or shorn of their alleged “Oriental imagery;” that the language and ideas are “too Jewish” to suit the enlightened condition and circumstances of a Christian dispensation, and hence must be rejected or some other meaning be engrafted thereupon, these persons take the most exalted Millennial descriptions, and force them, against express language and the facts of history, into the past history of the Church and as thus already fulfilled. Surely when such violence is done, that the mixed, often persecuted, sorely tried, often relapsed and struggling condition of the Church can be made to cover Millennial prophecy; that a period of time, at the pleasure of the interpreter, can be separated from the Millennial predictions of Daniel, Isaiah, etc.; that an era of promised happiness and reigning can be converted into one of severe trial to accommodate a theory; that characters, to say the least, very suspicious are elevated (as e.g. Constantine) into the predicted Saviour of the Church; that a period festering with heresies, intolerance, bigotry, superstitions, relic worship, etc., is the blessed Kingdom—these things are amply sufficient to evince the utter untenableness of such a theory. The Kingdom predicted by the prophets presents entirely different and most glorious aspects from those given to us by Eccl. History. The latter is a sad commentary on human frailty and depravity, while the former is a triumph of humanity made strong under the supervision and leadership of David's Son and Lord.*

Obs. 2. This doctrine also disproves the theory of those (as e.g. some R. Cath. Theologians and others, who simply regard the Millennial prophecies as a portraiture of this dispensation past, present, and future. The same reasons alleged against the view under Obs. 1, will apply here; and we may add several more which are opposed to both these opinions. It is taken for granted that this dispensation is equivalent to “the times of the Gentiles.” But as many writers have clearly shown, they widely differ, seeing that “the times of the Gentiles” extend back into the Mosaic dispensation from the time of the overthrow of the Kingdom and the captivity of the Jews, being a phrase denoting the period of Gentile domination, while, on the other hand, this dispensation can only be dated from what followed the First Advent. By this identification and union of things that differ, they hope to get rid of “the Jewish” aspect of the Kingdom and show that the Millennial predictions describe “the times of the Gentiles,” when the real truth in the case is, that the Millennial portrayals represent the Millennium to commence, the Kingdom to be established, at the very time that the “Gentile Times” come to an end (Prop. 164). Indeed, it is impossible for the Kingdom to come so long as Jerusalem is trodden down by the Gentiles (Props. 66, 112, 122, etc.). The process in this dispensation of engrafting Gentiles does not make it a Gentile dispensation, for the Jews enjoy precisely the same privileges of the Gospel and Church that the Gentiles do; the invitation and blessings are common to all, and it becomes a dispensation of grace to us Gentiles in that the adoption of Gentiles is so accessible under it. Again, it is supposed that this dispensation embraces the Millennial era as part of it, on the ground that the Church is the Kingdom, and will develop itself into the stage indicated under the Millennium. But we have shown at length (Props. 88–102) that the Church cannot possibly be the Kingdom, being opposed alike to covenant, promises based on the covenant, predictions of the prophets, and by the lack of everything that is essential to the promised Theocratic Kingdom. Besides this, having proven the undoubted postponement (Props. 57–68 and 94) of the Kingdom, the mixed condition and continued trial of the Church to the end of this age, the fact that the Kingdom as predicted is linked with the Second Advent, the ushering in of another era or dispensation after the Sec. Coming of Christ distinctively called “the Day of the Lord Jesus,” and numerous other particulars, all showing that this dispensation is not the predicted one in which Jesus and His saints reign in the manner indicated by prophets, it produces an evident antagonism in Scripture to fasten upon it such an opinion, and it leads to many embarrassing and really (under its direction) unanswerable objections from unbelievers, which the current apologetics but lamely meets.*

Obs. 3. The line of argument already adduced adequately meets all other opposing theories respecting the Millennium. Totally to ignore the Millennial era, to pass it by in silence, or to ascribe it to a human origin, is either to manifest disrespect to the Spirit. who has so largely dealt in it and makes it the culminating point of Redemption, or to deny that the Word is given by Divine inspiration. Transplanting the Millennial blessedness into the third heaven is so gross a violation of the entire tenor of Scripture, which locates it here on the earth, that very few have ventured to advocate it. Making some particular Church organization or association of belief or form of doctrine the fulfilment of the crowning excellency of Millennial prophecy, is so palpable a caricature of them that it is a matter of amazement that most amiable and learned men have given their influence in disseminating it. Ascribing only to Mill. prophecies

the inherent desires of the soul after deliverance, and which will be realized in the natural development of humanity, is both to lower the origin of those prophecies and to advocate a manner of realization beyond the power of a corrupted humanity. Locating the Millennium in the future, but spiritualizing its predictions (i.e. after the grammatical sense is ascertained to add to it another and alleged higher sense), is to leave its manner of verification to the caprice or imagination of the interpreter; to destroy the Divine unity of the Word by changing, modifying, reconstructing, and adding to covenant and prophetic phraseology; to set aside, as unworthy of fulfilment, the oath-bound covenant promises of God, and to deny to David's Son, the Son of man, the throne and Kingdom specially and gloriously covenanted to Him. Such "hypotheses" respecting the Millennium are purely of human origin and, according to our detailed argument based step by step on Scripture, have no foundation in the Word. They may, therefore, in the abundance of proof presented against them in our various propositions, be dismissed with the remark, that such a variety of them and the prevailing extent to which they are advocated (intrenched in the churches with able men as their advocates) is necessary to meet the predictions of the times just preceding the ushering in of the Millennial era which are characterized (Props. 174, 177, 178) as pervaded with unbelief concerning the Coming and Kingdom of the Lord Christ. For such a result to be produced, to bend the thinking and believing of the multitude into such a condition of disbelief, necessarily (unless we greatly underrate the intelligence of man) requires the aid and labors of sincere, pious, and learned men, and the dissemination of various and antagonistic views. Alas! the obscuration of truth, the darkening of the most precious covenanted promises under the leading influence of "philosophy falsely so called," the humiliating form in which so many alleged defences of the early Church appear, the removal of the ancient landmarks of a grammatical interpretation and the substitution of others to suit the Spirit of the age—these things surely indicate that we even have been under the shadow of an already commenced and continuing eclipse. If wise to enter into and receive the spirit of prophecy relating to these things; if observant of what occurs around us just as predicted, we will be slow to receive theories which in their very tendency pave the way for men to undergo the severe trial yet in store for the Church and world.

Obs. 4. Our opponents even claim for their denial of a Millennium proper that such is "the Church doctrine." Thus, e.g. the Princeton Review (Ap. 1850, p. 330, etc.), in opposing Rev. Imbrie's Millenarian Sermon, "The Kingdom of God," virtually re-adopts the Popish view, viz., that there is no Millennium in the future, saying "there is to be no such Millennium as is assumed by the advocates of the other theories to be predicted"—"it is not assumed (i.e. by himself) that there is to be any Millennium strictly speaking." But then the writer explains: "The glowing passages which are referred by some to the period of Christ's personal reign, and by others to a spiritual Millennium, are, according to this view, to be understood of the state of things after the final consummation" (i.e. are to be located to a period after the last resurrection, final judgment, etc.). And this he calls "the Church doctrine," a doctrine utterly unknown to the Primitive Church for several centuries, and repudiated by a host of the ablest expositors and theologians; and which in the form given is really held by very few Protestants. The Princeton Review simply revives Burnet's "Theory," which locates the Millennium—against the express order of the Apoc. and the analogy of Scripture—after the general judgment, engrafting the same on the Popish view, so that what cannot be appropriated to this dispensation is conveniently, without regard to context, turned over to this consummation."*

Obs. 5. Against all theories which locate the Mill. age (the thousand years) in the past or present, or after the last resurrection, it is sufficient to point out, what every able commentator of the Apoc. concedes, viz., that the distinctive thousand years of Rev. 20 follow after the seven seals, seven trumpets and seven vials; after a certain harvest and vintage; after a particular Advent and conflict; after a complete overthrow of Antichristian enemies; after a binding of Satan; and then after the supremacy and ruling of saints it is followed by "a little season" witnessing a remarkable but futile outburst of enmity; and then, and only then, after the thousand years are ended comes the last resurrection and the entrance into the eternal ages. No such order, no such events have been witnessed in the past or present, and by the very nature of the predictions, interposing time and, events, cannot be transposed to the eternal state. Simple unity, justice to the order laid down, demands that Rev. 20:1–6 should be regarded as a distinctive period, that of the binding of Satan, after which he is released and the events follow which precede the consummation of the last resurrection and judgment. No Bible reader who simply follows the order laid down can mistake the plainness of prediction.*

Obs. 6. The Millennial period is inseparably connected with the restoration of the Jews (which the restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom absolutely demands—see Props. 111, 112, 113, 114). The prophecies, the covenant, the restitution, all require this as a preliminary. Millennial blessedness without the cessation of Jewish tribulation and the elevation of that nation to its predicted supremacy, is something unknown to the Scriptures. Hence this simple distinctive point is itself sufficient to crush opposing theories which contradict it.*

PROPOSITION 159. This Theocratic Kingdom of the Lord Jesus, the Christ, will never come to an end.

It is asserted by some (as e.g. Calvin, Insti., B. 3, ch. 25) that our doctrine limits the reign of Christ only to the one thousand years. This is incorrect. While some Millenarians explain the "delivering up of the Kingdom" somewhat similar to our opposers, yet even nearly all—if not all—of these, as far as we have any knowledge of their writings, affirm that Jesus continues to reign in the same

Kingdom, subordinately to the Father, after the close of the thousand years. The reasons for the perpetuity of the Christ's Kingdom will now be presented, and the only passage that seems to militate against it will be examined.*

Obs. 1. While the words "eternal," "everlasting," "forever," are sometimes employed to denote limited duration (i.e. duration adapted to the nature of the thing of which it is affirmed), yet such words applied to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ cannot be thus restricted, because an unending duration intended by them is stated in explanatory phraseology (as e.g. Luke 1:3 "of His Kingdom there shall be no end," etc.). The thousand years are specifically mentioned as the period of Satan's binding and of the time existing between the two resurrections, and of this era it is also asserted that Christ and His saints reign. The declaration of their reigning during this period does not limit the reign to it, but is added to indicate that the reign is already commenced and extends through this Millenary age. Jesus is not merely the king of "an age" but of "the ages" (1 Tim. 1:17 Greek), and His Kingdom is united, not merely to "an age," but to "the age of ages" or "eternal ages," thus indicating its extension onward through the vast succession of time in unending series. Hence the perpetuity of the Kingdom is freely declared in 2 Sam. 7:16; Heb. 1:8; Luke 1:32, 33; Rev. 11:15; Isa. 9:7; 2 Pet. 1:11, etc., and this is explained, Dan. 2:44, to be "a Kingdom that shall never be destroyed," and in Dan. 7:14, "His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and His Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Indeed, so expressive are these and kindred passages that even those who advocate a transfer of the Kingdom to the Father and some kind of an ending of the Kingdom, are still forced, by their weight and concurrence, unhesitatingly to acknowledge, in some form (as Barnes, etc.) "the perpetuity of Christ's Kingdom and His eternal reign." Hence this reign, beginning at the Millennial era, is not terminated by the close of the thousand years. The idea of the perpetuity of Christ's reign was so generally diffused in the early Church, that we even find it in the Sibylline Oracles (B. 3) "the Holy King of all the earth shall come, who shall wield the sceptre during all the ages of swiftly moving time," etc.

Obs. 2. But in the Proposition it is stated that the Theocratic Kingdom of Jesus Christ shall not end. This is an important point, and deserves, for the sake of the honor and glory pertaining to Jesus, the Christ, careful consideration; especially as we are forced to differ from a multitude of expositors on this subject. Let the reader turn to the covenant which bestows this Kingdom upon Jesus, to the prophets which describe it, and the Bible (unless it be one solitary passage which will be duly examined) only recognizes one Kingdom, this Theocratic one, which pertains to Jesus, the Christ. And what is more to the purpose, the declarations of perpetuity, of never ending, of never being destroyed, etc. are all predicated of this identical Kingdom and not (as some unwarrantably affirm) of another one. If there is any force or propriety in language, this is most positively asserted, confirming and enforcing various propositions given relating to this Kingdom. It shows that the Kingdom described by Daniel, Isaiah, David, John, and others, when once established under the Messiah, is a perpetual, ever-enduring one, extending into eternity. Linked and identified as it is with restitution, with the new heaven and new earth, with the New Jerusalem state, etc., it possesses within itself the elements (saying nothing of the immortal King and associated rulers) of perpetuity. It is significant that the apostles adopt the Jewish phraseology, speaking of the perpetuity of the Messianic reign and Kingdom, without giving the least intimation of a change in meaning. The character, person, offices, position, in brief, all pertaining to the Messiah, as David's Son, once obtained by Him are appropriately represented as belonging to Him evermore. The inheritance given to Him as David's Son; the reward bestowed upon Him as such is never given up by Him, or withdrawn from Him. To say that David's Son will ever occupy a lower, subsidiary position, or that He will yield up His inheritance or dominion given to Him as "The Christ," is to contradict numerous prophecies and promises, which, while giving an extended detail of the Messianic Kingdom, always describe it as perpetual, never-ending. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for this Theocratic throne is declared to be both the throne of the Father and the Son—this has been repeatedly noticed—the fundamental idea of a Theocracy embracing the oneness of the Father and David's Son when acting in the capacity of an earthly Ruler. Hence much that has been assumed and written respecting the supposed differences of thrones in "the delivering up of the Kingdom," is based on a total misapprehension of the facts as they pertain to the Messianic throne. The prophets and apostles always recognize this Theocratic feature, and speak of the throne either as the Messiah's, or as God's, or as the Father's, or as Father's and Son's together; and the conception of the Theocratic idea in all its comprehensiveness indicates that it is the Divine purpose evermore to exercise the Rulership of a God over the whole earth in and through the Person, the glorified humanity, of the Lord Jesus and His associated brethren. The honor belonging to the distinctive Christ is never lessened or altered. Hence, in view of the general statements of the Word respecting the perpetuity of the Kingdom of the Christ and the evermore distinctive inheritance, honor, and glory of the God-man, the Theocratic King, it is painful to read the utterances of able and eminent men who, hampered by one text, override a multitude of others, and persist in dethroning "The Christ," as Christ—in having the covenanted King David's Son to yield up His throne and dominion (to the Father, as if it were not already the Father's in the highest sense), and then, on the other side, hampered by the texts indicative of the perpetuity of the Kingdom, they endeavor to reconcile their theory by a still more unwarranted procedure, viz., by dividing the Christ, and conjecturing that "Christ in His Divine nature, as God, shall never cease to reign." The humanity is thus set aside (see below), and it is not "The Christ"—God-man and Theocratic King—that reigns, but only a part of the Christ—that is, the Divine. Now, any theory, no matter from what source, that is driven to such a division of Christ and such a withdrawal from Him of the specifically bestowed honors, etc., is most certainly defective. For those nice distinctions which theologians have introduced by which the Messiah is made to transfer His Kingdom—to abdicate the Theocratic throne, i.e. the Davidic—and yet, after all, to reserve in some form, with the loss of the reign and dominion of the God-man Jesus Christ, a kingly

position is utterly unknown to the Scriptures. It virtually reduces the matter to this: That the Messiah yields up His inheritance and Kingdom promised to Him forever, and that He rules no longer as Jesus Christ, but only as God. Surely a doctrine so pregnant in results, which merges the humanity into Deity, takes away from Jesus, David's Son, that which Holy Writ ascribes to Him for all succeeding ages, ought to be well founded, most plainly taught.

Obs. 3. There is only one passage in Scripture which is supposed to teach the yielding up or ending of the distinctive Messianic Kingdom, viz., 1 Cor. 15:27, 28. Whatever view is engrafted upon or derived from these verses, nearly all (excepting those which utterly degrade Christ, and hence are unworthy of notice) admit, whatever delivering up is intended, that Jesus Christ still reigns, either as God, the humanity being subordinate, or as God-man deprived of His dominion and occupying a lower station, etc. Neander (His. Plant. Ch. Church, vol. 1, p. 529) more cautiously than many, says: "The Kingdom of Christ in its peculiar" (i.e. mediatorial) "form will come to an end, when it has attained this object, when, through the efficiency of the glorified Christ, the Kingdom of God has no more opposition to encounter, and will no longer need a Redeemer and Mediator." "The Mediatorial Kingdom of God will then merge into the immediatorial, such is the declaration of Paul in 1 Cor. 15:24–28." (Comp., however, his utterance, Prop. 49, Obs. 7, Note 1). Lange (Com. Matt. 3:1–12, doctrinal), more unguardedly, remarks: "At last when the Kingdom of God shall have been perfected, it will also have reached its full and final development, and be ripe for self-annihilation which awaits it," thus, as he explains, giving place to a Kingdom of glory. Barnes (Com. loci) incautiously says: "It means the Incarnate Son, the Mediator, the man that was born and that was raised from the dead and to whom this wide dominion had been given, should resign that dominion, and that the government should be re-assumed by the Divinity as God." Stephenson (The Atonement) makes Christ reigning first as "an independent King" and afterward as "a subordinate King." Thus David's Son, who is One with the Father, actually as Theocratic King seated on the Davidic throne adopted and incorporated by the Father as His throne, is made to yield up a throne and dominion which in many other places is pronounced—in view of this very relationship to the Father—never ending. Can there be a contradiction between Scripture such as these interpretations present? After careful consideration of the various passages directly bearing upon the subject, we unhesitatingly—in the name and for the sake of David's Son—answer, that it does not exist saving in the interpretations thus attached to it. In giving our reasons for no such antagonism, let the reader notice, that we do not present our criticisms, or those of persons favorable to Millenarianism, lest we might be chargeable with seeking out an accommodation for our doctrinal position. Instead of urging our own views of the passage in question, it is sufficient to let others specify them and thus indicate the wonderful harmony preserved in Holy Writ. In the phrase, "then cometh the end," we are not concerned in accepting of the interpretation of many critics, who, connecting the word translated "end" with the idea of the order of resurrection, render it "the last," viz., the last band, i.e. the rest of the dead. If this is discarded as untenable, then the idea of Barnes, etc., may be adopted, viz., of consummation, termination or limit, or that of Prof. Bush, who says that the true sense is more nearly allied to perfection or consummation than termination, imputing ultimate issue, perfect accomplishment. On the next phrase, "when He shall have delivered up the Kingdom," etc., eminent critics, such as Storr, Bush, and others, have declared that the nominative of the verb translated "shall have delivered up" is not Christ, as our translators (Eng. version) supposed, and, therefore, that the Kingdom delivered up is not Christ's. They affirm that this is an instance of a "common scriptural idiom in which the verb is used without any personal nominative, but has reference to the purpose of God elsewhere expressed in His Word," giving the rule and adducing examples of this idiom both from the Old and New Testaments (see e.g., Bush's *Anatasis*, p. 376 and 377). They make the following paraphrastic translation: "Then cometh the end (the grand consummation), when the prophetic announcement of the Scriptures require the delivering up (making over) of all adverse dominion into the hands of God or the Godhead (the Father and the Son conjointly) to whose unrivalled supremacy everything is to be made finally subject." Or, "Then cometh the end, when by the announced purpose of God in the Scripture, the Kingdom or Kingship, hitherto usurped by the rulers of this world, is made over to its rightful Divine Proprietor." It would be too lengthy to assign all the reasons and the examples assigned for such a rendering, and the reader is referred to the works which give them in detail. Barnes, who is inclined to the common view, adds it briefly to his comments, and speaks favorably of it. The phrase, "for He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet," does not limit—as is shown by examples (Bush, etc.) of Scripture phraseology and the admissions of all that some kind of a reign continues—the reign of Christ. The 28th verse, "And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all." In the reasoning of the apostle he had just replied to an objection that might be alleged, that if Christ has "all things" put under Him, His supremacy might exceed that of the Father, by saying that "He is excepted which did put all things under Him," and, in consequence, it follows, as an inevitable result, that if the Father is excepted and has put all things under the God-man Jesus Christ, He will retain His pre-eminence and that Christ is still sub-ordinate, even after He has acquired His greatest power and glory in His Kingdom. Bush well observes: "A delegated authority necessarily implies a supremacy to him who conferred it. This is undoubtedly the force of the original (τὸτε καὶ) 'then also' i.e. then, just as now—which the rendering of the common translation entirely fails to represent." "As Christ, in the great mediatorial scheme, now holds a place inferior to the Father, so, notwithstanding all the grandeur and glory that is predicted to accrue to Him from the final subjection of His enemies, He is still ordained to occupy that subordinate station." Storr and others explain the 28th verse as follows: The adverbs τὸν and τὸτε being regarded as influenced by the word translated "shall be subject" not as a future of time, but merely as a logical future denoting an inference, the verse is correspondingly rendered: "Since (τὸν), therefore, all things have been (by a Divine decree) put under Him, it will follow (τὸτε) that the Son Himself is or is to be, subject to Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."

Having thus hastily passed over the passage, giving the impartial, unbiassed views of Post and Anti-Millenarians, instead of finding it, as alleged, teaching the ending of the Kingdom, it stands in harmony with the prophetic announcements proclaiming the perpetuity of the Kingdom. In the language of Van Valkenburg (Bib. Repos., vol. 2, "Essay on Duration of Christ's Kingdom"), "As the Father was excepted when all things were put under the Son, so also shall He be excepted when all things are subdued unto Him. It appears, then, that this passage does not even intimate that there will ever be a termination of Christ's Kingdom, or that He will ever deliver up His Kingdom to the Father. The dominion shall indeed be rescued from His enemies, and restored to the Godhead, but not in any such sense, but that His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and that of His Kingdom there shall be no end." Storr (Diss. on Kingdom) takes the ground that "the government which it is said, verse 24, He shall restore to God, even the Father, must not be supposed to mean Christ's government, but that of every opposing power, which is evidently declared to be destroyed, that the power may be restored to God"—adding truly and most forcibly (as our Propositions abundantly prove) "the government is restored to God when it is restored to Christ." Thus the passage is made by them to be in accord with Rev. 11:15, "The Kingdoms (or Sovereignty) of this world are become the Kingdoms (or Sovereignty) of our Lord and Christ," and when this is done, Father and Son united in this Theocratic ordering and Personage, "He shall reign forever and ever." It is the fulfilment of Dan. 7 and other predictions, from which we learn that the Father gives Him dominion, that He exerts it until all His enemies are subdued, and reigns with acknowledged supremacy (subordinate as this passage teaches in His God-man rulership to One only) over all the earth. One thing must be self evident to the believer, that this passage, so difficult of interpretation (universally so acknowledged), ought not to be pressed against the testimony of a multitude of other passages, either to the separation of the Christ, or to the removal of His distinctive kingship as the Christ, or to the diminishing of any honor, etc., conferred upon Him. The honor of both the Father and the Son are identified with the perpetuity of this Theocratic Kingdom, for it is just as much the Father's Kingdom as it is the Son's—the most perfect union existing between them constituting a Oneness in rule and dominion.

PROPOSITION 160. This Kingdom is set up in the divided state of the Roman Empire.

This has already been intimated under Prop. 104, Obs. 2, etc., but being an important landmark in the comprehension of prophecy, attention is again called to it in this form. The depressed condition of God's people, the overthrow or withdrawal of the Theocracy is limited by the continuance of the four great Gentile monarchies or empires, which run a predetermined period, called by way of significance and identity "the times of the Gentiles" (a phrase which in itself duly considered is hostile to the notion of the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom).*

Obs. 1. Without repeating the reasoning elsewhere given, it is sufficient to say that this Kingdom, according to Daniel 7, is received by the Son of man after the Fourth Beast or Roman Empire is divided; after the rise of the ten horns and little horn, and at the very time that the judgments of God are to be poured out upon the divided Empire. The First Advent took place when the Empire was consolidated, the Second will occur when it is divided into its ten-toed form; for the smiting is upon the feet of the image, the reception and inheriting of the Kingdom is after the saints have long suffered from the arrogance, etc., of the powers arising out of this Empire, and these powers are to meet an awful infliction of tribulation.*

Obs. 2. Hence, it is a matter of importance to trace the Roman history as a confirmation of our faith. Generally it is supposed, with the exception of a few scholars, that the Roman Empire is something that existed long ago and with whose history—saving as it may illustrate the past and afford lessons for the future, we have no personal interest. This is a mistake, as prophecy itself indicates. Let us receive the impartial teachings of historians and writers, who had no reference to prophecy when giving their historical statements, and see how wonderfully the Spirit foresaw and described the course of events long before Romulus was in existence. The Roman Empire when divided into its Eastern and Western divisions, and when ruled over by several emperors conjointly, was still regarded as one great whole. Many writers have taken it for granted that when the Western head fell in the person of Augustulus (deposed about A.D. 476), the Roman Empire became entirely extinct in the West. But history rejects such a conclusion, seeing that the Roman Senate acknowledged the emperorship of Zeno at Constantinople, declaring that "the Majesty of a sole monarch is sufficient to pervade and to protect at the same time both the East and the West," etc. (Gibbon's Decl. and Fall, ch. 37). The West on various occasions, in the most public manner, received the decrees, etc., of the emperor at Constantinople, as those of their lawful ruler. Having consented (so Gibbon) "in their own name (i.e. the Senate's) and in the name of the people, that the seat of universal empire shall be transferred from Rome to Constantinople." It is unnecessary to add proof to that which history has made so plain. Attention is called to two facts—that, as predicted, the Empire, regarded (as Faber has so well established) as a unit in law, but beginning to feel the weight of its greatness and extension, was ruled over by several emperors at the same time; and that the privileges of Rome had been extended over the whole Empire, so that Paul, though a native of Tarsus, was born a Roman. Another fact must also be noticed, viz., that to constitute a person a Roman emperor it was not requisite that he should have the seat of power at Rome. This was abundantly shown in the emperors ruling at Constantinople, Antioch, etc., and especially in Diocletian making Nicomedia his Capitol. It has been supposed, and to some extent correctly, that a connection in some form or other (publicly or privately, i.e. acknowledged or allowed) with Rome is requisite to form a Roman emperorship, but this even was not an

indispensable requirement, as is seen in the case of the Eastern emperors, who finally lost all jurisdiction over Rome, and in that of some of the associated emperors who had no power or control at Rome. Prophecy itself intimates as much by assuring us that the Empire, once consolidated, shall become internally, politically, divided, losing much of its cohesion and strength. Before the Eastern emperorship fell (1453) the Western was revived in the person of Charlemagne (800), so that for a number of centuries two emperors of the Roman Empire existed, one in the East and the other in the West. As this is a matter of importance in tracing the fulfilment of prophecy and in evidencing our prophetic position, some remarks, for the general reader, are appropriate to show that Charlemagne was regarded a Roman emperor. So fully is this exhibited in history that we find it stated by numerous writers. Thus e.g. Machiavelli (*His. of Florence*, B. 1., ch. 3) has, speaking of Charlemagne, "the Pope and the people of Rome made him emperor, and thus Rome began to have an Emperor of the West." Ordericus Vitalis (*Eccl. His.*, B. 1, ch. 24) says: "Thus, in the fifth year of Pope Leo, which corresponds with the year 808 of the incarnation of our Lord, King Charlemagne became the eighty-third emperor from Augustus, and the Romans proclaimed him by that august name." James (*His. of Charlemagne*, p. 362, 3) remarks that he was crowned and saluted with the imperial salutations: "Long life and victory to Charles Augustus, crowned by God great and pacific Emperor of the Romans," that he was adored by the Pope "according to the forms employed toward the Cæsars (attested by Eginhard, Annalles and all the other Annals). From that hour the titles both of king and of patrician were laid aside, and the monarch of the Franks became the Emperor of the Romans. Thenceforward his coins were inscribed with his new dignity, and his acts were dated from the years of his Empire." Representations of those medals are given by various writers with the legend "Renovatio Imperii," "the revival of the Empire." Bower (*His. of the Popes*, Leo III.) gives a very clear statement of the transaction drawn from the Annalists, who, as also Sigonius, etc., call it a revival of the Western emperorship. Baronius, Bellarmine, and others, have noticed this bestowal of the emperorship upon Charlemagne by the Pope as an instance of the supreme power vested in the Pope over all kingdoms, alleging that this was a translation or transferring of the Imperial dignity from the East to the West, but this assumption, made only to exalt the Papacy, is disproven by all history. For there was no deposition of Irene (who then ruled in the East); the people and senate of Rome participated in the bestowal of the dignity (a number of writers, twenty, according to Du Pin, Bower's *His. of the Popes*, vol. 2, p. 179, do not even mention the Pope); and the subjection of the Pope, and acknowledgments made of the same, to the emperors, evidence the contrary. Indeed, ample proof is found in the embassies and communications which passed between the Western and Eastern Emperors that no such translation was intended, but that the Imperial dignity was allowed to both divisions. Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, ch. 49) relates the coronation scene; describes the extent of Charlemagne's dominions; informs us how he was styled "the sole and supreme Emperor of the West;" how he called the emperor at Constantinople by the "familiar appellation of brother;" how a treaty of peace and alliance was concluded between the East and West, the East acknowledging "the august Charlemagne" to be "the Basileus and Emperor of the Romans." It is sufficient, for our argument, that the acknowledgment was thus made, the insolence, pride, claims, concessions, etc., of after history amounting to nothing, being only what ought to be expected from the weakened and divided state of the Empire. Eginhard (quoted by Bowers, vol. 2, p. 187) asserts that one of the articles of peace included "that the Greeks should acknowledge Charlemagne for Emperor of the West, and allow him that title." Thus we have the Western Emperorship revived in the person of Charlemagne. In the division of the dominions of Charlemagne, history declares that this Imperial dignity was held by the Chief of Germany, having also sway over Rome, whose title was that of "Emperor of the Romans" (designated "Kaiser" or "Cæsar"), and whose Empire was officially styled "the Holy Roman Empire." The coronation of some of those emperors at Rome (as e.g. Otho, A.D. 962), the allegiance of Italy and Rome (Gibbon, vol. 5, p. 56 and 58), the letters addressed by these Roman emperors to others, the official acts as "Emperor of the Romans," prove that it was regarded as a real, vital succession. The incidental references (as e.g. in Luther's celebrated Appeal to his Imperial Majesty, etc., see D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, vol. 2, p. 93, in Dante's *Inferno*, in the Vision of Charles the Bald in *Chron. of St. Denis*, etc.) of the universal feeling on the subject are multitudinous, and the self-identification of these Emperors as the actual successors of the "very Augustus" (employed in letters) appears in the most unexpected manner, as e.g. in the remarkable letter of "Frederick, Emperor of the Romans, to Saladin, ruler of the Saracens" (*Annals of Roger De Hoveden*, vol. 2, p. 100–2). Frederick, in his capacity of successor, speaks of "our dictator, Marcus Crassus" The quarrels and struggles between these emperors and the Pope, between them and disaffected portions of their dominions, etc., accords with the delineations of prophecy, as e.g. Dan. 2:41, 22, 43, and does not interfere with the fact that the Roman Empire, enfeebled as it was (and sometimes faintly manifested by weak monarchs), was still represented by a "German Cæsar," chosen by an electoral College (Gibbon, vol. 5, p. 70). Thus, when the Eastern part of the Empire was everthrown in 1453, the Western still survived and continued down uninterruptedly until 1806, to the abdication of Francis II. Francis, forced to it by his disasters, renounced the long-held Roman emperorship; and Alison (*His. of Europe*, vol. 5, p. 690) gives his language as follows: "Being convinced of the impossibility of discharging any longer the duties which the Imperial throne imposed upon us, we owe it to our principles to abdicate a crown, which could have no value in our eyes when we were unable to discharge its duties and deserve the confidence of the princes, electors of the Empire. Therefore it is, that, considering the bonds which unite us to the Empire as dissolved by the Confederation of the Rhine, we renounce the Imperial crown, and, by these presents, absolve the electors, princes, and States, members of the Supreme Tribunal, and other magistrates, from the duties which unite them to us as their legal chief." Here, then, we have a continuous headship of the Roman Empire existing from the days of Augustus down to A.D. 1806, and in connection with it, descended also from the divided state of the Empire, the Papacy with its claims Empire derived. The divided condition of the Empire has been with prophetic writers the chief object of notice—many writers, as Bh. Newton, etc., endeavoring to make out precisely the number of ten kingdoms—while the fact

that a headship of the Empire existing has been too much ignored.

Obs. 3. It would be well if the Church, until a better explanation is given, would carefully note the interpretation presented by G. S. Faber in his *Revival of the French Emperorship*. In tracing the Roman emperorship from Francis II. he is supported both by prophecy and historical fact, and in continuation of the subject we will incorporate his view for the information and consideration of the reader. Turning to Rev. 17:9–12 we have a delineation of the civil polity (heads) of the same fourth beast (so numerous commentators and writers) described by Daniel 7. The Revelation speaks of seven forms of government that should exist, and as a source of identification informs us that five of those heads “are fallen,” which writers agree in deriving from Roman history (Livy, Tacitus, etc.) as follows: (1) Kings, (2) Consuls, (3) Dictators, (4) Decemvirs, (5) Military Tribunes. Then John tells us “one is,” i.e., that one form of the government was then existing. Now this sixth head of which the prophet speaks, is the Roman emperorship which, as we have seen under Obs. 2, continued uninterruptedly from the time of John down to Francis II. If there is force in historical facts and in the revival of the emperorship in the Western part of the Empire before the Eastern was overthrown, then Faber’s position that this emperorship continuously existed down to the abdication of Francis II. is impregnable. Therefore the sixth head that John described can only be followed by the seventh head after the abdication of Francis II. In 1804, two years before the sixth head fell, Napoleon proclaimed the emperorship of the French, and annexed Rome and the Roman States to his dominions. To confirm his power he was crowned an Imperial head, not only at Paris, but had the Pope brought to assist at his coronation. It was this head, in some respects separate and distinct from the sixth head, which caused the abdication of Francis II. This influenced Faber and others to regard it as the seventh head which was to come after the sixth one. The apparent confirmation by its being short lived “and when he cometh, he must continue but a short time” (for the Napoleonic dynasty in the person of the First Napoleon only lasted about eleven years),” and by its being “slain by the sword of military violence” (so Faber explains Rev. 13:3 in connection) led Father in 1818 to suggest that the Napoleonic dynasty being the seventh head, Rev. 17:11 plainly called for its revival. This opinion was based (1) on the alleged fact of its being the seventh head; (2) that the beast, employing the necessary figure, is represented, being headless for a time, to re-exist, i.e. receiving a renewed polity; (3) and this revived polity is to be of the seventh, and yet in some respects an eighth, head. The revival of the Napoleonic dynasty in the person of Napoleon III. was, at least, a remarkable fulfilment of Faber’s deductions. It is to be regretted that some persons, with the best of intentions overlooking the fact of a head being a dynasty and may thus embrace a succession of individuals, persistently applied Faber’s view to the individual person Napoleon III., and that Faber’s application of the same to the French emperorship was also changed by the American Publishers (Appletons) into “Napoleon III., the man of Prophecy.” This and the death of Napoleon III. has caused many persons to discard Faber’s theory, forgetting that, as he himself expressly guarded it, the head is not necessarily limited to one person, but may embrace a succession, and hence should not thus be limited without express warrant either from prophecy or the proper development of the Antichrist in him. We thus direct attention to his theory, which seems to be correct down to Francis II. It is asserted three several times, as if calling special attention to it, that the beast was to exist, i.e. have a head or political chief, then it was to cease to exist, i.e. have no such a head, and then it was to again exist, i.e. obtain such a head. In Faber’s view, the non-existence of the beast cannot be established until after the overthrow of the Napoleonic dynasty, making the beast twice headless, viz., between Napoleon I. and Napoleon III. and since the downfall of the latter. So that the overthrow of the dynasty, instead of militating against Faber’s view, really establishes it, seeing that our attention is specifically called to this very headless condition of the beast as something which we are to expect. But the real question to decide, after all, is this: Was the Napoleonic dynasty really a seventh head? In some respects it might be deemed such, but in others it seems impossible to concede it such a place, for it was regarded by the actors in it as a revival or return to Charlemagne’s Imperial state (so Napoleon himself speaks of “Charlemagne, Emperor of the French and our august predecessor” in the 19th vol. of *Cor., Eclectic*, vol. 5, No. 1), and, as Faber himself states, it was not a violation of unity in law for the Empire to have several emperors. Another objection is, that this Napoleonic head arose before the other fell, while the impression—not decided, it is true—made by the prediction is that these heads are to follow in succession. Again, the history of Napoleon III. indicates that he was completely patterning after Napoleon I., was identically in all respects the same head, and hence could not be called an eighth. This is seen in all the official acts, and was acknowledged by himself and the nation. Now, both these persons regarded themselves (and it seems proper that the Spirit of prophecy should designate the parties intended according to their own estimation of regal position) as regular successors to the Cæsars in the line of Charlemagne and his successors. Even admitting (which may be true) that Napoleon I. was a distinct seventh head, it does not follow that Napoleon III. was the eighth. The prophecy would then only await the revival of the French emperorship and its claims to Cæsarship, to make it of the seventh, and yet some remarkable traits superadded which would so distinguish it as to make it an eighth. But if the Napoleonic dynasty is only a continuation of the sixth Imperial head with an interval, then this seventh head is still future, and from Rev. 17:8, 11 is identified with a period of time (such as now exists) when the beast is headless, i.e. follows it. The student of prophecy is therefore reminded that this very predicted headless state of the beast (so discouraging to some) is a decided attestation to the truth, and a warning to us that it will result either in the rise of the seventh head to which the eighth is attached or to the revival of the seventh head with the same result. Prudence dictates that we do not dogmatically express ourselves on such points, but that we seek light from all directions and ponder well the interpretations and hints given, and see how they will correspond with the development of history. Faber’s view respecting the sixth head is firmly established down to Francis II.; how much more we can receive will be determined when the beast again exists—for that it will again live is clearly proclaimed. Because the Empire does not now exist with a head,

multitudes suppose that it is entirely perished (forgetting the imperial spirit and advocacy within its population and the maintenance of its ancient laws, etc.); but the Word informs us that we must not allow ourselves to be thus deceived, that headless as it may be for some time, yet the elements of the body remain, and that it shall again be resuscitated, and in its final aspect form a fearful and most powerful confederation against the truth.

Obs. 4. It is in the divided state of the Roman Empire that we are to find it, for a time, headless, i.e. without a leading civil, imperial form of government. It could not be under the sixth head which, as we have seen, was continuous down to 1806, and if, as we suspect, it includes the Imperial Napoleonic, down to very recent times. It is headless now, no one distinctively claiming to be the Imperial head of the Empire. But this, according to prophecy, cannot remain thus; a head will be formed and be recognized as that associated with and swaying rule over the Empire. When the Kingdom of the Messiah is to be manifested, the prophets teach that this Roman Empire is to exist in its broken, divided form and yet sufficiently united under the leadership of the last head of the same to form a most powerful combination against the true believers. Hence the efforts made in some directions to find the Antichrist (i.e. the one who shall wage war against the Lamb, Rev. 19) outside of the Roman Empire as e.g. Russia, Babylon in Asia, Mahomedanism, etc., is utterly opposed to the fundamental requirements of prophecy. Prophecy describes the Fourth Empire; runs it down consecutively to the time of the end; portrays its commingling of weakness and strength after its division; informs us that out of it shall arise the last confederation against Christ; associates the head of the last combination with this same identical beast or Empire; and thus fixes our attention, not to outside nations or governments, but to the Empire itself for the rise, progress, and terrible career of the last head. Every effort to call away the attention of believers from the Roman to some other power as the head around whom the Antichristian forces shall gather, is in so far a departure from the plain truth, no matter how plausibly represented or ingeniously portrayed. On this point we must come back to the position universally occupied by the early Church, viz., that the Antichristian power, the last head of the beast, the oppressing power which shall culminate just previous to the establishment of Messiah's Kingdom and the ushering in of the Millennial age, must arise in, and be fully identified with, the Roman Empire. This belief, entertained by the churches established by the apostles, has its firm and immovable basis in Dan., chs. 2 and 7—in Rev. 17, etc. This faith, entertained by believing Jew and Gentile, is evidently also one that the inspired apostles fully indorsed, as seen in the Revelator John enlarging upon Daniel's Fourth Empire and in the universality of belief which can only be appropriately accounted for on the ground that it was sustained by the private (public being avoided for prudential reasons) instruction of the apostles and elders. Hence correctly, the deduction was made that the Roman Empire in some form or other would exist down to the end of this age, and that its close would be followed by the universal Empire of the Messiah. So deep was this feeling that Tertullian (Apology, Sec. 32) gives as a reason why they pray for the stability of the Empire: "For we know that a mighty shock impending over the whole earth—in fact, the very end of all things, threatening dreadful woes—is only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman Empire"

Obs. 5. To indicate this perpetuation of the Roman Empire, we will present, in the briefest manner compatible with clearness, an outline of a portion of Daniel, chs. 11 and 12, leaving the reader to supply the details. Expositors generally agreeing down to the 31st verse of ch. 11, we will begin with the same, giving a running commentary. First, however, it may be said that the opinion held by some that Antiochus Epiphanes is still the subject of prediction, is, aside from reasons given by Bh. Newton, refuted by the simple facts that the power delineated in the following verses endures down to the time of the end, to the period of the restoration of God's people and the resurrection of His saints in which Daniel is promised to participate Prop. 126. In view of the history of the past and the still delayed resurrection of the saints, it is easy for us to see that the ancient opinion that these verses apply to the power which is to develop the Antichrist is the correct one. Nearly all admit that in verse 30 the Romans are introduced in the phrase "For the ships of Chittim shall come against him," and the view of Sir I. Newton, Bh. Newton, and many others, that in verse 31, the Romans are re-introduced and form the subject of the prophecy is evidently the correct interpretation, because in this way a harmony is affected between this and other predictions. The transition from the Greeks to the Romans becomes the more apparent by the remarkable fulfilment of the outlines here given. Without following particularly any writer, the interpretation that history affords seems to be something like this: v. 31, "And after him arms shall stand up" (the translation of the Newtons, Faber, etc.); that is, after Antiochus, a great military power shall possess the ascendancy, which was the Roman. "And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength;" history testifies to such a profaning and razing of the temple by them, etc. "And they shall take away the daily sacrifice;" which was done effectually by the destruction of the temple. "And they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate;" now, whatever the meaning to be attached to this disputed phrase, the reader is requested to notice that Jesus, Matt. 24:15 (against the Antiochian theory), places this to occur after His First Advent, the Spirit thus giving us an additional reason for applying it to the Romans. Some refer this to the idolatrous Roman ensigns, others to the building of the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus, etc.; but noticing the widely differing renderings in versions, etc., the idea conveyed by the phrase seems rather to be, that "the bestial" power that maketh desolate shall be firmly planted in the conquered city and country, productive of great misery. V. 32, "And such as do wickedly against the Covenant, shall be corrupt by flatteries;" let the reader notice that Jerusalem being now destroyed, etc., the Christian Church, God's people, are now alluded to, and it is a historical fact that the Roman emperors in various ways endeavored to seduce believers from their faith in the covenant promises of God, and we have reason to believe, in too many instances, with success. Newton and others tell us that many apostatized. "But the people that do know their God shall be strong and do;" that is,

such shall perform their allotted work, being strong and heroic in faith, unseducible, they shall proclaim the Gospel to the saving of them that believe. V. 33, "And they that understand among the people shall instruct many;" which is fulfilled in the remarkable and extensive success of the early preaching of the Gospel in all parts of the Empire and even beyond it. "Yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil many days;" which was fearfully verified by passing through repeated persecutions, extending more or less over a period of nearly three hundred years. V. 34, "Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help;" history informs us (1) that the Christians were driven to great extremities by the persecutions heaped upon them; (2) that in this crisis help was extended by the accession of Constantine, by which the general persecutions ceased; (3) it was "little help," for while stopping the persecutions of paganism, it paved the way for others, in his intolerant edicts, perversion of Christianity, introducing the hierarchy, in the acts of himself and successors. "But many shall cleave unto them with flatteries;" which was verified in the multitudes of Pagans that were brought into nominal Christianity by the hope of honor, emoluments, etc., so that some in the Church were alarmed at the flood of worldliness poured in upon them. V. 35, "And some of them of understanding shall fall;" this may denote that some of the pious, resisting the introduction of those evils, were persecuted and crushed, some even being put to death. Examples of this kind are not of a rare occurrence at this period. Or, it may mean that some of the pious shall be so deluded by this external prosperity—shall be so controlled by the splendor of the civil power professedly enlisted in behalf of Christianity, that they shall fall, i.e. yield up their principles and adopt those introduced, as witnessed in the pomp of worship, image worship, introduction of new doctrines, etc. And, if the reader carefully notices the next verse, he will find that the prophet, having directed attention to the times following Constantine, now describes this to be virtually the condition of the true Church down "to the time of the end;" that is, some shall fall, either being seduced by prosperity or being persecuted. For it is added: "To try them, and to purge and to make them white, even to the time of the end, because it is yet for a time appointed;" the Church is to be tried and tested, is a fighting, struggling Church, down to the time of the end. It is the language applied to the saints who endure temptation and fight the good fight of faith. Having described the condition of the Church, the prophet returns to the Roman power. V. 36, "And the king shall do according to his will;" that is, shall be absolute. "And he shall exalt himself," in extension of dominion, conduct, etc.; "And magnify himself above every god," if the word "god" means (so some) king or ruler, then he shall magnify himself above all kings, as evinced in the titles and conduct of the emperors, or, if it denotes objects of worship, then the fulfilment would be found in the control of worship, direction of doctrine (as in Imperial decrees of Constantine and successors), assumptions of authority, and in crushing opposition to ecclesiastical encroachments, etc. "And he shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods;" as in the amazing assumptions of authority over the consciences of subjects in public decrees, in sustaining the pretensions of the papacy, in persecuting believers, in ascribing divinity to itself, in doing great wickedness under the garb of religion. "And shall prosper until the indignation is accomplished;" that is, this Roman power shall exist more or less flourishing during a period of time in which the anger of God is manifested toward a people. Now, we learn that this people upon whom God's indignation is poured out is the Jewish nation—the Theocracy being overthrown and Gentile domination allowed for a certain period. This elect nation is under God's indignation (Prop. 57, etc.), and here it is said that this Roman power shall remain in existence until (Ch. 12:7) the time has arrived for the withdrawal of the same, thus corresponding with various other predictions. Hence (1) this power exists so long as the Jewish nation is scattered; (2) it is instrumental in oppressing Jews; (3) it will resist Jewish restoration under its Theocratic king; (4) when this power is utterly destroyed the Jews will be completely restored; (5) in some form or other it is a leading power in the times of the Gentiles, but its prosperity will suddenly end when these times are expired. This also shows how mistaken those are who find a fulfilment of this prophecy before the Christian era. "For that that is determined shall be done." V. 37, "Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers;" fulfilled in the change of the Empire, against the efforts of the Pagans, in its religion—really such a change that Paganism—the god of the fathers—was obliterated. "Nor the desire of woman," This last clause is much disputed, and it is difficult indeed to decide upon a definite meaning. Some (as Faber, Elliot, Smith) make it to denote Christ, He being the object of desire of Hebrew women. This, perhaps, is scarcely its meaning, but, if so, would evince, what we have already stated, a disregard to the paramount authority, etc., of Christ. Others (as Bh. Newton, etc.) think it denotes discouraging of marriage, which would find a verification in the repeal of the laws (Julian and Papian) encouraging marriage by Constantine, the veneration of monastic life, celibacy, etc. Others (as Stäudlin, etc.) interpret it as meaning cruel, i.e. disregarding the tears of women, or (as Bertholdt) would not spare little children, the object of a mother's love, or (as Jerome) would be Justful, licentious, etc., all of which would find ample fulfilment in the history of this power. "Nor regard any god, for He shall magnify Himself above all;" see v. 36, the reader noticing also that as the Spirit takes into view this gigantic power as one whole, some of this exaltation or magnifying is still for the future to manifest. V. 38, "But in his estate shall he honor the god of forces." Critics find the phrase, "the god of forces," the most difficult in the prophecy, and some versions, unable to give a meaning, retain the original. It has been rendered "God of forces," "the strong god," "god of fastnesses or fortresses," "god protectors or tutelar gods," etc. The idea, as all admit, that this "god" is one of power, having force or ability to exert in protection or sustaining, etc., is very evident, and a clew is given to its character, etc., by the next verse, in which it is called "a strange god." Let history in its indisputable facts tell us of the only "god" or ruler that was venerated and adored by the Roman power during this period, and the answer is, the Pope, who was acknowledged the Spiritual Head, having the keys of heaven and hell, who was called the vicegerent of God on earth, who was so adored that even his foot was kissed by emperors. This "god" also sustained the Imperial power in its crowning, blessings, decrees, etc., and when, in antagonism at times with it, exhibited itself as a formidable power, able, upon several occasions, to depose and bestow the crown. If Bh. Newton's rendering (see his Diss. on Proph.) is correct, that the word "forces" denotes "protectors," then there would be an allusion to the worship of

saints and images as "protectors." The relationship that the Papacy sustained to the Empire is here briefly but distinctively expressed corresponding to past history. "But in his estate shall be honor," etc.; Gesenius, Luther, De Wette, etc., suppose this to mean, "But in his place or stead he shall honor;" if so, then it would denote that the Pope shall be adored or honored in the place of the former gods of the Roman power. Barnes and others think that the idea of base or foundation is conveyed, so that it may denote "in his foundation," i.e. in his throne, by civil power shall he honor this god. If this should be the meaning, then again is it fully verified in the imperial decrees by which the Papacy was exalted, the supremacy given to the Bishop of Rome, in the grants of territory and civil power, and in the supports often tendered to it by the emperors. The notion of being firmly established and highly honored by Imperial patronage is the one conveyed. "And a god whom his fathers knew not;" that is, the ancient Imperial power was not cognizant of this Papal power, for it was to arise, being distinct from anything that had preceded, in the course of its history. Brief as the description is, yet how applicable. "Shall he honor with gold, with silver, and with precious stones, and with pleasant things;" the student need scarcely be reminded that the enormous wealth of the Papacy, in every age, has been drawn from the patronage of this Roman power through grants, gifts, taxes, legacies, indulgences, revenues, endowments, etc. The riches of Rome, the seat of the Papacy, during the past centuries has been notorious, and the source from whence derived is equally well known. V. 39, "Thus shall he do in the most strongholds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory;" which may denote that in all parts of his dominion, including his strongholds, this god should be honored, or, that under the auspices, aid, etc., of this god he should take strongholds. Critics are divided as to its meaning, but either one or the other would find ample fulfillment in the Papacy. Bishop Newton's translation (Diss.) brings out the idea that the defenders or abettors of this god, he (the Roman power) shall honor with the god; so also Mede's rendering and others'. "And he shall cause them to rule over many;" that is, the aiders, upholders of this god, shall be also honored with power over others, as exemplified abundantly in the priesthood, bishops, archbishops, etc., of the Papacy. "And shall divide the land for gain;" among these Papal officials, as witnessed in the bishoprics, dioceses, etc., in the bestowment of special grants, church lands, endowments, etc. Indeed, so much was this the case, that the power and wealth thus obtained became a serious embarrassment to nations, and led to great contests. V. 40, "And at the time of the end." The prophet having given a rapid but distinctive description of the Papacy, its union with this Roman power, etc., now turns to the time of the end, viz., to the closing scenes of this Gentile denomination, to the period when this Roman power, notwithstanding its greatness, shall come to an end. This that follows, then, wholly relates to the future, being yet unfulfilled. The Roman Empire in its divided form still exists in the spirit and principles avowed (and while it is for the present headless, yet this is particularly predicted as something that shall come to pass, so that we are cautioned not to be misled by its headless condition), and this god, the Papacy, also exists and still is honored, more or less, by the adherents and advocates of Imperialism. Our attention is pointedly called, to avoid all mistake, to the time of the end, the closing period of this gigantic power, viz., to the time of the last head of this power, described in other prophecies as the fourth beast in the long-continued succession of Gentile rule. In the interpretation that follows, the conjectures or suppositions that appear the best supported by the text are only given. "Shall the King of the South push at him?" Much depends upon the locality where the revived head will be restored; if in France, then Spain, Italy, etc., might form the King of the South; if in Austria, then Italy, etc., might be the power denoted, or, as some do, Egypt, Turkey, etc., may be denoted. In fact, the power here predicted may or may not be in existence at present, and relatively to the locality or seat of the last head of the beast is a "King of the South." "And the King of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships;" that is, this Roman power will also be attacked by some king or power located toward the North, as, e.g. England, Germany, or Russia. While mere conjecture can only be presented, yet the "many ships" indicate a power possessing a navy. "And he shall enter into the countries"—this is perhaps the clause which has caused the greatest difficulty to critics, owing to the sudden transition from one person to another. If we were to confine ourselves to this prophecy, it would be impossible from the language to decide what king this was that is to enter into the countries; whether the King of the North, or of the South, or of the Roman Empire, but we are not left to conjecture upon this point. The king who is thus victorious at the time of the end we find in Dan. 2 and 7 and Rev. 17 to be identified with the fourth beast, the Roman power. Taking other prophecies as interpreters, it refers to the Roman power under its last head, who shall invade other countries, thus implying that the King of the South and the King of the North have been unsuccessful against him. What countries these are, time must reveal, but the language impresses the idea of conquest, for it is added, "And shall overflow and pass over;" beating down all resistance and obtaining the victory. V. 41, "He shall enter also the glorious land;" this land ancients and moderns have, almost universally, applied to Palestine. This corresponds with Zech. 14; Joel 3; Rev. 14:20, etc., which all agree (see e.g. comparison of Faber, Diss. on Proph., vol. 2, ch. 11, sec. 3) in placing the overthrow of the last great power in connection with his entrance into Palestine and subjugation of the same. "And many countries shall be overthrown;" the word "countries" is supplied by the translators; it may refer to countries, cities, places, forces, etc., evincing that his course would be a devastating, victorious one. "But these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon;" whether the countries geographically known as such, or whether those are figurative appellations for other countries that shall escape, is difficult to decide. Yet, if the former, the student may find a reason for their escaping in Prop. 184, in the extraordinary proceedings that will at that time be inaugurated at Mt. Sinai. V. 42, "He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries," or "send forth" (so Luther, and marg.); occupying the position of conqueror, perhaps by levying heavy taxes, or by sending forth forces to countries not immediately in his course. "And the land of Egypt shall not escape, but he shall have power over the treasures of gold, and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt, and the Libyans and Ethiopians shall be at his steps." The course of this power in its career of conquest seems to be this: after enduring a struggle

with the King of the South and the King of the North, he invades the countries, passing on to Turkey and into Palestine, and from thence into Egypt, obtaining the wealth of the country augmented by those who fled there before his invasion. From Egypt he returns to Palestine, the extent of his conquests being intimated by the Libyans and Ethiopians (see Barnes, loci) attending him. V. 44, "But tidings out of the East and the North shall trouble him;" what those tidings are it is impossible to tell, but that they are in some way related to the Jews (Mede, Faber, and many others) is reasonable, for the tidings bring him back to Palestine. What portion of the North is meant, whether, as some, England, or, as others, Russia, or, some other country, it is impracticable to say, but the tidings from the East can be more definitely fixed. If the reader turns to Prop. 166, where it is alleged that the formative, introductory movement of the Theocracy is initiated at Mount Sinai, just at this period, he will see abundant reason for tidings directly East from him (for he is in Egypt when they arrive) to reach him which, owing to their remarkable nature, are sufficient to "trouble him." Taking the period of time denoted and the prophecies relating to it in consideration, there can be no doubt but that the question of the restoration of the Jewish nation and the re-establishment of the Theocracy at Jerusalem is involved. The last head of the Roman power is to have possession of Palestine at the time of the restoration (and, as some Jews have, perhaps through his instrumentality, been put in possession of Jerusalem), he returns to Palestine to fight against Jerusalem, as e.g., Zech. 14:1, 2, a revolt from some cause having taken place after his departure to Egypt. "Therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many;" the tidings enrage him to make a war of extermination, and it is well to notice, as Bh. Newton, Faber and numerous writers have observed, that as the original of "utterly to make away many" signifies to anathematize, to consecrate, to devote to utter perdition," it strongly implies that this war shall be prosecuted on the account of religion, and that religion is in some way related to it. This supposition is supported and confirmed by the fact that this beast under his last head is represented as finally making war against the Lamb, etc. V. 45, "And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas in the glorious holy mountain;" his royal tents shall be planted, not only at Jerusalem, between the Mediterranean and Dead seas, but in Jerusalem (for "the city shall be taken," Zech. 14:2) and on Mount Zion. "Yet he shall come to his end;" that is, shall be overcome and destroyed. The manner in, and the instrumentalities by, which this is to be accomplished are succinctly stated in other prophecies, as, e.g., Zech. 14; Rev. 19; Dan. 7, etc. "And none shall help him;" his destruction is certain and without reparation. Ch. 12:1, "And at that time;" the reader will observe the intimate connection that the following sustains to the manifestation of the last head of the Roman power in Palestine. "Shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people?" It is not in our province to discuss the question concerning Michael, some contending that an Archangel is denoted, specially devoted to and intrusted with the interests of the Jewish nation, while others believe that the Messiah is thus designated, and still others that Michael is named here as the guardian angel of the nation who will be associated with Christ. Taking the several prophecies relating to this period, it is not very material to decide such a question, the main, leading, and important particular being the great results that are to be affected by the Christ or His agents. One thing, however, must not be overlooked, viz., that this interference is made in behalf of the Jewish nation, whose extremity—the closing act of their long-continued tribulation—is great, as seen in Zech. 14:2. "And there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time;" that is, a time of unprecedented trouble. According to Mathew, Mark, and Luke, our Saviour predicted the trouble befalling the Jewish nation at the destruction and continued down-trodden condition of the city and nation until it culminates at this very period, being at this crisis "the time of Jacob's trouble," Jer. 30:6–9. But great as this is, owing to its long continuance, long-borne calamities, its climax under this Roman power, it is as nothing compared with that which the vengeance of God shall pour out upon the vast confederation of Gentile nations found arrayed against Jerusalem and His people. If there is a prophetic truth distinctly taught, it is the one that as and after the Jewish tribulation closes, then a most fearful season of trial, indignation, and woe will befall the Gentiles (see Prop. 162). "And at that time thy people shall be delivered;" that is, notwithstanding the greatness of this Roman power and the extremity to which it shall reduce the Jewish nation, that nation, Daniel's people, shall be delivered. But let the reader keep in mind our Props. relative to the election of this people and how the Gentiles by faith are engrafted into that elect people, and he will at once be prepared for what follows: viz., that at the glorious restoration of the nation under the Theocratic ordering predicted, the time has also arrived for the resurrection, not only of the Jews, but also of the engrafted believers—all God's people—to participate in the blessings and glory of the Messiah's reign. Hence in the following verses the resurrection is predicted, for which see Prop. 126, our purpose now only being to show that the Roman power will exist in its last form, a destructive force, down to the end of this age, and will only be removed when the Advent of Christ, the resurrection of the saints, and the ushering in of the Theocratic Kingdom has come. To indicate that the series of predictions run down, past our time, into the future, the most solemn assurance is given, Ch. 12:7 "when He shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." The Jewish tribulation is not yet finished; the nation is still scattered; the capitol is still trodden down; the times of the Gentiles still endure; and while this lasts we must still look for the fulfilling of what is thus predicted, with the experience attached Ch. 12:10.

Obs. 6. The same feature, viz., the continuation of the Roman power to the time of the end, is contained in the now largely received interpretation of the seventy weeks of Daniel. If we are to accept of the explanation of those weeks (Dan. 9:24–27), as given by Dr. Burgh, Sir Denny, Tregelles, Kelsall, Maitland, B. W. Newton, Strange, Taunton, Guinness, McCausland, Parker, Bickersteth, Birks, Seiss, Brookes, Baxter, etc. (and as intimated by ancients, as Irenæus, Hippolytus, Julius Africanus, Victorinus, Apollinarius, Primasius, etc.), then it is self-evident that the Roman power continues to exist down to the final and complete deliverance of the Jewish nation at the Second Advent. The scheme as presented is, at least, worthy of due consideration from the prophetic student.

It has been well observed by various writers that if the seventy weeks are to end with the death of Christ and the incoming destruction of Jerusalem, it is simply impossible—with all ingenuity expended in this direction by eminent men—to make out an accurate fulfilment of prophecy from the dates given, for the time usually adduced being either too long to fit with the crucifixion of Christ or too short to extend to the destruction of Jerusalem. That, and that alone, which seems to meet the difficulty, is to allow, that the Spirit when He comes to a certain period, introducing the Roman power, separates a portion of those seventy weeks from the rest, because of the rejection of Christ by the Jewish nation and the domination of the Gentile power. But, that the reader may obtain a clear idea of the matter, we present in the briefest form a running comment upon Dan. 9:24–27, given without reference to those authors just named, but corresponding accurately with, and adding to, the position assumed by them. Before proceeding, attention is called to Daniel's prayer, which was for the restoration of the nation and city and the introduction of the promised blessings of the prophets. Barnes and others tell us that the answer to his prayer is not direct, that instead of being told of the restoration of the nation, etc., he is informed of the First Advent of the Messiah, the closing of the temple service, and a more enduring destruction of the temple, city, etc. We take the ground, that as Daniel's prayer included a complete and final deliverance of his people and a continued (as previously predicted) restoration to their land, God answers Daniel according to the spirit and intent of his prayer. For the partial restoration from Babylon which followed does not, as history proves, meet the scope of Daniel's prayer as derived from previous prophecies, or even those given by himself in Chs. 2 and 7. Hence in a special revelation, the restoration from Babylon—which never fulfilled the magnificent predictions pertaining to the Jewish nation—is rapidly passed by, and the mind of Daniel is directed to several great events that must first transpire before (so implied, seeing that the fulfilment of the prophecies is taken for granted) the prayer of Daniel in its fulness could be realized. Those events directly alluded to are the Coming of the Messiah (but instead of the restoration), His removal, the destruction of Jerusalem, and continued ruin until a certain period of time was reached. V. 24, "Seventy weeks;" seventy sevens of years, or seventy weeks, symbolizing years (see Barnes, etc., loci). "Are determined;" Gesenius, and other critics, inform us that the original properly denotes a cutting off, a dividing off, and Barnes gives the meaning thus: "This portion of time, the seventy weeks, was cut off from the whole duration, or cut out of it, as it were, and set by itself for a definite purpose." This criticism is well sustained by fact, seeing that it is only a small portion of time out of that larger period of Jewish overthrow, etc., before their final restoration. If the question be asked why such a brief period should be cut out of the larger portion and be thus expressed, several answers are suggested: (1) the time stated is, if we may so call it, Jewish time, i.e. time relating to the nation, and hence the period of Gentile domination is not included under it; (2) the Divine Spirit in a most remarkable manner presents His abhorrence of the appalling act of which the nation was guilty, viz., in crucifying the Messiah, by which act the nation forfeited for a period God's recognition of it as a nation, and hence the period of such non-recognition is not reckoned; (3) Jesus Himself tells us that "the times of the Gentiles" shall intervene, which are not included, they becoming such pre-eminently by the rejection of the Messiah. For, at the appearing of the Messiah, as we have seen (Prop. 57, etc.), the Kingdom was tendered to the nation on condition of repentance. Had the nation repented, the period of seventy weeks alone would have embraced their degradation, for the Kingdom would have been re-established, Prop. 55, etc. Hence the prophecy is given in view of the offer of this Kingdom, and yet fully by implication expresses the refusal of the same. The events recorded in the prophecy are such as pertain preparatory to the re-establishment of the Theocracy, and down to the sixty-ninth week the Theocracy to be restored was freely within the choice of the nation, as evidenced by the preaching of this Kingdom (Props. 54–58). But in view of the sinfulness of the nation, it was postponed, Prop. 66, and hence a week is detached from the rest, which is only verified when God again recognizes the Jewish nation as a nation in the work preparatory to the setting up of the promised Theocracy. The Gentile times will come to an end, and time specially related to the people belonging as an inheritance to Christ will begin again. This will appear more clearly as we proceed—these remarks being now made that the reader may observe the force and propriety in the phrase that this designated time is something cut cut of, separated from time in general—thus in the outset calling attention to the fact that another (and as history shows the larger) portion is not reckoned in view of the rejection of the nation for its treatment of the Messiah. "Upon thy people and upon thy holy city;" respecting or pertaining to the Jewish nation and Jerusalem. "To finish the transgression;" the reading generally adopted (Barnes, Hengstenberg, etc.) is that of the margin: To restrain, confine, shut up. Here it is positively asserted that at the end of the seventy weeks "the transgression," either the sin which brought such misery into the world, or the results of such transgression, or, perhaps more specially, the sin and punishment pertaining to the Jewish nation, shall be restrained, shut up, ended. If we take the usual interpretation given to the passage that this was done at the First Advent in the sufferings and death of Christ for sin and to restrain sin in His followers, we reply that it does not meet either the spirit of Daniel's prayer or that of the prophecy, because the death of Christ fearfully increased the sinfulness and the punishment of the nation, and increases the sinfulness of the world in rejecting Him. Transgression produced that death, continued transgression rejects Him, and yet the prophecy declares that, as pertaining to them and the city, at the close of the seventy weeks they shall be no longer under the dominion of transgression. Comparatively few Jews were converted, so that the immense mass of believers are Gentiles; and it is certainly wrong to insist upon a fulfilment, in which neither the nation nor city, as such, participated to any extent, but terribly suffered for transgression. On the other hand, the prophets predict a period of time when the sinfulness of the Jewish nation shall be forgiven, when transgression shall be blotted out and the nation shall be gloriously delivered, when Satan himself shall be restrained, shut up, so that "all shall be righteous,"—the time that Daniel evidently longed and prayed for—which is still future. Now this prediction, in some way, stands related to this period. So far as the sixty-nine weeks are concerned, there is no difficulty, for there is, as numerous writers (Tregelles, Brookes, etc.) have shown, a strictly chronological fulfilment down to Christ's death. The trouble is

what to do with the last week which is in excess to that death and too brief to extend to the destruction of Jerusalem. It is at the end of this last week that the transgression is to be restrained. The only explanation is, that, as the prophecy itself intimates, this one week is detached, separated from the rest, and held in abeyance—owing to the rejection of the nation and pre-eminence of Gentile times—until this nation is again recognized in its national capacity. The closing of the seventy weeks, separated by an undefined period—the resultant of the death of the Messiah and the non-recognition of the Jewish nation as such—is to be found at the ushering in of the Millennial period, when transgression shall indeed be restrained. “To make an end of sins” or, as many, “to seal up sins;” the meaning being, as Barnes, etc., “to remove it from sight, to remove it from view,” to banish it, etc. The usual explanation given, is that “faith in Christ forgives sins and makes them inert,” etc. But this is defective for the same reasons just assigned under previous clause, and from the fact that although God pardons sins, yet, like David’s, Peter’s, etc., they are not necessarily concealed from view, and that pious men have constantly to resist sin. This promise specially given to the nation and city cannot, without violation of the prediction, be thus applied to the present experience of believers. But the time is coming when sin shall be effectually removed from sight, when Satan himself is confined and a seal is affixed (Rev. 20:3), when holiness shall be triumphantly established. “And to make reconciliation for iniquity;” critics tell us that the meaning of the original is not “to make reconciliation,” but “to cover” or “to cover over,” and, Barnes says, is often used in the general sense of to pardon or forgive. The reasoning already given will equally apply to this phrase; for, instead of pardoning the iniquity of the Jewish nation, to whom the prophecy specially applies, the nation is still feeling the effects of God’s withdrawal, but the time is coming when their iniquity shall be forgiven and the forgiveness manifested in prosperity and exaltation. See Props. 112, 113, 114. “To bring in everlasting righteousness;” literally, “to cause to come,” “a permanent enduring” state of “righteousness,” or, as some, “to cause to come the righteousness of the ages,” which is emphatically true of the Millennial era bringing in an enduring period of righteousness. “And to seal up the vision and the prophecy,” or “prophet;” this indicates, keeping in view that the prophecy pertains to the Jewish nation, that the nation would not comprehend this vision or prophecy. They did not when the Messiah came; they do not now; and they will not until the Second Advent. Or, if it denotes, as some may think, the fulfilment of the whole prophecy, this will only be accomplished at the end of the seventy weeks. If this prediction is not thus understood by the Jewish nation, how comes it that Gentiles may understand it? The sealing of it alludes to the prophecy as it pertains to the Jewish nation and not to the times of the Gentiles intervening, and not to those who would accept of the Messiah, for Jesus Himself gives an unsealed Revelation relating to this intervening period and the closing of this prophecy which also is only received by believers, and not by the nation. “To anoint the Most Holy;” passing by the different views (Barnes, etc., loci) of this phrase, it is sufficient to indicate its probable meaning; either that Christ will consecrate, at His Second Coming, with His presence the Holy hill of Zion; or, that the New Jerusalem will thus be exalted; or, that Christ Himself shall then (as Dan. 7) receive the Kingdom from the Father; or, that it pertains to the glorified saints. It refers us to an act of consecration, because of its connection with the preceding, at the time of the Sec. Advent, and refers either to Christ Himself or to some place, as Jerusalem, Mount Zion, New Jerusalem, or to the corporate body of saints that there inherit the Kingdom. It is perhaps impossible to definitely fix its meaning. V. 25, “Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks.” Omitting the lengthy details of commentators (Barnes, etc.), it is sufficient for our purpose to say, that the almost generally received opinion that the time of the decree of the Persian king (commonly called Ezra’s), extending down to the First Advent of Christ, which precisely includes those sixty-nine weeks (with slight variations), seems to be the best founded. This throws the ministry of Christ either into the middle or at the close of the sixty-ninth week. This view has been so ably defended by numerous writers, independently of the interpretation that we have adopted (as e.g. Barnes, etc.), that it requires no extended mention, our object being merely to notice the relationship that the prophecy sustains to the Roman power and the future. There is a phrase, however, added in the 25th verse that we must apply differently from other writers, viz., “the street shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times.” In the wide diversity of rendering given to this, it may be regarded impracticable to definitely determine its meaning. From the renderings given we suggest the following: “The way or broad way” (Barnes, etc.) “shall be restored and built” (Hengstenberg, etc.) “and the threshing instrument” (the word “wall” in original so used in Isa. 28:27; Amos. 1:3; Isa. 41:15; Joel 3:14 marg.) “in a time of distress” (Hengstenberg). This phrase is erroneously affixed to the ending of the seven weeks or forty-nine years, but it is expressly stated as following the sixty-nine weeks and the coming of the Messiah. Aside from the impossibility of showing that there was this rebuilding of Jerusalem just after seven weeks, the location of the statement in the prophecy, as following after the sixty-nine weeks, forbids such an application. Even if it refers to the rebuilding of Jerusalem, as our version has it, then the reference is to that rebuilding which is still future and predicted. But let the reader turn to Prop. 34, and see how the prophets describe the future glory as dependent upon the Advent of the Messiah without indicating which one is meant, owing to the fact that the First Advent itself tendered to the nation this Theocratic restoration. Hence the prophet, having referred to this Advent, before describing the rejection of the Messiah, in strict accord with the other prophets, declares that “the way or broad way shall be built,” which is done when the Millennial age is ushered in, as seen in Isa. 35:8–10; Isa. 43:19–21; Isa. 62:11, 12, etc. That the millennium is preceded by a “time of distress,” has been repeatedly stated, and that the Jewish nation becomes at that time “a new sharp threshing instrument” (Isa. 41:15; Micah 4:13; Joel 3:14, comp. Prop. 115), has been shown. Had the Jews accepted of the Messiah thus sent and repented, this, too, would have been accomplished, but, rejecting Him, this is now postponed to His Second Coming, and therefore the prophet gives us what follows. “And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off;” this, as eminent commentators have abundantly shown, was fulfilled in the death of the Messiah. “But not for himself;” if this rendering is

correct, then He died for the benefit of others; if the marg. reading is to be preferred, “and shall have nothing,” it refers to the fact that the Messiah, as David’s Son, did not obtain His inheritance (Prop. 67); if the Vulgate, “and they shall not be His people who shall deny Him,” reference is had to the taking away of the Kingdom and bestowing it (as an inheritance) upon others (Prop. 61), if we are to follow Hengstenberg (similar to Syriac), “and is not to Him,” i.e. dominion, authority is not to Him, which would agree with the postponement of the Kingdom (Prop. 66). Thus almost every rendering given to the concise and difficult phrase would find a fulfilment in fact. Now we come to the part of the prophecy having reference to the Roman power. “And the people of the prince that shall come;” this refers to the events following the cutting off of the Messiah, and all commentators who favor the Messianic reference of the prophecy agree in making “the people” alluded to the Romans. The prince is the Roman emperor or head who comes with his armies after the death of the Messiah for purposes of devastation. “Shall destroy the city and the sanctuary;” how this was accomplished under the Roman power is part of history, and needs no explanation. “And the end thereof shall be with a flood;” the end of the city or nation shall be involved in the ravages, overwhelming devastation of this power. “And unto the end of the war desolations are determined;” the idea, as critics inform us, is apparent, viz., that for an indefinite time a decreed measure of desolation would be continued upon the city, which is contained in our version and in the following: “And unto the end is war, a decree of ruins” (Hengstenberg), or “and the great desolations shall continue unto the end of the war” (Bertholdt), or, “and after the end of the war desolation is determined” (Vulgate), or “and unto the end shall be war, a decreed measure of desolations” (Prof. Stuart), or “and unto the end of the war, desolations are decreed” (Barnes). The city and the sanctuary being overthrown, this desolation would be continued on during a period of time decreed or determined by God, as e.g. the Messiah predicted that Jerusalem would continue (after it was taken) to be trodden down by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled. The impressive feature that after the taking of the city by the Romans the overthrow and desolation of the Jewish nation would not cease, but continue on, has been fearfully verified in its history. V. 27, “And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week;” here, after the indefinite, unmeasured period following the sixty-nine weeks, is introduced the last week, making the total of seventy weeks; and the one alluded to, who shall make the covenant, is by the tenor of the prophecy connected with “the people of the prince that shall come,” i.e. shall also belong to, or be head of, this persecuting Roman power. The effort of Barnes and others to apply this to Christ is futile for the simple reasons (1) that it follows the cutting off of the Messiah; (2) it succeeds the destruction of the city and sanctuary, and this pre-determined tribulation of the Jewish nation; (3) it is connected with its antecedent, the Roman power; (4) Christ did not make a covenant for a week, or seven years; (5) the impossibility of making this week, seven years, fit with the public ministry and death of Christ. The only tenable position is to apply the personage denoted to a successor in the line of the destructive power previously mentioned. But with whom does this Roman power make a covenant? It is generally supposed by the writers referred to that a covenant with the Jews, raising them into the position of a nation (thus commencing the seventh week), is intended, and there are many things which make such a view plausible—such as the restoration of the Jews to their land under the agency of some power previous (Zech. 14:1, 2) to their restoration under Christ and the indirect allusions to some such covenant (as in Isa. 28:18; 33:8; Ps. 55:20). While this opinion is worthy of the serious consideration of the student, yet another covenant, compact, or agreement that the last head of the Roman power shall enter into is more specifically noted in the Scriptures, and may be the one here denoted, viz., the agreement and union with the ten horns or powers mentioned in Rev. 17:12, 13. It is this covenant entered into between the revived head of the Empire and the ten kings that leads to the last great conflict. The brevity of the agreement also corresponds, while the relationship that it may sustain to the Jewish nation (viz., partially restoring it) is implied by a comparison of predictions. “And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease;” this may refer either to the terrible persecution of the Church under this last head, by which the nations shall be led to embrace the Antichristian worship, or, as many suppose, to the removal of the worship instituted by the Jews at their partial restoration, or, to the restoration of idol, image worship and the exclusion of other forms. Perhaps the best commentary on this clause is the one given by the Spirit in Rev. 14:9 and Rev. 13:14–16. The worship of the true God is to be ignored and persecuted with marvellous success. “And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate;” amid the great diversity of rendering and interpretation, it seems scarcely practicable to give one that could be dogmatically maintained; but the reader is requested to consider one peculiarity admitted by a large number of critics, viz., that the phraseology implies, if it does not explicitly declare, that idol or image worship or something relating to false worship is meant, by which desolation is produced. Taking, then, the more recent predictions in Revelations as explanatory of the concise statements here, it appears that when the last head of this Roman power arises and causes by oppression and fearful persecution the worship of God to cease (i.e. forbids the liberty of such worship), in place of that worship shall be substituted the image worship to which all are forced upon pain of death, just before the Millennial age is ushered in (see Rev. 19:20; 14:9–14; 13:14–16). “Even until the consummation;” that is, until the completion of the period appointed, showing that all is under God’s control, and that this power, after all, endures just as long as He allows it. “And that determined shall be poured upon the desolate or desolater;” God has foretold the rise, progress, and apparent triumph of this Roman power, but He has also predicted the fearful vengeance that shall befall this hostile power at the time of the end. What God has determined to pour out upon him is stated in numerous prophecies, as e.g. in those already adduced, Rev. 19:20, 21; Rev. 14:10, 11; Rev. 16, etc. Thus the latter part of this prediction was applied by the early Church to the events preceding the future open personal Advent of Christ, and a careful consideration of the passage, in its relationship, indicates the propriety of such an application, and teaches (because no change is intimated after the Romans are introduced) the continuation of the Roman power down to the time of the end, and the

dreadful nature of the events introduced under the last head of this power.

PROPOSITION 161. This Kingdom will not be re-established until after Antichrist is overthrown.

This has already been represented under Prop. 123 (and other places, as Prop. 160, Obs. 4, etc.), and follows in view of the elect position of the Jewish nation in this Kingdom (being the special inheritance of David's Son), and the predicted fact that this nation is fearfully oppressed by the Antichrist, and only finds deliverance and restitution at the open manifestation of Jesus and His saints, Zech. 14, etc. We present the subject again in this form in order to add some observations to a very important matter, deeply affecting the interests of man.*

Obs. 1. The Church has always kept its eye fixed on the prophecies pertaining to Antichrist. Every century, from the Christian era down, gives us in the writings of eminent men an expression of opinion relating to it. However important the subject in the past, interest in it increases proportionately to the increasing nearness of the Millennial age. The Millennium can never be introduced before the fearful scenes under that Antichrist are first witnessed and experienced. The prominence given to Antichrist in the Scriptures and by the faith of the Church; the nearness of fulfilment that may be nigh to us; the delineation of character and work given by the Spirit; these are sufficient warrant for a careful consideration of this powerful actor in the world's history.*

Obs. 2. It was a generally received opinion of the Jews (comp. Reuss, *His. of Ch. Theol. Ap. Age*, p. 115, etc.) that the Messianic Kingdom could not be introduced without the previous manifestation of the Antichrist. This view was derived from Daniel and the other prophets, who described such an Antichristian power—the great enemy portrayed in its outward culminated form—as preceding the coming of the Son of man to set up His Kingdom. This belief was incorporated in the early Church, and was universally held as belonging to the period immediately antecedent to the open, visible Advent of the Lord Jesus at His Second Coming. It evidently, too, was a point much contemplated, so that John (1 John 2:18) could say, “Ye have heard that Antichrist shall come,” and Paul (2 Thess. 2:5) could assert, “Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?” The language, etc., of the apostles fully corroborates the Jewish view, only applying to the Sec. Advent what had previously been supposed to pertain to the First. This at once confirms our previous positions respecting the Kingdom, viz., that the Church is not intended, because Jesus at the First Advent came in a time of peace and not of war with the Antichrist as predicted by Daniel, Zechariah, and others. The student will here recognize in the prophecies a most wonderful evidence of inspiration in the foreseen rejection of Jesus, the postponement of the Kingdom, and hence in describing the continued Gentile domination passing over the First Advent and linking its overthrow under the culminated Antichrist with the Second Coming—and doing this, too, without specification of the same, lest it interfere with the tender of the Kingdom to the nation. The doctrinal position of the early Church, the general drift of the prophecies, pertaining to the Antichrist alone, if duly considered in its connections, abundantly confirms our view of the Kingdom. Prophecy links the re-establishment of the Kingdom with the destruction of the Antichrist; any other view is utterly untenable; for it is impossible to uphold such a previous erection of the Messianic Kingdom, seeing that Antichrist, not only oppresses the Church and the Jewish nation, but is actually represented as triumphant over both Church and nation, holding Jerusalem, Palestine, etc., in his power at the time of the Advent.

Obs. 3. It will be interesting to give a brief statement of the opinions entertained respecting Antichrist, because it serves, not only to illustrate the interest taken in the subject, the influence of mere prejudice, the crudeness of interpretation and comparison, but also that Divine revelation has purposely enshrouded the matter so as not to interfere with the free agency of man in development, so as to cause a diligent comparison and study of the Word, and to excite a state of watchfulness in view of the constant presence of Antichristian elements. A sufficiency is given for warning and for recognition when the time arrives; a minute tracing of the Antichrist, giving the details concerning him, would in many respects have been unwise both as to the proper attitude of believers and of unbelievers; an omission of mention, on the other hand, with a general description including the outlines, would have been in opposition to the uniform merciful kindness of God, who will not leave any without suitable admonition and caution. Like all subjects which are given by the Spirit in a fragmentary form, here something and there something, it can only be properly comprehended by observing all the passages relating to it; by confining ourselves (being prophetic, and hence beyond man's power to portray) closely to the Scriptures; and by drawing conclusions supported by the general analogy of the entire Scriptures. The great variety of opinions, to which we shall now refer, does not weaken the scriptural representation of the subject—that remains unchangeably the same, although a multitude more were added—it only indicates the weakness of man in often violating the first principles of interpretation, or in giving place to mere passion designing to make others odious, or in substituting mere human deductions for the prophetic announcements. The history of this doctrine and the use made of it in the past may lead us to renewed caution in its application to the future.

1. The quite early Fathers express themselves in general terms very different from that exaggerated, fabulous addition appended afterward. Thus, e.g. Justin Martyr (*Dial. Trypho.*, etc.) clearly teaches, as Bh. Kay (*Kay's Justin*, p. 103) remarks, “the appearance

of the man of sin as immediately connected with the Second Coming of Christ in glory, and His appearance as the prelude of severe persecutions against Christians." Irenæus (Ag. Heresies, B. 5) does the same, declaring his overthrow by Christ's Advent, and then "the restoring to Abraham the promise of the inheritance," etc. In tracing the Antichrist, the early Fathers in some way identified him with the Roman Empire, which (as by Irenæus, etc.) was made the fourth beast of Daniel, and that his ascendancy and downfall would be "in the six thousandth year." Barnabas before these speaks of the time, viz., at the close of the six thousand years, "when His Son shall come and abolish the Wicked One." Polycarp refers to the Antichrist in John's language; Hermas speaks of it as a subject well understood, in that he predicts and warns the Church to "endure the great trial at hand," which Coming tribulation was universally attributed to the Antichrist. Tertullian (Res. and Apol.) also locates the Antichrist before the open revelation of Christ, and specifically identifies the appearance of him with the division of the Roman Empire into ten Kingdoms. This notion of an existing Antichrist at the personal Coming of Jesus, was not only common to Chiliasts, but to their opposers of the Origenistic school, and even to those who, in antagonism to Paul, developed extreme Jewish notions respecting the law. An example of the last can be seen in the author of the Epistle of Peter to James prefixed to the Clementines (comp. Neander, Ch. His., vol. 1 p. 361). All parties, too, were agreed in referring Antichrist's appearance to the closing of the sixth Milliad, so e.g. Origen, Clemens, Alexandrinus, Lactantius, Cyprian, etc. One feature deserves attention; one reason why so much interest was taken in the subject by the early Fathers was the supposed imminency of His appearing arising from the adoption of the Sep. chronology. The resistance already manifested to the truth, the persecution of believers, etc., led them all, in the language of Ignatius, to say: "The last times are come upon us;" or, in that of Clement of Rome, "Ye see how in a little while the fruit of the trees come to maturity. Of a truth, yet a little while, and His will shall be accomplished suddenly, the Holy Scripture itself bearing witness that He shall come quickly and not tarry," etc. Persecution was invariably associated with the time preceding the Advent, and its presence and experience, more or less during the first centuries, always induced a belief either in the speedy Coming of the Antichrist, or else, if the persecution was very severe, of His being already here in the persecuting power. Hippolytus wrote a tract concerning the Antichrist, and in portions of an exposition of Daniel, preserved in Syriac in the British Museum (see Trans. in Journal of Sac. Lit. N. S., vol. 8, p. 348-354), he makes the Antichrist to be destroyed by the personal Coming of Jesus followed by the establishment of "the Kingdom of heaven." Victorinus wrote in the same style; also Sulpitius Severus, Cyril, Nepos, Coracion, Melito, Commodian, Methodius, Apollinarius, in brief, all the Fathers so far as their writings have come to us or their sentiments are expressed by others. All located the Antichrist and his destruction according to the plain prophecies.

2. The writers down to the Reformation continue to locate the Antichrist in the future and preceding the Advent. Thus, e.g. Jerome (Bh. Newton's Diss., p. 412, Bickersteth's Guide, p. 112), and in view of the supposed nearness of the close of the sixth Milliad, the Antichrist's approach was also conjectured to be nigh. So also Augustine, Chrysostom, and others identified the coming of the Antichrist with the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and insisted that without his preceding, Christ would not come, laying special stress on 2 Thess. 2. The views thus held by recognized leaders in the Church were incorporated in the writings of a long line of successors. Even the rise and progress of the Papacy, the triumph of the Church in its temporal emoluments, etc., which now produced a change of doctrinal position, and led men to predict increased prosperity, could not eradicate belief in a coming Antichrist. One of the most noted instances is that of Gregory the Great who (Bower's His. Popes, vol. 1, p. 409), resisting the effort of the Patriarch of Constantinople to obtain the title of "The Universal Bishop," declares: "But this is the time which Christ Himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride (that is), Antichrist, is at hand, and, what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness, are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition." It so happened that when this title, denominated antichristian by Gregory, was adopted by the Papacy, and that the ambition, vices, etc., of the Popes were exhibited, men here and there arose who either called the popes Antichrist or forerunners of him. Indeed, as time developed still more and more the characteristics of the Papacy, this application to the Popes of the name became so notorious that, as Bh. Newton remarks, the Pope in the Lateran Council (Lat. Conc. sub. Julio et Leone Sess. 11., specified in Jewell's Defence) "gave strait commandment to all preachers, that no man should presume once to speak of the coming of Antichrist." When Mahomet arose in the East, and his religion extended far and wide, the name of Antichrist was applied to him or to Mohammedanism, and this in proportion to the widening conquests. In addition to this, as will appear in a following observation, parties hostile to each other accused one another of being forerunners of the Antichrist. The feeling increased in intensity as the periods approached (assigned by the opponents of Chiliasm) of the end of the world, as in the tenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

3. The reformers continued to advocate either the presence of the Antichrist (as in the Papacy and Mohammedanism, or in both) or the coming of the same, of which forerunners already existed. Thus e.g. Brooks (Elem. Proph. Interp., p. 266) instances Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Calvin, Knox, Latimer, and Hooper; Bickersteth (Pract. Guide, p. 119) gives additional Cranmer, Ridley, Bradford, Jewell, Frith, Tyndale, Fulke among the English, and Æcolampadius, Martyr, and Musculus among the foreign, reformers. This list might be greatly swelled from the co-laborers and contemporaries; for, as Brooks justly observes, "it is notorious that in the times of the Reformation the opinion that the Pope was Antichrist became general and decided among Protestants." The student well knows that this very belief materially aided in advancing the Reformation. Indeed, so generally did this opinion advance that we

find it finally even inserted as an article of faith in the Confession of the French Reformed Church at the Synod of Gass in 1603, and in the Smalcald Articles (Rechenberg's Ed. 2, 4, p. 314, and Ap. p. 347.)

4. Since the Reformation, down to the present, men have variously advocated the doctrine of the Antichrist, chiefly applying it to the Papacy, or to Mohammedanism, or to both combined, or to some existing system or party, or to a power or person still future. Those who make an application to the Papacy are numerous, as e.g. Bickersteth gives Gualter, Frith, Danæus, Fox, More, Whitaker, Downame, Abbott, Beard, Maresius, Keach, Halifax, Hurd, Mede, Warburton, Bh. Newton, Cressener, Cunningham, Bonar, Elliott, Fleming, Gregory, Gault, Jones, Keith—a list which could be swelled by many hundreds of Protestant writers, such as Ramsey, Hoe, Broughton, Bengel, Daubuz, Lowman, including various commentators, as Vtringa, Clarke, etc., down to recent ones, as Barnes, etc. Some of these, as e.g. Doddridge, Fox (Book of Martyrs, p. 675, etc.), Bickersteth (El. Proph. Interp., p. 164), Homos (Res. Revealed, p. 148, etc.), held to several Antichrists existing in Popery and Mohammedanism—thus reviving the view of Sulpitius Severus (2 Dial. de Vita Mart., ch. 14) who in the fifth century spoke of two Antichrists who should arise, one in the East and the other in the West. To these last many others can be added, as Keith, Habershon, Brooks, Rabett, Owen, Wigand, Smith, King, Whitaker, Frere, who, like Scott (Com.), pronounce these two “twin sisters,” or who, like Prideaux (Faber, On Proph., vol. 1, p. 256), seeing two such powers arise about the same time, said: “That Antichrist had at that time set both his feet on Christendom together, the one, in the East, the other in the West.” Others, as e.g. Graserus (His. of Antichrist), Whitby (Scheme of Prophecy), etc., confine the Antichrist to Mahomet or the Turks. While others reject the application to the Papacy, deeming it either as fulfilled in some other power, as Pagan or Imperial Rome, or Mohammedanism, or Infidelity, or in one still future to arise, as e.g. Zanchius, Grotius (comp. Maresius's, Marcus's and Limborch's answers to same), Hammond, Bossuet, Sheldon, Thorndyke, Maitland, Burgh, Horsley, Fraser, etc. A class of these, among which Faber is a noted example, while discarding the title as applicable to the Pope or the Romish Church (holding that “the Antichrist” is still future), yet interpret passages, usually attributed to the Antichrist, as e.g. the little horn of Daniel 7, delineative of the Papacy. Davies, in “Two Antichrists,” definitely makes two, viz., Infidelity and Romanism. Some have a number of Antichrists, as e.g. Riland in the very title of his work, “Antichrist: Papal, Protestant, and Infidel,” or Rutherford, in his “Spiritual Antichrist: Opening the Secrets of Familism, Antinomianism, etc.” Others again evince a low spirit in making out an opposing system of religious belief to be such, as e.g. Bh. Williams in his “Antichrist Revealed,” maintaining him to be the Presbyterians; or Tazewell, “On the Antichrist,” making him to be the Quakers; or Bramhall's (Smith's Dic., Art. Antichrist) suggestions respecting the General Assembly of the kirk of Scotland. Comparatively few have condescended to such perverted interpretation, and these, too, have exerted no influence upon others. Govet and others, both Protestant and Romish, have placed the Antichrist in the future, and this opinion has been latterly gaining ground among prophetic interpreters. Döllinger, while making (Lange, 2 Thess.) a kind of typical Antichrist of Nero, also places him, with other Roman Catholic writers, in the future. Calvin (Lange, 2 Thess., p. 134) included Mahomet and Sectarianism; Kern. Bauer, and Hilgenfeld returned to the Neroic theory; Schneckenburger has a mere personification of evil; and Jowett has it fulfilled in the Jewish heretics; and Nevin makes it to consist in “the spirit of sect and schism.”

5. It may be interesting, as a matter of history, to notice to whom, in addition to those mentioned, the name has been applied. Calmet states (Dic., Art. Antichrist) that Nebuchadnezzar, Cambyses, Herod, Judas Iscariot, Simon Magus were regarded as types, and that most of the Roman Emperors, under whom persecution arose, were either considered Antichrists or forerunners of him, or types of him, such as e.g. Claudius, Nero, Domitian, Marcus Aurelius, Severus, Decius, Gallus, Diocletian, and Julian. Antiochus Epiphanes was supposed by some to be the Antichrist (an opinion revived by Erasmus, etc.), but Jerome, Theodoret, Cyprian, and others only made him a type. It is remarkable that Grotius, in his efforts to neutralize the Protestant interpretation relating to the Papacy, made Caligula and then Simon Magus the Antichrist; Dr. Hammond applied the same to Simon Magus and the Gnostics; Le Clerc, to the rebellious Jews under the leader Simon, the son of Gioras; Whitby, to the Jews who rejected Christ; Schötgen, to the Pharisees and Rabbies; Krause, to the Zealots; Harduin, to the High Priest Ananias. Faber (On Proph., p. 87) informs us that the character was attributed to Cerinthus and the Manicheans, and also to the impostor Barchochebas. Balaam was not overlooked. Wetstein gives the title to Titus; Herder, to Simon Gorionides; Gensler, to Julian the Apostate; Bossuet, to Diocletian; Feuardentius, etc., to Luther; Rupertus, to Genseric; Talitskoi, to Peter the Great; the Starovers (or Old Believers, Harper's Mag., p. 421, 1872), to Nikon, the Reformer; Davis, to Czar Nicolas; Nelson, to Oliver Cromwell; Christadelphians, to Russia; Faber, to the French Emperorship; Baxter, to Louis Napoleon III. (the same being formerly bestowed upon his uncle, Napoleon I., because in Hebrew Corsica numbered 666, etc.); some, to Louis XIV.; the priests of Spain and Italy, to Gustavus Adolphus; others, to the infidelity connected with the French Revolution or to infidelity in general; Hilary, to a semi-infidel power; Pelt, to a mere tendency, and F. D. Maurice, to Vitellius.

6. But it must be noticed that the application of the name by many in these ways—being designed simply to designate that which was regarded antagonistic to Christ or at variance with His doctrine—did not supersede the notion that the Antichrist, by way of pre-eminence, in its culminated form was still future. The generality of writers thought that he was revealed (as e.g. in the Papacy, Mohammedanism, Infidelity, etc.), but would finally culminate in one great personal head in whom all the marks, inchoately fulfilled, would be found. Some of the writers favoring such a view are Bickersteth (Pract. Guide), Brooks (El. of Proph. Interp.), etc. Others thought that the term Antichrist could not be legitimately given to any but to the one who was still regarded as future, as e.g. Faber

(On Proph., p. 87, etc.) Lange, (Com., 2 Thess. 2; Doct. 2), etc. These both agreed that the distinctive great Antichrist was yet to be revealed. The former, while insisting upon a present fulfilment, looked for a more comprehensive and striking one; the latter, while considering the Papacy, etc., unchristian, and applying Scriptures usually interpreted as belonging to the Antichrist, also awaited a future revelation which should properly be thus designated. Neither party went to the length, as a few have done, to make these conflicting and hostile elements, however presented, a necessity in the history of nations, but both, whatever truth they may have possessed, and whatever services they may have rendered, spoke of them as opposed to the true doctrine and interests of the Church, and originating in the freedom and depravity of man. Amid the diversity, there is a general agreement (aside from rationalistic interpretations) respecting the meaning of the word Antichrist, the time of his appearing, viz., preceding, and at the open manifestation of Jesus Christ and His saints—the formation of a confederation by him—and a terrible persecution to the Church, etc. It is a subject properly belonging to eschatology, and forms an important link in the history of “the last things,” which cannot possibly be omitted without serious injury to a proper understanding of the historical connection. Within the last twenty years many writers (those of ability), after a careful examination of the Scriptures, have come to the conclusion that, whatever inchoate fulfilment has been exhibited in the past or the present, the Antichrist, who is to exist at the Coming of the Lord Jesus with His saints, has not yet arisen as predicted. Among the more recent writers who, relying upon a comparison of scriptural announcements, hold to this opinion, are the following: Lange (Com., 2 Thess. 2.), who announces (Doc. 4, p. 136) “a resumption of the Patristic interpretation” and a “leaving open the prospect of a still impending realization of the prophetic picture” (and instances Bengel, Roos, Olshausen, Hofman after deducting his Antiochus redivivus, Luthardt, Baumgarten, Von Gerlach, Heubner, Döllinger in a second future fulfilment, Thiersh, Von Oettingen, Alford, Ellicott, Lillie). M’Clintock and Strong’s Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., Art. “Antichrist,” fully indorses this view, and specifies various writers of eminence who hold to it, as Ben Ezra, Burgh, S. Maitland, Newman, C. Maitland, and others. Hundreds of recent writers in Europe and America could be added.

Obs. 4. In addition, the student will observe that the ancients and the moderns (more recent writers) coincide in making this Antichrist a personal one, and not merely a system of doctrine, etc. The force of the article attached (comp. e.g. Lange’s Com., 2 Thess. 2:3–5) leads to the idea of “a single personality,” over against the collective. (Zwingle, etc.) notion which (as applied to the Papacy, etc.) has also its upholders. Brooks (El. of Proph. Interp., p. 257) asserts: “The Fathers were unanimous in their opinion that the Antichrist was to be a person; nor has the Greek Church, which in most respects has maintained the sentiments of the Fathers on this point, ever made a question of it.” Many Roman Catholic writers also described him as a person, and this individuality or personality is found in the writings of men in the various churches, some limiting it to a single individual, others extending it to a succession of persons. The more ancient view of confining it to a single person, the leader of anti-Christian forces, is revived and ably defended by recent writers, as the most consistent with the titles given to him, the acts to be performed by him, etc. Our leading commentators (Lange, Delitzsch, Alford, etc.) favor it, while prominent prophetic writers (as Tregelles, Bonar, Purdon, Dean Trench, Bell, Birks, Chester, etc.) fully indorse it, as numerous works indicate. Even such writers as Pressense (Early Years of Christianity, p. 438, foot-note), are inclined to the view that Antichrist will be “a personality.” Van Oosterzee (Theol. of the N. T., sec. 42) makes him “the highest and more individual concentration,” and (Ch. Dog., vol. 2, S. 145) declares: “Here it can only be said, that for him who interprets the Scripture without preconceived views and allows his thoughts to be brought into captivity to the obedience of the Word, there can be no doubt that a personal Antichrist will yet arise before the close of the world’s history.” He repudiates “an ideal personality” (advocated by Hengstenberg), admits that other Antichrists have appeared, but only as the forerunners of a “central personality” still future. (He makes the characteristics pride and deception, which work by false signs, Matt 24:24; 2 Thess. 2:9, adding: “Truly it is entirely natural, but at the same time the terrible irony of a higher Nemesis, that disbelief in the true miracle should yet once more be punished with a superstitious belief in false signs.”) The position and prevailing view is that of Cyprian, who pronounced all heretics—all that was opposed to Christ—“the precursors of that one and special Antichrist which is to come at the last end of the world” (quoted by Bickersteth, p. 165). Comparatively few entertain the idea of a Satanic incarnation, or a resurrected Judas (reviving in another form and person the old resurrected Nero—comp. Stuart, Apoc., vol. 2, p. 441—theory, Sulp. Severus saying: “At the close of the age, he is to be sent again that he may exercise the mystery of iniquity”); the large majority inclining to his being a mere man, wonderfully endowed, and in whom wickedness shall reach its consummation (some incorporating in a measure Theodoret’s or Chrysostom’s idea that he shall be under the special energy of the devil and exhibit therefore Satanic might). Smith’s Bib. Dic., Art. Antichrist, 5, commenting on the titles given to Antichrist (2 Thess. 2), remarks: “If words have meaning, these words designate an individual,” and Olshausen (Com., 2 Thess. 2) declares: “The individuality of Antichrist can manifestly be excluded from this passage only by forcing its meaning.”

Obs. 5. (1) Another feature in the discussion of the past, and fruitful of mistake (even in otherwise very able writers), is the indiscriminate application of all predictions relating to antichristian powers to this one Antichrist. Thus e.g. Protestant writers have quoted, Rev. 17, and interpreted the woman as representative of the Papacy. This favorite application, confirmed, too, by a historical record and association the most powerful, is also made out to be the Antichrist over against the most positive proof in the chapter itself, that (however much the Papacy may aid in the coming of the Antichrist and be with him in the initial career) this woman, delineative of the Romish Church, is likewise destined (v. 16) to be punished and overthrown by “the ten horns and the beast” (so Bengel, Stuart, etc., read, comp. Tischendorf’s N. T.), i.e. by the confederation under the Antichrist as the context plainly shows.

How, then, can the Papacy, here doomed to confiscation, fearful retribution, and utter destruction, be the Antichrist under whose leadership and inspiration this is performed? And yet this simple and indisputable distinction has been overlooked by many, thus burdening interpretation with palpable contradiction. (This also shows that the Papacy (as advocated by Faber, etc.) is not the false prophet, or the second beast, Rev. 13, associated with the last head of the first beast, because this prophet remains in flourishing existence down to the final catastrophe after the woman has met her fated end.) The whore is not the Antichrist, since she comes to her doom when this Antichrist is at the height of his power, and to blend together what the Scriptures so plainly separates only introduces confusion. Any interpretation (as e.g. Bengel, Schmucker, etc.) which makes either the Beast out of the sea, or the Beast out of the earth (these existing down to the battle with Christ) to be the Papacy is most certainly erroneous, and involves the predictions into contradictory statements. For, however much this Beast out of the sea may have sustained the Papacy in the past (as taught in Rev. 17). it will, under the last head of this same Beast, be its deadly enemy, and it is only under this last head (still future, Prop. 160, etc., that this second Beast arises. The points of resemblance between these and the Papacy, however striking, are not sufficient to justify so wide a departure from the plain prediction. The Antichrist and his associate perish under the power of the Mighty King and His armies; the Papacy is previously overthrown by this Antichrist and his confederation. To the believer, such a distinction is all-sufficient, although other reasons (such as the tracing of the seven heads in the Roman line, etc.) are to be found corroborative of the same.

(2) Again: Another and more plausible interpretation is that given to the little horn of Daniel, ch. 7, which is at great length and force—owing to strong resemblances—applied to the Papacy, and hence characterized as descriptive of the Antichrist (excepting Faber, and some others, who make this application without designating the little horn or the Papacy as the Antichrist). This theory, which has had a multitude of expounders (and is ably presented by recent writers, as Barnes, Com. Dan., Guinness, Approaching End, etc.) is not at all abashed by the fulfilment of its year day, 1260 years, dated from A.D. 533 or 606, without the corresponding destruction predicted to accompany the close of the times, times and a half. Its advocates still endeavor to find some explanation to satisfy, if not remove, the difficulty. But one, which clearly shows that this little horn is not the Papacy they cannot possibly overcome, viz., that the fate of this little horn is brought about not by the interposition of earthly powers (as e.g. is the case with the woman in Rev. 17), but (as in the case of the last head of the beast and the false prophet) by direct agency of a supernatural nature. The prediction of Dan. most certainly impresses the reader with the idea that this horn exists down to the coming of the Ancient of Days, to the personal Advent itself, thus corresponding—whatever inchoate fulfilment may be attributed to it—with the Antichrist destroyed at Christ's Sec. Advent and not with the whore previously destroyed by the Beast and ten horns. Faber's position is also untenable, owing to this identity of end, a crucial test that very few of the past theories are able to sustain. For this reason we must regard Daniel's little horn in the 7th ch. as both delineative of the Antichrist and still future. The only objection of a serious Mature (which would support Faber's view) is, that Daniel speaks of the beast as "slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame," while in Rev. 19 the beast is taken and "cast alive" into the lake of fire; but this is removed by considering that Daniel refers more to the Kingdom aspect (v. 23) of the beast and its utter destruction, and John more to the individual aspect, the leadership or last head, of the beast, for it is fully demonstrated (Prop. 160) that both beasts (in Dan. and John) are identical, and hence the language is not to be so pressed as to form an antagonism. If the objection, however, in the estimation of any, is a valid one, then the prophecy cannot be taken as descriptive of the Antichrist (seeing that their ends differ), but must be received very much in the manner specified by Faber, the Antichrist following after the little horn. The student in deciding this point will consider two things (1) that Daniel's prophecy, pertaining largely to the Jewish nation, as under Gentile domination, would hardly omit mention of the last great Antichrist in so connected an epitome; (2) that it would be strange to omit what directly (as e.g. Zech. 14, etc.) pertains to the nation and the great tribulation; and (3) link the overthrow of the Papacy (if denoted) with the immediate setting up of the Messianic Kingdom and reign of the saints, when virtually (according to this theory) the greatest of all enemies and the most fearful of all persecutions still intervened between. Hence, regarding the prophecy in its connection with the last things, we are forced by preponderating testimony to regard it—whatever inchoate fulfilment for wise purposes was allowed—as applicable to the still future history of the Antichrist, the last head of the beast, who as the representative head will be cast into the lake of fire, while his Kingdom is utterly consumed, i.e. the body, in his associated kings and followers will be slain, etc.

(3) Again: Many writers when delineating the rise of the Antichrist, as given in Dan. 7 or Rev. 13 and 17, out of the seventh head unhesitatingly, and justly, too, have him developed out of the revived Roman power or Kingdom; but when they come to Dan., ch. 8, we have at once a discord, for they tell us that (as e.g. Reineke, Proph. Times, vol. 11, Baxter's Napoleon, etc.) this Antichrist "will take his rise out of one of the four Kingdoms into which the Greek Empire was divided at the time of Alexander's death," and without explanation how this can be so, make this little horn the exact counterpart of the little horn in ch. 7. If they are correct in the interpretation of ch. 8, then it follows that the little horn of ch. 7 is not, and cannot be, identical with it, seeing that the one springs out of the Eastern Kingdom and out of the third beast from one of its four heads, and the other arises out of the fourth beast or Kingdom. Hence some writers, noticing the discrepancy, advocate that each horn represents a distinct and separate hostile power. Thus, e.g. Faber, Barnes, and other writers, hold that the little horn of ch. 7 portrays the Papacy and the little horn of ch. 8 the Mohammedan power; others, as e.g. a writer in *The Israelite* Indeed, Dec., 1861, hold that ch. 8 describes the still future Antichrist who is to arise out of one of the emerged or revived four divisions of Alexander's Empire, and identifies it with that of ch. 7, without attempting to

reconcile, or even notice, the difficulty. If the prophecy of ch. 8 really delineates the rise of a power out of the Greek Empire, then it cannot be applied to the power rising out of the Roman Empire, and, instead of quoting it as applicable to the last Antichrist developed out of the fourth beast, we must fall back upon the theories, either that it refers exclusively to the Mohammedan power or to another one that is to arise in the East (co-operating with the Western) at the time of the end. If, on the other hand, we accept of the views of Sir. I. Newton, Bh. Newton, Cunningham, etc., viz., that the little horn of the goat denotes the Roman Empire as established in the East, then there is a point of contact (considering the Roman Empire an a unity) by which the prophecy can be used as identical with that of ch. 7. But until this matter is cleared up, and the point of identification fully stated and proven, it is uncritical, to say the least, to employ those prophecies so indiscriminately.

(4) Again: Writers have taken the year-day fulfilment of the Apoc. (as given e.g. by Elliott, Lord, etc.) as proven, and from it have deduced a chronological arrangement (as e.g. Bagster, etc.) respecting the literal-day fulfilment still future. All such deductions are hazardous, and from the nature of the case cannot prove reliable, since, allowing even a sort of inchoate fulfilment to the Apoc., on the principle advocated, a regular and consecutive fulfilment of the seals, trumpets, and vials has not yet—however coincident and expressive the inchoate fulfilment hitherto may have been—been realized as predicted. Not only the variety of interpretations (some e.g. applying the first seals to the Church, others to the Roman power, etc.) forbid it, but a glance at the sixth seal (as e.g. compared with last vial, Rev. 16:17, 18; Isa. 24:18, 20; Joel 3:15, etc.) and at the simple fact that the vials which contain the seven last plagues in the outpouring of God's wrath are preceded by the res. and translation of the 144,000, and stand closely related to the slaughter (Rev. 14:10) and harvest of the martyrs. Hence, whatever fulfilment may be accorded to portions of the Apoc., it is, in view of the unsettled and conflicting opinions concerning such fulfilment, impolitic to take it as a basis for a future one.

(5) Again: The failure to abide by the force and propriety of symbolical language, when once admitted to be symbolical, is prevailing to a great extent, and forms a most fruitful source of erroneous conclusions. Thus, e.g. we have writers who adopt the year-day fulfilment, and insist upon its accuracy, basing their opinion upon the alleged fact that the symbols have been thus verified; but when they come to the literal-day fulfilment the symbolical language is taken for literal, so that, by way of illustration, the locusts interpreted under the former as representative of human beings arising in their might, etc., are transformed by the latter method into real, literal locusts. Others make the language in one passage symbolical and in another literal, according to fancy, so that not only fruitful diversity but direct contradiction is involved. By the observance of a few rules legitimately drawn from, and abundantly exemplified in, the use of figurative language, an immense amount of irrelevant and misleading interpretation would have been avoided.

Obs. 6. Another characteristic exhibited in the writings of the past, and which has had a decided influence in forming interpretations, is the tendency to make the apostasy and the man of sin, in 2 Thess. 2, the same, both being by many Protestants applied to the Papacy. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Augustine, and others, took the falling away to be the Antichrist himself who caused it, but the record distinctly teaches (comp. Olshausen, Com. 2 Thess. 2:3, 4; Lange, Com. do., Doc. 3. (4) 1; Smith's Dic., Art. Antichrist, 3), as Riggerbach expresses it, that "the falling away is by no means identical with the Antichrist (as the Fathers understood it), or even merely (as De Wetto thinks) the working exclusively of Antichrist; rather, the general rush of violent departure from the faith precedes that final disclosure of the Antichristian despot." The most careful writers thus discriminate between the apostasy itself and the Antichrist which is developed from or arises out of it; the former being regarded as introductory, the latter as its ripened fruit. This falling away, too, is applied to an apostatizing from Christianity, extending in its effects to all nations, and embracing a denial of fundamental truths, which culminates finally in this apostatizing from all truth (as centred in God and His Word) being represented to us in the acts and brief rule of a single person, who, by way of eminence, is styled the Antichrist. We are not told how long this apostatizing is to precede this person; commencing already in the days of the apostles, it works on in its leavening process from century to century, until finally it breaks forth with a power and energy, controlled and directed by a single head, which distinguishes the last part of its history from all the preceding. The emphasis attached to this apostasy by the Spirit indicates that it shall, even before the rise of the personal Antichrist, be a great, distinguishing departure from the faith. Hence, while the reformers and many others did not properly distinguish between the preliminaries and the Antichrist, yet they were abundantly justified in applying 2 Thess. 2 to the Papacy, in so far as they showed that it departed from the truth. They were also correct in making the same application to Mohammedanism and other opposing systems, in so far as the apostatizing in a general sense may include a wilful departure from the knowledge of God and the substitution of other forms of belief in its place. The apostasy is not confined simply to one person, one party or sect, but may embrace many persons and various systems under the one general term. Starting in the Church or at the side of it, it extends to all men who are commanded to repent and obey, and all who refuse to do so, are, in virtue of moral and religious obligation attested to by the Word and self-consciousness, regarded as included in this apostatizing class, as is readily seen by looking at the characters described as prominent in the last days. Strictly limited, it relates to those who profess Christ and depart from the truth in Him; comprehensively it includes those who, knowing of Christ, still reject Him, and both these pave the way for the Antichrist, who, in his own person, concentrates and manifests hostility to the Christ and His truth. Therefore it is, that while regarding this personal Antichrist as still future (the one to whom prophecy points as pre-eminently deserving the title, and being the one specially predicted), yet the reformers and others were undoubtedly correct in designating opposing systems, etc., as Antichristian. from the fact that "many Antichrists" (distinguished from the last great one) shall exist. The conclusion at which we arrive is, that, whatever inchoate fulfilment is evident in the past and present, the apostasy (however

antichristian) only paves the way for the still future rise of the prophetic Antichrist, and that just previous to his manifestation this apostatizing from the truth will, in and outside of the Church, be more widely extended. The spirit of Antichrist already in John's days (so he declares) exhibiting itself in persons hostile to the truth, departing from the faith, teachers of infidelity and of doctrine leading to sin, has been largely manifested in succeeding ages, and to-day in its aggregate, both in the professed Church and world, assumes proportions that makes it exceedingly significant to the thoughtful student, who believes with Irenæus (Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "Antichrist") that this apostasy will be summed up in a personal, individual Antichrist.

Obs. 7. Another important matter to notice is this, that some Scripture predictions, directly applied by writers to the future personal Antichrist, are only applicable to a power or person associated with him; and that for the sake of consistency we must distinguish between them. The old view of Hippolytus that the false Prophet or sec. Beast of Rev. 13 is the future personal Antichrist has been a favorite with some, and is adopted in Smith's Bib. Dic., Art "Antichrist." While this interpretation is not near so objectionable as Faber's, etc. (seeing that it avoids the incongruity of making the Papacy to exist down to the Sec. Advent, when it is previously destroyed by the beast and ten horns), yet it is misleading from the simple fact that the last head of the first Beast is the great leading actor, under whose leadership the confederation is formed, etc.; and that this false prophet only occupies a subsidiary position, and one, too, which strives to honor and exalt the power and authority of this last head. The prophecy impresses us by the acts of this false prophet, all being allied with the revived last head, that he only arises and comes into play as an active agent during the career of this seventh-eighth (Prop. 160) head. Nothing in it is predicative of a previous existence; all, so far as recorded, is descriptive of that brief but fearful period when the mighty leader to whom worship is tendered—hence the Antichrist (if worship were given to the false prophet and he were the prime mover of the confederation, then the argument might have force)—has control over nations.*

Obs. 8. In the discussion of this subject, the student, in order to obtain an intelligent and consistent interpretation, must plant himself upon what we deem an impregnable position, viz., that the Roman Empire is the fourth Beast of Daniel (adopted literally by a host of able expositors, ancient and modern), and that the little horn of ch. 7 springs out of, is attached to, as part, and controlling part, of the beast. This is clearly taught, and, owing to remarkable points of resemblance, the most eminent expositors have, in some way, made this horn representative of the Papacy. Admitting wonderful and striking coincidences (based upon persecuting Antichristian power), yet, taking the prophecy as a whole, it is impossible to apply it to the Papacy, owing to the final end being diverse to that in Rev. 17; to the fact that the ten Kingdoms only arise, simultaneously or nearly so, at the time (Rev. 17) of the closing period of the fourth Beast's history (commentators have hitherto been unable to fix these ten Kingdoms, giving various lists of them, or else taking the number ten for an indefinite number which is forbidden by the prediction and the three removed); to the fact that this horn arises after the ten Kingdoms; and to the additional fact that, however ingeniously pressed, the Papacy did not uproot three horns or Kingdoms in its rise (those usually urged being inadequate to sustain the position). But we proceed another step, in saying that this little horn is the Antichrist that shall arise at the time of the end, the closing period, and be destroyed at the Sec. Advent. The reasons already given respecting the similarity of end, etc., are sufficient to indicate this, which was the view of the early Fathers, and has been the favorite one of a multitude of writers. The reader will observe that the quite early Fathers invariably linked the coming of the Antichrist with the Roman Empire, and it was after the idea arose that the Roman power was the hindering cause that the notion was promulgated, that after the Roman Empire was overthrown then only would Antichrist be revealed. But still, in some way, he would reunite the Roman power and exercise sway over it and against Christianity. A comparison of Scripture forces us, if legitimately performed, to indorse the view that the Antichrist arises out of the Roman Empire, and arises, too, at the time it is in a divided state, the consolidation into a confederacy being performed under his auspices. Two objections that may be urged against this view ought to be considered. (1) The non-existence of the Beast or Roman Empire is supposed to militate against this view; but, in reply, it is sufficient to say that this very non-existence is also predicted, and that it is only after a period of lost headship that a revival takes place, and the last head or Antichrist appears, comp. Prop. 160. (2) The personality or individuality of Antichrist is alleged against it; but it is an ample answer to remind the student that Antichrist is presented to us by the Spirit in His several aspects (a) as an individual person, the leader of the confederation, as e.g. in 2 Thess. 2; (b) then the tracing the rise of this person (from whence he springs) as e.g. Rev. 13:3–8; Rev. 17:9–11; (c) as virtually—yet differing—a prolongation of the seventh revived head (comp. Prop. 160); (d) as a polity (for king and Kingdom are convertible terms, e.g. a person may stand for a Kingdom or polity, Dan. 2:38, last clause), thus showing that he is the head over a powerful government; (e) thus being a person who is the head or controlling leader of the Beast, he is in virtue of his position represented either as an individual or as a power springing out of and directing the Beast, or in virtue of his tremendous influence in directing the Beast, being its representative head, he is the Beast himself just as Nebuchadnezzar was the head of gold. In view of the fearful issues connected with the coming of this Antichrist, the Spirit mercifully presents those several aspects, so that when the time arrives for fulfilment the points of recognition may be multiplied to the sustaining of faith in the dreadful fiery trial. Now we take another step in advance, viz., in identifying the sameness of Dan. 7 (the little horn), Rev. 13 (the last head), Rev. 17 (the last head), and 2 Thess. 2 (the man of sin). In the elucidation of this subject such an identity becomes imperative. In looking over the expositors, ancient and modern, nearly all agree in making Dan. 7, Rev. 13, and Rev. 17 descriptive of the same Roman Empire (some in its civil, others in its papal, prolongation, and still others in both of these), and in virtue of the civil headship attributed to the heads that were fallen (which John only designates as an

additional fact of identification), it is impossible, without a violation of consistency, to attribute to this last head (of the same beast) any other but a civil headship like unto the rest of the heads. This is a point of vital importance, and cannot be yielded up without serious deviation from the prophecy. If this were all revealed by John then we might fail in linking this last head with the Antichrist of 2 Thess. 2, but John informs us that this civil head sets up precisely the same claims to Divine honors, worship, etc., and is finally destroyed by the personal Advent of the Lord Jesus, just as Paul describes, so that we cannot doubt the correctness of that line of expositors who, whatever mistakes were made in details, applied all these predictions to the Antichrist. The personal Antichrist, taking these prophecies together, is then both a civil and religious head, endeavoring to control the civil, social, and religious interests of society, or, in other words, State and Church (such as the latter may be, viz., humanitarian), are represented in him. Our indebtedness to many able writers who, in some way, held up this Beast as the Roman Empire, and the Antichrist as springing out of it, is great (and here gratefully acknowledged), however much we may differ from them in the way of tracing (prophetically and historically) the final headship of this Beast, because they preserved, amid diversity, an important and essential element in the correct apprehension of the subject. It was owing to this feeling—based upon the prophetic idea that the Antichrist must be, in order to meet the requirements of prediction, related to the Roman power—that so many of the Fathers and writers (Brooks, *El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 48, etc.; Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, Art. Antichrist, etc.) thought that Rome itself would be the seat of the Antichrist (the latter, however, whatever power the Beast may have over Rome, being especially applied in Rev. 17 to the whore, the great representative of the apostasy).

Obs. 9. The meaning of the word "Antichrist" can readily be made out from the force of "anti" in composition, denoting "against or opposed to, in place of or correspondence to," thus designating either opposition to Christ or imitation of Christ. It may then mean (1) one who sets himself up against Christ, denying or usurping His power, or (2) one who strives to resemble Christ in His prerogatives, power, etc., or (3) one who unites both these characteristics. Over against the opinion of Greswell (*Exp. of Parab.*, vol. 1, p. 372), that it denotes rather a kind of rivalry than antagonism, a "Counterfeit-Christ," we have in the account given of the Antichrist abundant evidence to sustain the almost universally received one that he will be an opposer of Christ. This is unmistakably predicted both in his characteristics and in his acts, without, however, rejecting Greswell's idea that he also may, in the course of such opposition, claim, as Dean Trench (*Synonymes of the N. T.*) suggests, to be, without taking the name, a kind of Messiah (for the honor and worship tendered to him seems to indicate something of the kind). Trench's explanation, based upon the marks given to him that he will set himself up both against Christ and in the place of (as the world's Saviour) Christ, being thus both an Anti and False Christ, is fully sustained by His being a denier of Christ (1 John 2:22, Luther, a Wider Christ), an adversary or opposer of Christ (2 Thess. 2:4), one who fights against Christ (Rev. 17:18), and also one who sets Himself up as a kind of Redeemer worthy of worship (2 Thess. 2:4; Rev. 13:4, 12, etc.), thus occupying the place, the Theocratic position, assigned to Jesus. It may also be remarked that in view of the latitude of meaning in the word, John already in his day (1 John 2:18) could well say, in view of the opposition to or denial of Christ (or, even the substitutions for Christ), "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time." Every age has, in his sense, both in and alongside of the Church, produced its Antichrists, the preliminary earnest of the great one still to come; and because the Messiah has come and such opposers to Him can thus exist in opposition to Him, we know, too, that this is the last hour, or time, or dispensation preparatory to Christ's triumph over His adversary.

Obs. 10. Notice the marks or characteristics given to this Antichrist. 1. By John in the Epistles. 1 John 2:22, "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." By this we have a denier of Jesus, the Christ, and the Father who sent Him. This shows at once and conclusively (however men have ingenuously attempted to evade it) that it cannot be applied to the Papacy, which, whatever un-Christian (i.e. practical denial) may attach to it, never denied the Father and the Son, but acknowledges both in its confession of faith, and promulgates its decrees in their name. Here we have not simply an indirect denial of truths pertaining to them, but a plain, open, unblushing denial of their authority, and of allegiance to them. It is Infidelity in its highest phase. Again he says, 1 John 4:3: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." Keeping in view what the ancients meant by "the Christ" (viz., the Theocratic ordering of Jesus, Prop. 205), we have here a refusal to acknowledge that Jesus as "the Christ," i.e. the covenanted David's Son, had come in His First Advent in humanity. It is a total rejection of the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship grounded upon disbelief in His incarnation: a spirit which was already exhibited in John's time. But again John teaches, 2 John 7: "Many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come" (Gr. is coming, or who cometh, so many writers have instanced, Lange's *Com. loci*, etc.) "in the flesh. This is a (or the) deceiver and an (or the) Antichrist." This is declarative not only of a denial of the humanity of Jesus Christ, but that He will again come as the Son of man and the Christ. If we turn to the Apoc., John gives us, among other things, the following characteristics. He is to be a blasphemer (Rev. 13:5, 6, taking the Scriptural sense of blasphemy, viz., to say, claim and do that which properly belongs to God); an object of worship to the world (Rev. 13:4, 8, 12, etc.); a possessor of great military power (Rev. 13:4, 7, 12): a persecutor of the saints (Rev. 13:7) and of the Papacy (Rev. 17:16); and a direct hostile opposer of the Lamb (Rev. 17:14 and 19:19). In addition, we have, that he will be an eighth, but virtually seventh, head of the Roman beast (Rev. 13:3 and 17:10, 11. Comp. Prop. 160), and so intent upon establishing his power that he will slay all who will not receive his mark and tender homage to

him (Rev. 13:15–17 and 14:9–13). 2. We notice now the marks given by Paul, in 2 Thess. 2 as follows: He is “the man of sin,” i.e., one of pre-eminent wickedness, in whom sin culminates, being wholly and successfully devoted to it; “the Son of perdition,” i.e. Judas-like he is filled with Satan, Judas-like he opposes Christ and is devoted to destruction (comp. Rev. 17:11), leading others (comp. Rev. 14:9–11) to perdition; the opposer or adversary (see comments) of God and the Christ; the Anti-God (as Chrysostom designates him; v. 4, exalting himself above all that is worshipped, etc.); the Lawless One (Coms.) centring in himself all law; a worker according to or through the energy of Satan “with power and signs, and lying wonders,” etc. 3. We come to the delineation given by Daniel, chs. 7 and 11, where we have, in addition, this power related to, part of, and controlling the beast (the Roman), “speaking great words against the Most High;” making war against the saints; invading Palestine, etc.; in brief, having the same arrogant and hostile last development out of the Roman Empire arrayed against the truth and God’s people, and triumphing over them until deliverance comes from God. (And if we can take ch. 8 by either regarding—as many do—its fulfilment in some power (as e.g. Mohammedanism) as typical, or by making—as others—the little horn the Roman Empire succeeding to the Grecian, then other traits could be added, as being “a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences,” who “shall destroy wonderfully.” cause “craft to prosper,” and shall “stand up against the Prince of princes.” Here he is said to be “broken without hand,” i.e. by supernatural power, direct divine agency, as in Rev. 19, 2 Thess. 2, by Jesus Christ and His armies.) 4. Allusions and descriptions are to be found in other Scriptures. Thus in Ps. 10:18 he is called “the man of the earth” and in Ps. 9 the “man” (e.g. Jerome applies these Ps. to Antichrist) who will be judged by God (various Psalms descriptive of a proud, wicked, overpowering “man” are quoted by the Fathers as illustrative of him, such as Ps. 109, 12, 14, 51, 52, 75, 94, 120, 140, etc., also Isa. 11:4; 14:25; 10:13; Hab. 2:5; Ezek. 38, etc.), conveying the same idea of self-exaltation, greatness of power, violence and hostility to God. As these references will be alluded to under a following observation, it will be sufficient to observe that the distinctive marks of the Antichrist, as presented by the Spirit, are (1) the last and great adversary of God and Christ; (2) the development of infidelity so that it results in a denial of Father and Son, both as it relates to their authority and redemptive work; (3) the denial of the Messiahship of Jesus based upon that of His having come in humanity; (4) the denial of the Theocratic position of Jesus, founded upon that He will not come again in humanity (i.e. as “Son of man”); (5) the retention of a religious element, which causes him to become the object of general worship; (6) the claimer of attributes and honor belonging to God; (7) the blasphemer by way of eminence, exceeding all that has hitherto transpired, being lawless and actuated by Satan, etc; (8) the most astounding capacity and success in obtaining adherents; (9) the obtainer of vast power over the nations; (10) the leader of ten subordinate powers; (11) the eulogized head of a sustaining power; (12) the persecutor of the believers; (13) the overthrower of the whore; (14) the slayer of all who will not worship him; (15) the performer of signs and lying wonders; (16) the direct antagonist of “the King” at His Coming; (17) and finally, the last head or controlling polity arising out of the revived fourth beast or Roman Empire. No wonder that he who humbly receives the Word contemplates such characteristics with astonishment and dread; and that, when locating this Antichrist still in the future (where undoubtedly the Scriptures place it), he regards this a subject well worthy of the closest attention and study.

Obs. 11. When shall this Antichrist be revealed? This is a question of great importance, seeing the tremendous issues pertaining to His advent. The Spirit has not left us without testimony on this point; for while teaching us that the spirit of Antichrist from the days of the Apostolic Church has been in the world, and that all who corrupt the truth and oppose Christ (especially those great powers in a corrupted church, and beside it all that do this) deserve the reproachful name, He also directs us to the one great personal Antichrist, in whom wickedness shall culminate, and plainly tells us that the time of His coming is before the open revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven. It is this Antichrist, with his confederated forces, that makes war with the King at His Coming and is overthrown by Him, a point so clear (Prop. 123), and almost universally held, that it requires no additional notice. This Antichrist is the last head of the fourth Kingdom, the Roman, which when again revived (Prop. 160) persecutes the saints, brings in the fearful tribulation, and makes war with the Lamb. And notice that in Rev. 14, the time of His gigantic power, cruel persecution and worship follows the resurrection and translation of the chosen 144,000, the renewed proclamation of God’s predictions and the fall of the Papal power (and State churches, etc). Antichrist, therefore, however developed previously, succeeds the first stage (Props. 130, 166, 174) of the Sec. Advent and the removal of a select body of saints, and flourishes in all his might, fierceness, and self-deification between the two stages of the Sec. Advent.*

Obs. 12. Before the Antichrist is revealed something which hinders or prevents (2 Thess. 2:6, 7) his manifestation must be removed. We have already shown (Prop. 160, and see Prop. on Translation 130, Obs. 8) how utterly untenable the prevailing theories on the subject are. The removal of the Roman power (so Chrysostom, Jerome, and many others) is not meant, because he (Antichrist) rises out of and forms the controlling part of the fourth beast (it is not even applicable to the case of Papacy, to which it is usually applied, seeing that the Papacy, as taught in Rev. 17, is supported and elevated by the Roman Empire); and that it cannot mean (as Bell, Seiss, etc.) the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit, both on account of the use of the neuter form of the word indicative of that which withholdeth, and from the predicted fact that the Spirit will sustain (not being withdrawn) the multitude of martyrs who die under the Antichristian persecution. The later opinion of some (Ellicott, Alford, etc.) that the reference in the neuter form is to the restraining influence of human law wielded by the Roman Empire and then by other succeeding governments, thus in the latter form (i.e. as a State or States) meeting the masculine form of the phraseology. This view overlooks that this Antichrist springs out of the Roman Empire revived, and that human law, i.e. the laws derived from and under a civil compact, will, in so far as he also represents a

polity, be in full force. He, in fact, regulates society in all its relations by the enactment of law, made, indeed, to suit his ambition, but still the continued regulations of a civil polity. After carefully considering the views hitherto given and the fact, stated in the previous Obs., that the chosen, elect number of saints (symbolized by the 144,000) are first removed, taken away before the revelation of Antichrist occurs, we find no better interpretation for this difficult passage than that suggestive one of Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia (Smith's Bib. Dic., "Antichrist"), which gives a clew to a consistent one sustained by fact. It suggests (from their making that which withholdeth the determination, purpose, decree of God) that the Divine Purpose of God, relating to the number of these elect, chosen ones, must first be fulfilled (thus meeting the neuter form), and that this elect-body must be removed; He who restrains (the Divine Purposer), or the election (thus represented and considered in its corporate capacity) hindering until the predetermined number is completed and taken away—the masculine form being met by an allusion to Him who, by His Purpose in this direction, restrains the coming of Antichrist, or by a reference to the election itself resulting from the Purpose of God, keeping back this mighty evil until its removal as predicted. Passing by several conjectures (such as that the withholding power was Paul, or his supplication, or the apostles, or the prayers of Christians, or Elijah, etc.) as wholly unsustained, we may upon this obscure passage additionally suggest as favorable to the view presented by us, that evidently that which withholdeth continues to withhold down to the present day, seeing that the personal Antichrist is not yet revealed. Besides this, it preserves the idea, mentioned by some (Lange, Olshausen, etc.), that this withholding is to be regarded as "beneficent" and is performed by a "beneficent power" (which our view embraces) without making "the Roman Empire and the Roman Emperor presented in another relation, viz., its beneficent aspect" (so Olshausen) over against the express delineations of the fourth beast by Daniel and John as the reverse of beneficent through all its heads, culminating in the last one. To make, as Olshausen and others, the emperors types of Antichrist and then in their official position the (masculine) restraining power is, as Lange asserts, "too refined and artificial," and it may be added opposed to the impregnable position (Prop. 160) that it is really one of the last, the last, Rulers of the revived, but modified, Roman Empire (because it is to exist, with one or two periods of non-existence particularly asserted to avoid misapprehension, down to the Sec. Advent) who becomes the predicted Antichrist. (Comp. Prop. 130, Obs. 8.)

Obs. 13. A few remarks pertaining to the special partner of Antichrist, viz., the second beast of Rev. 13:11–18, are in place. This false prophet materially aids in exalting and enforcing the authority of the last head of the first beast, and hence deserves our attention. Briefly, it may be said that as the last head of the revived Roman power (the first beast) is still future, so also is this second beast, seeing that all his acts, policy, etc., is directed to sustaining the last head of the first beast, and therefore falls in with the period presented in Rev. 14, viz., after the removal of the 144,000, the renewed proclamation of coming judgments, and the fall of Babylon, and continues to co-operate with this last head down to their co-joined overthrow, Rev. 19:19, 20. Being also a beast, he, like the other beast, represents a polity (one, too, having a twofold power symbolized by the horns); and yet attention is evidently called to one person, the representative or head of this polity, who as "the false prophet" assists the personal Antichrist and meets with his doom. This prophet is not the Antichrist himself, as many have supposed, because he is not the one that is the leader, or that is worshipped, but occupies a subordinate position under the last head of the beast, and aids in causing him to be worshipped. (This is so plainly stated, that any other view is untenable.) This false prophet is, therefore, also not the Papacy, an interpretation adopted by many, even able, writers. The time (see above) when he arises, the subordination to the Antichrist, the activity in causing all to worship the last revived head (and the Papacy instead of being active in causing worship to the Empire, endeavored to divert such honor and worship to itself), and especially in view of the extraordinary power and manifestations of this second beast after the downfall of Babylon (or the Papacy), it is impossible, consistently with the chronological position of the beast and its acts in behalf of the restored last head of the first beast, to apply it to the Papacy (unless inchoately). It refers to a power still future, and which, as to its origin, from whence it will arise, is open to conjecture. Taking the symbolical language into consideration, we can only say this: that if the first beast arose out of the sea, i.e. out of the convulsions of the nations, the rising of the second one "out of the earth," indicates either his arising out of an empire or Kingdom having a more established form of government (so Lord, and others), or out of the Roman earth or Empire (so Faber, etc.), or out of the territorial limits of a Kingdom already established, or arising out of republicanism, etc. When compared with other phraseology, it somehow impresses us with the idea that it springs from a popular and general desire of the multitudes of a settled government pervaded by apostasy, which, now that the established forms of religion are overthrown, cannot free itself entirely from what the Creator has indelibly implanted in man, viz., a religious feeling. Hence this beast arises as the director of worship, to meet a felt and acknowledged want, but, rejecting the Father and the Son, turns man into a public worshipper, under severe penalties, of a self-deified humanity. Disdaining as foolishness the Redemptive process by which God becomes man to reach and embrace humanity in salvation, it, as an expression of human wisdom, seeks for Redemption in making out man to be God; thus seeking its highest good in man, and giving at the final end the most palpable proof that the often ridiculed temptation and fall in Eden is verified in terrible expressiveness. While it is idle to conjecture in what way or in what particular locality he will arise, yet God has given us a sufficiency to fully identify him when he does come. The outlines indicate a power not only devoted to the interests of a Humanitarian religion, but concentrating and enforcing the worship of such a religion in the person of the last head of the first beast. He is the chief miracle worker (Meyrick, art. "Antichrist," Smith's Bib. Dic., overlooks e.g. Rev. 16:13, 14, when he says that miracle working is not attributed to the first beast) in behalf of the first beast, exerts the power of the first beast in his presence, deceives the masses by his miracles, erects image worship in laudation of the Antichrist, and causes all to be killed who refuse such worship.

Obs. 14. Leaving some things which this Antichrist is to perform for the following Propositions, a few things relating to him may be introduced here. The position assumed is that the apostasy—emphasized as the distinctive great apostasy—precedes and introduces the Antichrist, and this only when the last head of the fourth revived Empire is attained; a head, too, so remarkable in its claims, etc., that it deserves to be called an eighth head, and yet, in virtue of its connection with the seventh, really pertains to it. Therefore, neither the Papacy (which is the apostasy, i.e. the great one) nor the Roman Empire (however unchristian and under apostatizing influences) until down to a particular time when it changes its form as intimated in the last head, is the Antichrist (Antichrists in John's sense of "many Antichrists" they may be, but not the particularly predicted last Antichrist). For, as shown, the Papacy is destroyed by this Antichrist, and the Roman Empire does not develop it until this last, final modification takes place. Attention is called again to this point to indicate that this Antichrist is a civil head, the absolute ruler over a vast government, the Imperial Lord over an extended Empire which embraces in it subordinated but too willing civil agents. Connected with this purely civil relationship there is also the religious claim of power to direct the worship of the nations, and it is this especially which gives him the title of Antichrist. Both are combined, and it is this combination which makes Him so fearful to contemplate; the former giving him the ability to enforce the penalties relating to the latter. Now, to understand the prophecies pertaining to him, it must be allowed that the Spirit describes him under his several aspects. Thus e.g. in one place, as 2 Thess. 2, he is portrayed to us more in his religious aspect and hostility to Christ, but linking him by his overthrow through the Advent of Jesus with the virtually eighth head of the fourth beast, which has the same characteristics and fate; in another place, as Rev. 17, he is represented more in his civil aspect, who makes war with Christ and is overcome; and in still another place, as Rev. 13, he is described as combining these in himself. It is only therefore by a comparison of Scripture that we can arrive at the full description—for purposes of recognition and warning—of this gigantic power, concentrated and directed in a single person. This feature makes a regular ascending scale in his portraiture, having him first of all presented simply as a man of great wickedness (as in the Ps.), then as a powerful ruler (as in Isa.), then as identified with the fourth Empire (implied in Dan. 2 and amplified in Dan. 7. Comp. Irenæus, b. v., ch. 25), then respectively we are directed by Paul and John to additional particulars respecting his religious and civil relationship; all of which clearly and unmistakably presents us with a personage, excelling all that has ever yet been manifested in the way of arrogance and sinfulness. The picture presented is too circumstantial, and the results in the blood shed, etc., too horribly particularized for us to believe that it is overdrawn or exaggerated in the least particular. Let the world say what it will, let professed believers explain away as they may the testimony of the Spirit, yet such an Antichrist will, must come. The apostatizing does include a falling away from the truth in those who profess to be in the Church (and this history verifies in that of the Church), but this is only preliminary, preparative to the emergence of the Antichrist. The Antichrist is nowhere asserted to be even a professed member of the Christian Church (see note to preceding Obs. and (5)); his open and unsparing hostility is too apparent to admit of it, but he is the virtually eighth head of the Roman beast, and designated as such, because in this very respect he differs from the immediate preceding head which professed to be still Christian. Yet we must ever keep in mind, as the tenor of prophecy proclaims, that he is one who knows the truth of God as it is recorded (which he opposes), but positively and obstinately rejects it, and sets up another standard for the truth. Therefore he is no heathen, in the sense of one who has never heard the Word, but is one conversant with Bible doctrine and determined upon crushing it. Keeping, therefore, in view these several aspects of the Antichrist, we are the better prepared to recognize and appreciate the Scriptures appertaining to him. Thus e.g. who else but this Antichrist is denoted (Ps. 52) in the "mighty man" (Luther: Tyrant) who "boasts himself in mischief," denies (as implied) the providence of God, deviseth mischief and deceit with his "tongue" (with "the tongue" will he prevail), loves "evil," "lying," and "devouring words;" whom God is to "destroy," "take away," "pluck out of his dwelling place," and "root out of the land of the living;" and of whom it shall be said: "Lo! this is the man that made not God his strength, but trusted in the abundance of his riches, and strengthened himself in his wickedness?" To confine its fulfilment simply to Doeg the Edomite, is to weaken the description, impair its force and propriety, and immeasurably exalt the standing and power of Doeg. In the light of other predictions the Fathers were not mistaken when (Ps. 140) they applied "the evil man," "the violent man," "the evil speaker" or "a man of tongue," who purposes to overthrow the believer in the most insidious manner, and upon whom vengeance is denounced, to the Antichrist. The allusion (Isa. 51:12) to "the man that shall die" and to "the Son of man that shall be made as grass," also styled "the oppressor," is sufficiently significant when taken in its connection with the promised deliverance. Indeed, by observing that the Spirit, while not passing by the preliminary antichristian development, specially describes the culmination, as seen by the relationship it sustains to certain results (the deliverance of God's people, the restoration of the Jewish nation, the introduction of Mill. blessedness, etc.), we will find allusions, scattered here and there, which otherwise would escape the notice and comparison that they richly deserve.*

Obs. 15. This Antichrist will be destroyed before the re-establishment of the Davidic throne and Kingdom. The plain predictions of the Word absolutely require it. The reader, even in a cursory examination of the prophecies, must be struck with the fact that nearly all Millennial descriptions, either in the text or context, incorporate this idea of some great power being suddenly and overwhelmingly overcome by the exertion of Divine interposition and power. Having already abundantly shown (Prop. 123, etc.) this feature of the subject, it is unnecessary to repeat it, seeing how conclusively this is asserted in Rev. 19, 2 Thess. 2, Dan. 7, etc. The identity of the man of sin (Paul), the little horn (Dan.), the eighth head of the seven-headed beast (John), the last Wilful King (Dan.), is abundantly shown in the same claims, the same characteristics, the same end at the same time and by the same means, so that it is impossible, without inconsistency, to reject the overwhelming testimony. With these agree various other predictions already specified, and that

will be advanced in following propositions. To indicate how largely the Spirit describes this overthrow of this culminated antichristian head, we, by way of illustration only, present a few passages. Thus e.g. in Ps. 72. where the blessed and most glorious reign of Jesus, the Messiah, is delineated, it is represented as having broken "in pieces the oppressor," and in saving the poor and needy (Justin, Dial. with Trypho, ch. 34, says, "from the man of power") from "deceit, violence, and bloodshed" (for the expression "precious shall their blood be in His sight" is indicative of a previously experienced martyrdom). The Assyrian of Micah 5:5 has been held by many (as e.g. Victorinus, Com. on Apoc., etc.) to be descriptive of the Antichrist. Notwithstanding the diversity of translations and the conjectures engrafted upon the passage, the student will find that some propriety pertains to this suggestion, because in point of time, as the context shows, it stands related to the Messianic reign over the restored Jews which is effected by the destruction of the Assyrian (the name of the present enemy being used to designate a coming one—a principle advocated by Jews, commentators, and prophetic writers). It at least, whatever difficulty appertains to a correct explanation of a portion of it, pertains to some power who is, at the time when this reign is to be inaugurated and the Jews are to be restored, to invade Palestine, etc., and must, in view of its obscurity, be interpreted in the light of more extended predictions. Again, it is the might of King Jesus that overcomes this "Assyrian." Isa. 66:15–24 is descriptive of this period, as a comparison with other Scripture unmistakably proves, for we have the Coming of the Lord to deliver His people, the fearful destruction by fire and sword of a gathered multitude, followed by the restoration of the Jewish nation, the conversion of the nations that are spared, and the setting up of the new heavens and new earth. In Isa., chs. 25 and 26, the Millennial era is immediately preceded by the violent downfall of some great oppressing power (which was as "the blast of the terrible ones") called "the branch of the terrible ones" (the Anti-Branch). And this retribution, with the Kingdom and blessings immediately following, is pointedly ascribed to the special manifestation and might of the Lord who comes for salvation. Such references could be multiplied, expressively enforcing the unity of prophecy in describing the last times immediately preceding the restored Davidic Kingdom under Jesus, the Christ.

Obs. 16. The subject of the Antichrist teaches, if we will only receive it, that we must come to the interpretation of the Apocalypse in a manner very different from that usually hitherto presented. We find it to be a distinguishing chronological mark and test of various interpretations. Only that mode of explaining the Apocalypse (whatever inchoate fulfilment some may be pleased to engraft upon it) which preserves the Antichrist as the last head of the beast (Rev. 13), and raises up no conflict or contradiction (as to characteristics and final end) between Paul and the Prophets, is alone worthy of our acceptance. The plausibility of interpreting an isolated portion of the Apocalypse, etc., by finding remarkable coincidences in history, must, if true, be corroborated by a comparison of prophecy as given through all of the prophets. The crucial test is found here, and sets aside (whatever of merit, ability, and valuable information may be connected with them) a host of prophetic writings. Let the student, e.g. find the Antichrist overcome by Jesus in Rev. 19 (which all admit), and then let him trace this beast, and he finds at once that by it is denoted the last head of the first beast in Rev. 13. What necessarily follows? First, that this last head is no representative of the Papacy (and neither the false prophet) because the harlot (Papacy) is previously destroyed by this last head and confederated kings. Secondly, that this last head persecuting (Rev. 14) after the fall of Babylon, all of which is still future in fulfilment, has then to experience the outpouring of God's wrath (Rev. 14:10). Now the wrath of God is contained in the seven "vials of the wrath of God" (Rev. 15:1, and 16:1). It follows, therefore, since this last head, arising in his might only after the fall of Babylon and slaying the martyrs of Jesus who refuse his worship and image, is still future, that the outpouring of the vials is also future, for the first one is poured out upon "the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshipped his image" (Rev. 16:2), and which can only be done when this last head of the beast has arisen. The conclusion irresistibly comes upon us, that these vials, at least, are all yet to be fulfilled. Thirdly, the Spirit, as if to guard us against holding a premature fulfilment (as exemplified in otherwise valuable works, Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, Faber's *Diss.*, Lord's *Apoc.*, Barnes's *Com.*, etc.), shows us the relationship that this last head of the beast sustains to prior events (considered in most schemes mentioned as the most satisfactorily proven by history). Thus in Rev. 11:7, the two witnesses are killed by the beast of Rev. 13 (this is admitted), and a comparison of the time mentioned, etc. unmistakably shows that this too is only done by this last head of the beast still future. The prediction hence refers to scenes that are yet to be realized; the proof being irresistible, if we allow the force of comparison logically applied. We are assured (Rev. 11:14) that this is included already in "the second woe," from which we conclude either that we have not entered into it, or that the scenes to be enacted under its duration have not yet been realized, and, therefore, at least from this point, it is premature to engraft a consecutive series of events as fulfilled in the remaining trumpet and vials. Fourthly, the chronological order or regular consecutive series of events upon which so great stress is laid by the Preterist Expositors (although they materially differ as to the events really denoted, e.g. comp. Elliott's seals with Lord's *Exp.*, etc.) is hereby shown to be defective, and that they therefore do not merit the degree of confidence that so many extend to them. The only possible way to reconcile these schemes with the future fulfilment is to allow that the Spirit has so framed them as to permit a kind of partial, inchoate fulfilment (which position some, as Baxter, etc. take). Whatever of truth there may be in such a mode of double interpretation, our subject is one that demands no special examination into its merits. Neither affirming nor denying that some of these predictions may have been inchoately fulfilled, we feel constrained to declare that such a regular, consecutive fulfilment, extending down even to, and through most of, the vials, has no foundation in any fulfilment that history has recorded; seeing that, as shown, many alleged to be past fall within the allotted period of the Antichrist, the virtual eighth head of the beast. Fifthly, this finds its strongest corroboration in the fact that the identity of this last head corresponds with all the other predictions, giving the same time when he exists, attributing the same self-deification and acts, and describing the same Divine agency in his destruction with the

subsequent blessings resulting from his removal. In addition, let the expounder of Rev. obtain once the proven position stated by Christlieb (*Essay on Mod. Infidel.*), that "the Antichrist, who denies the Father and the Son, can be destroyed, not by men, but only by the Lord in the brightness of His Coming," or attributed by Schmid (*Bib. Theol.*, p. 510) to Paul, "the idea that the appearance of Antichrist will immediately precede the manifestation of Christ," then it materially changes the interpretation of a large portion of the Apocalypse. The Advent of Rev. 19, instead of being spiritualized away as something merely providential, etc.; the Millennium, instead of being transformed into a period when the martyr spirit is to be revived; the reign of Christ and of the saints, instead of being regarded and treated as the ordinary operations of grace, etc.; then stand forth with a vividness, reality, and power which again finds its confirmation in the plain, grammatical meaning of the Prophets combined. Whatever faults in details may be noticeable in such interpreters, they at least preserve the distinctive outlines in their consistency, and do not mistake when they distinguish (e.g. like Dr. Gess, *Proph. Times*, vol. 5, p. 130) the Antichrist as belonging to the beast, to which we have applied it in its last head, and as different even from the corrupt Church which it overthrows, and who is to be destroyed by "the second visible manifestation of Jesus" "as the Son of Man in His glorified body and accompanied by His saints," preparatory to "the reign of a thousand years," etc.*

Obs. 17. Something may appropriately be said respecting the tendencies which must necessarily exist previous to, and aid in the development of, this Antichrist. It is evident that such a powerful and wicked personage can never arise and gain the ascendancy over the nations as predicted, unless there is a previous preparation for him. This inquiry becomes the more important, seeing that the period of his manifestation is not far distant. The same reasoning that we have applied to the Sec. Advent in this respect, will also teach us that the coming of this last head cannot be long delayed, with the exception that the Advent (in its first stage, Prop. 130) may occur at any time, while that of the Antichrist will follow certain events (Rev. 14), and will be so recognizable that a previous proclamation to that effect will be general among believers. If the position that is assumed in this work is correct, then we ought to see tendencies leading toward the recognition of such an antichristian power, a drifting of the nations into such a state of unbelief that the way is gradually but surely preparing for this monster manifestation. The predictions of men on this point differ very materially from that given in the Bible. Thus, e.g. Castelar, in the series of able papers on "The Republican Movement in Europe" (*Harper's Mag.*), declares that "the education of the human race must end in the Universal Republic." The inspired Word, on the other hand, pronounces this an idle dream, pointing us, as a resultant of human nature, to a monarchy more arrogant, far-reaching, encroaching, and tyrannical than the world has ever yet witnessed. Eaton (*Perm. of Christianity*, Lect. 5) argues that scepticism is but transient, and will, by the present use of means, ultimately pass away, being but "a definite stage, a passing phase in the process of intellectual growth," and approvingly quotes Carlyle as saying that "this darkness is but a transitory obscurity; these ashes are the soil of future herbage and richer harvests," etc. But God's Word warns us not to receive such predictions of improvement based upon the coming culture, refinement, civilization, science, etc., of man, but to believe that the self-relying efforts of man to exalt humanity will result in his degradation—a degradation, too, so debasing that it falls down to the worship of man in the person of Antichrist—that it even stoops to image worship enforced by the death penalty, and that it imbrues its hands in the blood of a vast number of martyrs. Let the reader study the characteristics of this last head and of the period in which he rules, and prominently stands forth the self-deification of the Antichrist and the worship tendered to him. Men may say this is impossible; but let them look around and see the seed now sown, the opinions now entertained by multitudes respecting the greatness, power, and glory of humanity. Are not Comte, Bauer, Renan, and a large number of writers, lauding and magnifying the incoming "Church of Humanity?" are not to-day a vast body of the leading minds of the world aiming at the overthrow of Christianity and the substitution of the boasted "Religion of Humanity?" Is this an Antichrist? Are there not literally masses who glory (as e.g. the Nat. Assoc. of Spiritualists that met in Chicago September 17, 1873, and through one of the speakers declared: "We are called Spiritualists, but we have another name for our sect, 'Antichristian' ") that they are Antichristian in principle and practice? Does this Antichrist set himself above God and all divine law? What does this necessarily imply, but that which is directly taught, viz., that men, in foolishness and wantonness, will reject the idea of a personal God—a God who has the claims of a Creator and Redeemer. Look around and behold men of the greatest influence, of acknowledged scientific and literary ability, deliberately engaged in the destructive work of setting aside the personality of God, the foundation of all law. Is it not a sad fact, that literally masses among the nations, led on by intelligence and learning, are already discarding the God of the Bible as one who has no existence and to whom, therefore, no man is responsible. Infidelity, guided by the much-lauded scientific learning, is now doing what it never before was able to accomplish, viz., to elevate this rejection of a personal God from its former lower and almost isolated condition into a higher and more dignified position by the artful blandishments of human reason controlled by a proud dislike to the humbling doctrines of the cross. Its advocates can be counted by the million, and occupy the most favorable places to influence the multitude. What in the day of David (Ps. 53) was true in particular instances, and has more or less been seen repeated in history, now under the plea of enlightenment and progress, has become so general that it is unblushingly asserted and defended by numerous writers and lecturers of literary and scientific ability. Dr. Auberlen has well remarked that one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Antichrist is "intellectual culture." In the very nature of the case this must be so, for it is only under the guidance of professed intelligence that the foundations of moral obligation can thus be removed, and that the nations, so far advanced in civilization, can be induced to receive him as the Ruler over them. A just Nemesis seems to bring retribution in the line of offence; for rejecting God as unworthy of homage and worship, they, exalting Nature and Humanity, are led by the insidious doctrine of natural development (the direct opposite of the Bib.

doctrine) and by the removal of the restraints imposed by faith in Holy Writ, to honor and worship man himself as the highest embodiment of law and order; and the result is, that they impose upon themselves the most tyrannical and cruel tyrant that ever yet trod the earth. Let no one turn away from such predictions, and say that it is impossible for intelligence to sink so low in the scale of worship, etc., for, as if purposely to meet this objection, it is expressly foretold, to account for such a fall, that God, "because they received not the love of the truth," "shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie," etc. (2 Thess. 2:10–12), owing to their having "pleasure in unrighteousness." God will permit human nature to carry out the principles now at work to its legitimate end, and will so order it in His Providence that it shall have the liberty and power to culminate, to bring forth the fruitage of its devices, and to abundantly harvest the too faithfully cultivated seed so diligently sown by the multitude of sowers. God's purpose is that man, in his efforts at regeneration in his own way and not after God's plan, shall experience in bitterness and sorrow the falsehood of his own obstinacy and pride, and this, too, by God's ordering, in the adoration of a blasphemer. Having already alluded to the principles at work in this direction (Props. 123, 147, 160, and see Props. 162, 163, 174), it is unnecessary to detain the reader upon a point that must be, in view of abundant existing facts, self-evident. The representations of Antichrist are fearfully dark—"the godless, self-deifying ruler of worldly Empire," the Restorer of a worse abomination than the ancient emperor worship, the instigator and propagator of the most seducing, blasphemous, and persecuting falsehoods—but they are sustained, not merely by their being God's faithful and true portraitures, but by the appalling facts already presented in the dark history of the preceding and preparative apostatizing from the truth which teaches us that when man is cut loose from the Gospel truth, and follows his own imaginings, there is no iniquity and no crime too great which he is not ready to commit. The threats already uttered against Christianity by representatives of large classes of men; the hatred with which the Bible and its doctrines are received; the fanatical following of reason when its deductions are palpably founded upon unproven premises; the laudation and glorification of humanely concocted schemes for the amelioration and exaltation of the race; the widening denial that the world needs Divine interposition and a Divine Redeemer; the elevation of Materialism, Naturalism, Spiritualism, Humanitarianism into the commanding posture of promising Redemption; the sure and steady breaking down of the religious barriers by the interposition and substitution of natural law and the consequent increase of laxity of morals—these are just the indications that we ought to see, if Antichrist's approach draws nigh. It is folly to deny these things or to lessen the value of their warning. Riggensbach (Lange's Com., 2 Thess. 2, and Comp. his quotations from Auberlen, Huebner, etc.) justly observes: "It is well worth while to give heed to the prophetic word, and that so much the more, as the day comes nearer; not throwing it into the shade with a shrug of the shoulder, as if it were a matter of fanaticism." The refusal of man to believe does not alter the predictions or change God's purpose in their fulfilment; and the fact, aside from the greatness, etc., of this enemy, that the Spirit so largely enters into the description of this personage, ought certainly to influence the reverent believer into a careful contemplation and study of this subject. The false faith, now already so prevalent, in man as his own Saviour, when once supported by the predicted Wonder-working power of this Antichrist and his associate, the False Prophet, will have no difficulty in accepting of and acknowledging the Antichrist in his most daring of claims, for it will conclude that such faith, attested to and proven by "lying wonders," is pre-eminently worthy of being entertained, especially when it falls in with the carnal desires of the heart and tramples upon the detested Biblical repentance and self-sacrificing faith. Plausibility and human desires enforced by miracles, finds the masses so well prepared that the man coming in the name of Humanity (Comp. Jno. 5:43, which extends beyond the Jews, although the Jews, too, are to be prepared by an adherence to "the new religion of Humanity," which many now indorse, to receive its highest exponent, the Antichrist as their Messiah) will find, as predicted, a mighty host of adherents, which will be only too ready to do his bidding. Men are already busy proclaiming a "New Religion," a "new order of things" which is to supersede Christianity; and when we turn to the Bible to inform us in what this boasted Religion and Order shall consist, we shudder at the fearful exchange made, at the horrible transmutation experienced, feeling assured that it can never, as God's Word teaches, be introduced without a previous falling away from the truth, and without the superadded agencies of a most astounding nature. Theories and words flattering to man, the unification of some ideas congenial to the corrupt nature of man, the specious promises of deliverance to humanity in religion and government, the tenders of beguiling enjoyments and pleasures, the cry of a common and universal brotherhood under one central headship to meet the longings of ages, and all this under the manipulation of the wonderful prophet, leads to the culmination of the sin of Adam to be like God in a headship which theocratically only belongs to God and His Christ. Antichrist is the last step in the development of Satanic influence and power in and through man, and we are assured that this last phase shall be specially pervaded by his energy in order to resist the incoming Messianic Kingdom. Amazing climax! so astonishing is it, that (Rev. 13:3 and 17:8) "all the world wondered after the beast," excepting only those who are believing and wise.

Obs. 18. The worship of Antichrist evidences that man, however atheistic some of his utterances are, cannot divest himself of some conception of religion, the necessity of worship, and the superiority of some being. For, constituted by the mercy and love of the Creator a religious being, he cannot, as Luthardt justly observes in his Apolog. Lectures, "get rid of the idea;" because a belief in something higher than his individual self naturally arises from his moral constitution. This universality and indestructibility of religion is most forcibly developed by Dr. Sprecher in his Groundwork of Theol., and in relation to it he (p. 280) remarks: "It is a universal fact of human life, of man's existence as an individual and as a society. In every individual there is subjectively, and in every community objectively, the element of religion. This is now very generally acknowledged, even by the opponents of Christianity. It is now seen that religion in some form always has existed and always will exist. It may be neglected and practically ignored; men may stupefy themselves into habitual indifference to it, but they can never destroy its existence. Even Idealism with its pantheism, and

Materialism with its Atheism, are now seen to be forms of religion. And even absolute Nescience, which denies the valid being of the knower and the known, and recognizes only the knowing as real, must yield itself to 'the theory of knowledge,' as its God. That it has always and everywhere existed, is now acknowledged as an indisputable fact." Now this very innate adaptability and susceptibility of man to religion and worship will be taken advantage of in order to pave the way for a recognition of the Antichrist, aided by the infernal machinery set in operation by the False Prophet. Christlieb (Mod. Doubt, p. 143), after showing that the rejection of God is "an arbitrary act of the will," adds: "It was therefore a perfectly correct instinct which led the Greeks to look upon atheism as a moral fault. And every moral fault avenges itself. The refusal to acknowledge which is, and absolutely is, and is directly certain to every heart, leads to the acceptance of that which is nothing but a deceptive shadow. Man must have a God. If he rejects the true God, he must make a God for himself, and this is of necessity a false one." Already we see the signs of religious concession from many able unbelieving pens, for, passing from the purely materialistic idea which makes man a mere "sentient automaton," they argue that man in course of development must have, in correspondence with what nature has bestowed, some kind of religion adapted to his circumstances.*

Obs. 19. This antichristian religion and worship culminates in the deification of man and his worship. It is strange that Christianity should meet as a final struggle the deification of humanity which it met when it started on its mission of gathering out the believers. In the beginning the apotheosis and worship of the emperors was a serious and strong opponent, and became the test of faith and perseverance. Uhlhorn (Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, p. 56, etc.) shows in detail how important and extended this worship was, saying: "It would be a great misapprehension to regard the worship of the emperors solely as an indication of the extent to which human folly can go, and as deserving only ridicule and scorn. In reality it exerted the greatest influence not only upon the religious, but also upon the social, life of that time; and became of the greatest importance in the conflict of Christianity and Heathenism." He proceeds to show how deeply rooted this was among the ancients; how it extended over the provinces and became a duty, an act of patriotism, and an expression of gratitude; how it "gained great political and social importance" in provincial assemblies and fraternities; how it supplied a worship common to the whole Roman Empire, and thus introduced a unity; how "the worship of the emperors eclipsed all other worships" (quoting Melito as saying: "The statues of the emperors are more revered than those of the ancient gods"); and how it became a test of the faith and religion of the subjects. This religious development, culminating in imperial worship, will be repeated on a more fearful scale. The deification of man will bring forth a more dreadful fruitage at the close of this dispensation.*

PROPOSITION 162. This Kingdom will be preceded by a fearful time of trouble, both in the Church and the World.

This already follows from the preceding Propositions. The rise and progress of the Antichrist, the acts performed by him, the persecution experienced under him, and the outpouring of God's judgments, all embrace a series of trial and trouble unexampled in the history of the world.*

Obs. 1. Coming now to specify more particularly the persecutions that shall arise, a few introductory remarks are in place. Some, when the subject is mentioned, are at once ready to discredit, and even (as the writer knows from experience) to ridicule, it, presuming that human nature so enlightened and civilized cannot and will not break forth into such acts of persecution and cruelty as are predicted. But God knows human nature better than we do, and can assuredly foretell its depraved manifestations. It has often been remarked, taking the evidence given by the sad history of the past, that the most cruel enemy of man is man himself. The same old man still exists, and, under favorable circumstances, will manifest himself. When men like Bossuet, Massillon, and a host of others, equally famous, can indorse the persecutions and tortures inflicted by fanaticism; when misguided zeal and unenlightened piety can, without pity, bestow as an alleged act of self-protection the most fearful deaths; when men and women can, in the supposed interest of their rights, pass from violence to murder; when M. Venillot (Harper's Mag., Ap., 1874, p. 784) in the Univers can say: "For my part, I frankly avow my regret not only that John Huss was not burned sooner, but that Luther was not burned too. And I regret, further, that there has not been some prince sufficiently pious and politic to have made a crusade against the Protestants;"—all this, and much more that columns of any newspaper will afford, teaches us what confidence to place in human nature. The latter, without the superadded grace of God, is (however learned and wise) wicked and ready, when interest prompts, to do evil; and even with that grace in a measure added but not wholly controlling the man, it may, as alas! too many cases attest, fall into a spirit of persecution that is antichristian. It was probably this view of the incorrigible nature of man that causes even a Renan to despairingly say (Ded. to St Paul): "I am fearful that Fate has stored up no good for us in this world," in direct contradiction to his dreams of a golden future. In the discussion of this subject we plant ourselves firmly upon the Word of God; what that Word says respecting it we receive, and believe, and teach. (1) It will not do to say, as some, that the progress of the Gospel forbids such an enactment of bloody scenes, for the Bible does not tell us that down to the Sec. Advent the Gospel will be accepted by the masses, but exactly the reverse (Prop, 175, etc.). The tares exist down to Christ's coming, and at the time of His Advent in such abundance, too, that they form a mighty array in contrast to the wheat. The simple fact that the great confederation is arrayed against Christ at His coming is sufficient proof of the correctness of our position; and that human nature, notwithstanding the privileges and mercy

enjoyed, is capable of any act when under the influence of passion and selfishness. Finding this recorded, we receive it. (2) Well-meaning and pious persons, by an expression of affected humility which makes it only the more deceptive, coolly inform us that although recorded we can know nothing about it. Thus e.g. that otherwise excellent writer, James (The Church in Earnest, p. 289), although he can in his way know and tell us of the triumphs of the Church, says: "What vials of wrath have yet to be exhausted upon the world, or through what tribulations the Church has yet to pass on her way to her Millennial and to her triumphant state, it is not for us even to conjecture. Perhaps there are conflicts for her to endure, of which she is now happily ignorant." "Perhaps!" "Conjecture!" is it possible, in the light of so much Scripture, and the exhortations to take heed thereto, to make such an utterance? Allow that there is symbolical language and details difficult to explain, yet a child even can comprehend that this very language is descriptive of fearful tribulation to the Church under some gigantic power. There is no "conjecture" and "perhaps" in the meaning intended, and the man, whoever he is, and however pious, who implies that the future trial of the Church is one of doubt, is to that extent responsible of concealing the truth from the people. (3) Another class are found who know the severe ordeal through which the Church is to pass, but refrain from expressing themselves. Thus e.g. Dr. Clarke, in closing his comments (Com.) on Dan. 7, employs the following language: "In considering these things and looking at the evils that shall come upon the world before those auspicious times can take place, I may say with Daniel: My cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me, but I keep the matter of my conjectures and consequent feelings in my own heart." Dr. Clarke, however, has not concealed, as many places show, the fact that the church and world is yet to endure great tribulation; but there are literally a great number who know that the fact is unmistakably predicted and yet make no mention of it, speaking "peace and safety" to the people. They receive and believe, but do not teach, for fear of being regarded enthusiastic, or fanatical, forgetting that they will be held responsible by the Saviour for withholding the Divine warnings (4). Simple honesty and candor, with a reverence for God's faithful word, and a desire to warn others, urge us to direct attention to these last times, and to conceal nothing which God has deemed proper to reveal, and which He has commanded us to read, study and proclaim (2 Tim. 4:6, Rev. 1:3, Luke 11:42, etc.). We dare not, with our convictions of duty, do less; and hence, therefore, even those who may not be willing to receive what is here asserted, will, at least, credit us with being deeply impressed by a sense of responsibility in this matter, seeing that in the immediate connection of this Antichrist the Spirit (Rev. 13:9) says: "If any man have an ear, let him hear,"—a phrase most expressive that the matter in hand is one of special importance and deserving of our closest attention. We constantly feel too, that we are not so much writing for the present time as for the time of tribulation to come. When the true Church finds herself struggling amid the thickest gloom, and the false predictions of peace, safety and prosperity are found delusive; when the world instead of being converted, is found arrayed against the truth, reason holding the sway in place of faith, and the Word of God is abjured and derided as unworthy of enlightened man; when the multitude follow wondering after the revived beast, the Antichrist, and a bloody death, or a dastardly forsaking and denial of Christ is presented as the only alternative; when there is no hope or way of escape, and the godly among men are to cease amid the penalties of image-worship, then it is that anything and everything that can throw any light upon the painful situation will be eagerly accepted and pondered. The Bible will be read and searched with increasing interest—intensified by actual trial and suffering—and everything illustrative of the times then existing will be most carefully examined. Then it is that such a work like this—perhaps now derided and sneered at by some professed believers—will be thankfully perused and its deductions from the Scriptures gratefully contrasted with the then existing manifestations and the Divine original. It is both an honor and a privilege to write for such a period, thus becoming, by God's grace, instrumental in upholding the faith and consoling the hearts of martyrs, of sustaining men and women under Antichrist's cruel rule by the assurance that this very trial shall redound, if faithful, to their everlasting honor and glory (Rev. 20:4, 6). The same can be said of the faithful warnings given of this period by various writers of ability and eminence in England, Germany, Holland, America, etc., whose works, now appreciated by the few, will be specially read and studied by all the pious (when Antichrist comes) to give them strength and comfort amid the terrible incoming trouble. The very fact that this tribulation has been predicted, that reverent students of the Word insisted upon its fulfilment, etc., will have no little influence in confirming the martyr faith of many. God help them to suffer and to triumph.

Obs. 2. That; fearful times are immediately to precede the open manifestations of Jesus Christ was so distinctly taught in the Old Test. by various prophets and especially by Daniel, that the Jews universally held to a great time of trouble preceding the times of the Messiah. They anticipated, as Lightfoot, Berthold, and others, remarked: "Dolores Messiæ, or calamitous times to precede the reign of the Messiah," (comp. views of Rabbins, Lange's Com. Matt. 2:3, etc.) and which Olshausen (Com. Matt. 24:6–8) states the Rabbins called "the birth pangs of the Messiah" Even such passages as Isa. 59:19 were thus interpreted by them—upon which verse Clarke (Com. loci) remarks: "This all the Rabbins refer to the Coming of the Messiah. If ye see a generation that endures much tribulation, then (say they) expect Him according to what is written, 'when the enemy shall come in as a flood,' " etc. As is well known, these predictions were not verified at the First Advent; no such hostile power as was predicted was overcome by Christ, and no such glorious reign followed (the reasons for this have already been given), and to avoid making this an objection to the Messiahship of Jesus we find that in the New Test, these predictions are incorporated and applied in their fulfilment to the Sec. Advent of this same Jesus. Instead of a denial of them, or an effort to spiritualize them away to mean something else, the Jewish faith is retained, explained, amplified, and referred to the period preceding and at the open revelation of the resurrected and ascended Lord. The confirmation of the Jewish belief is found in the utterances of Jesus (Matt. 24, etc.) in the warnings of the Apostles, and especially in the Revelation of John. "The terrible one that is brought to naught" (Isa. 29:19, 20. Comp. Alexander's

Version) at the Coming of "the Holy One of Israel" because he oppressed the people of God, is applied to the last head of the beast at the Advent of King Jesus; and the wonderful healing of the people followed by continuous blessings but preceded by the Coming of the Lord in anger toward the nations and in confining the King (the head) in the ordained Tophet (Isa. 30), is in the New Test. referred to that virtually eighth head of the revived beast who is taken at the Coming of the Lord and cast (Rev. 19) into the Lake of Fire. Such adoption and continued amplification of Old Test. prophecies engrafted upon the Sec. Advent are indispensable to preserve the unity of prophecy; and we most gratefully receive and adopt them as essential to the consistency of Revelation, how ever much some may sneeringly call them "Jewish fables." Satisfied with the grammatical sense of these prophecies—a sense abundantly sustained by past and present fulfilment—and fortified by the Jewish and Primitive interpretation; sustained by a long series of the most eminent divines and expositors, we receive as eminently Scriptural the following clause (quoted by Dr. Seiss in A Question in Eschatology, p. 37—see his references in same connection to other confessions and especially to Melancthon's views respecting "the last times, immediately before the end of the world," etc.) taken from the Latter Confession of Helvetia (1566), XI Art., "Out of heaven the same Christ will return unto Judgment, even then, when wickedness shall chiefly reign in the world, and when Antichrist, having corrupted true religion, shall fill all things with superstition and impiety, and shall most cruelly destroy the Church with fire and bloodshed."

Obs. 3. The careful reader of the Bible must have observed this remarkable peculiarity connected with it, viz., that in a multitude of places it speaks of the vengeance poured out upon the nations of the earth by God at His Coming in wrath after long delay, and the prayer is offered up, most fervently, that God should thus come. This feature has been seized upon by unbelief and urged as an objection against the Word itself (as breathing a cruel spirit, etc.), and even some Christians (as Stanley, His. of the Jew, Ch., p. 170) misapprehending its propriety, have pronounced it "a defect" as exhibited e.g. in Psalms 18, 69, 109, 137, etc.). Infidelity sneeringly calls it "a vindictive spirit," that (Gibbon, ch. 38) nourished the savage breast of Clovis," and weak faith either feebly attempts to apologize for it, or, as stated, acknowledges it as (mildly worded) "a defect." The truth is, that it needs no apology, but it is precisely the language that we ought reasonably to anticipate, provided it is true that, after the long extended mercy and love of God in Christ Jesus, the nations and the kings of the earth will be arrayed against the truth; that they will exalt a monster of iniquity over them as their chief Ruler; that they will proceed to martyr all true believers; and that they will even dare to oppose the Lord Jesus Himself. These Psalms are prophetic. The Spirit, by anticipation, speaks for the believer, and puts forth the prayers that time will prove are precisely those that true piety, oppressed by a terribly vindictive power, can consistently utter. (Comp. Prop. 115).*

Obs. 4. Without endeavoring to present the order of events (which is elsewhere intimated), let us from the Scriptures ascertain who shall endure the tribulation of the last days. The Jews shall not escape. Sufficient and interesting data exist showing that they, too, will feel the terrible scourge of the Antichrist. That which is more obscurely stated by other prophets is plainly presented in Zech. 14, implying that a partial restoration (which many writers attribute to this Antichrist, others to some other friendly power) of a portion of the nation has been previously effected. Here the prophet predicts an overthrow of the city of Jerusalem which has never yet taken place. The events that follow, the Divine interposition, the Coming of the Lord with all the saints, the fighting and success of Judah, the plague that strikes the nations fighting against Jerusalem, the peaceful and happy restoration, the general worship—all forbid any interpretation, than that of a still future devastation of the city by some great power, which in turn is met and destroyed by the Lord Himself miraculously interposing. The student will not consider this prediction isolated, but immediately seeks out the parallel prophecies which serve to illustrate and confirm this statement. These are found without difficulty in various places. Thus, e.g., Zech. begins with the destruction of the city without mentioning the power that does this, as if it were a matter already well known, or at least previously predicted. This is the case, for he begins with the latter part of Dan. ch. 11, and first part of ch. 12. Daniel tells us that this last king shall enter Palestine and occupy the glorious holy mountain, without specifying particularly what he does to Jerusalem (which Zech. gives); and that this alludes to the same period is evident from the identical results following, viz., "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time," the Divine interposition, the deliverance of God's people, including a resurrection of the dead. Indeed Faber, and many other writers, have so conclusively proven that Daniel, Zechariah, Joel and John, all describe the same last culminated Antichrist, accompanied by the same overthrow through supernatural interference, and the same restoration of the Kingdom of God, that it is superfluous to dwell longer upon the identity of description. Besides these, there are other predictions that specify a crisis in the history of the Jews at the very time of their deliverance. Let the reader consider the context and text of Millennial descriptions, and notice how the prophet, without the least indication of a change from Jew to Gentile, speaks of the rejection of the Jewish nation long continued, of their fallen condition and oppression suddenly followed by an astonishing, marvellous deliverance and exaltation. Thus, e.g., in Isa. 49, and as indicative of the same, the question is asked, "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty? (or as Lowth, Clarke, Syriac, Vulgate, etc., read: "Shall the prey seized by the terrible be rescued?") and then comes "the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children. And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine; and all flesh shall know that I the Lord am the Saviour and the Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob." Various utterances intimate the same, as in Ps. 50, when "God shall come" "to judge His people" and "a fire shall devour before Him," etc., the assurance, implying existing trouble, is given "And call upon Me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me." Abundance of illustration can be found in Isa. chs. 41, 24, and 25, 33, etc., so that Jeremiah, in view

of the condition of the same nation that is oppressed, and whose restoration is predicted by him in the context, exclaims: "Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it; it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it."*

Obs. 5. All believers in Jesus Christ then existing shall endure a sharp and excessively severe persecution under Antichrist. Many predictions in the Old Test. plainly teach this, when we consider that the Bible regards all such as adopted Jews, engrafted and accounted as the seed of Abraham. Therefore it is, that many prophecies pertaining to this period which describe the sufferings and oppression of God's people, include not merely the elect Jewish nation but also the adopted faithful from among the nations—a continuation of the elect people. Having already presented much Scripture bearing on this point, it is only necessary to direct the attention of the reader to a few passages directly teaching the greatness and universality of this tribulation under this last head of the beast, and this too affirmed of the faithful in Christ Jesus. The time is surely coming, whether men credit it or not, when this Antichrist, in the greatness of his power and the wantonness of his will, shall reproduce the edict of the ancient King of Babylon, and the compelled worship of the golden image on the plains of Dura will be reasserted in the homage demanded for Antichrist and his image. All men are required to worship the beast and to receive, as evidence of it, his distinguishing mark, or else forfeit life itself. The description is too precise and simple to allow us to mistake its dreadful meaning. Turn to Rev. 13, and read what is to be done under this last head, how he shall "blaspheme" God, "make war with the saints and overcome them" "and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed" (comp. Rev. 14:9–13, and 17:10–14). Then when we turn to Rev. 20:4, and 7:14, we find that a multitude of persons have, rather than forsake the worship and honor of Jesus, refused to yield obedience to the cruel edict in reverence to the self-deifying Antichrist, and have laid down their lives in martyr faith and grace. Alas! man again will so hate the truth, the humbling but elevating truth, as it is in Christ Jesus, that he will be satisfied with nothing less than a denial of Him who exhibited His costly love for us on the cross, and in the shedding of precious blood consecrated to God through His Son. Alas! it stands recorded that "all that dwell upon the earth shall worship, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Wonders, of which Spiritualism may give the faintest earnest, connected with Humanity following out its fleshly desires and sustained by the powerful civil and military power of the beast, will so impress the minds of the masses that, notwithstanding the impression and even terrific warnings (Rev. 14:9–11) of God, they will not only receive the mark of the beast and worship his image, but even carry out his sanguinary edicts and stain their hands with innocent and righteous blood. Thanks be to God. that many, on the other hand, upheld by the Word and the Spirit, urged on by the promises of, and love for, the Saviour, shall not be deceived by the miracles—shall not quail under the demands of worship—shall not sacrifice their honor and glory to abject fear and transitory pain—shall not refuse to tread in the bloody footsteps of their Master who loved them also unto death. We rejoice to-day while writing, that, if faithful ourselves, we shall have the honor and pleasure of seeing, in the Coming Kingdom, that glorious multitude, stripped of their bloody garments and arrayed in white, and of hearing from their own lips the story of trial, of sustaining faith, and of triumph over Antichrist. When these scenes transpire; when death or man-worship is the alternative; when Christ or the Antichrist is to be chosen, then, more impressively than ever, will such Scripture stand forth to bestow encouragement and warning to decide for Jesus, as, e.g., Matt. 10:39; 16:25; Mark 8:35; John 12:25, etc. Then, too, that class of passages which exhort us to endure persecution, as e.g. 2 Tim. 3:12; John 15:20; Acts 14:22; 1 Thess. 3:3; 1 Pet. 4:9, etc.—which encourage us to meet it, as e.g., Phil. 1:8, 28, 29; 1 Pet. 1:6; 2 Thess. 1:4, 5; 1 Pet. 4:12, 13, etc.—which stimulate us to suffering by the promise of blessing, as e.g., Matt. 5:12; Rom. 8:18; 1 Pet. 1:7; Luke 6:22, 23, etc., will all be deeply pondered and cherished in loving hearts. The warning given by Arch. Usher (see statement in detail, Brooks's El. Proph. Interp., p. 168), just previous to his death, "that a very great persecution would fall upon all the Protestant churches of Europe" adding "I tell you, all you have yet seen hath been but the beginning of sorrows to what is yet to come upon the Protestant churches of Christ, which will ere long fall under a sharper persecution than ever," is only one of a multitude that might be quoted from eminent men—all based upon the decided teachings of the Word. When conservative men, like Usher, are forced to make such acknowledgments; when the most able and learned divines, the leading commentators and expositors have no hesitancy (comp. Olshausen, Lange, Alford etc.) in repeating the same, and exhorting to observation, etc.; when the Spirit has presented it to us in a form that leaves no possible doubt (saving in unbelief) of its occurrence, it is folly and rashness in us to turn away from the subject. If we have no regard for ourselves (not deeming ourselves in danger of experiencing it) let us consider those who may and will experience it, peradventure our own children or children's children. Love for these, love for the Church, love for our fellow-men, love for the truth and the Redeemer, should influence us neither to neglect these things nor to keep silence respecting them. Allow that we are mistaken in the minor details, that we have misapprehended this or that particular statement in the description yet there remains the broad and distinctive outlines of a coming dreadful, persecuting power under which believers shall fall as the wheat before the reaper. If there is a truth recorded in God's Word easy of comprehension, and abundantly confirmed by reiteration, it is, that, just before the open revelation of Jesus Christ, the Antichrist, whoever he may be, shall terribly persecute the people of God. While deprecating that precise fixing of time which so many, to the injury of the cause, adopt in their writings, yet it is true (as Rieneke and many others have very ably shown) that the precise time, during which this persecution is to last, has been pointed out in Rev. 13:5–8, comp. Rev. 11:3–7, etc. The double assurance is thus given that this Antichrist has his time limited, and that the persecution is to be a short one. This persecution too shall be "suddenly"—after "the secret counsel of the wicked and "the privily laid snares" have been concocted—sprung upon the righteous to take them if possible unawares, and just as "suddenly" (Ps. 64, comp. Rev. 16:15; 1 Thess. 5:3, etc.) shall God ensnare the persecutors in destruction. No doubt too, one cause of the exceeding bitterness and animosity manifested

toward the followers of Jesus, will be the previous proclamation (see Obs. below) that this last revived head will be the Antichrist. The personal hatred toward believers is thus easily accounted for; naturally, it will be excited by the faithful portraiture which, by way of warning, Christians will extensively circulate. We can well imagine, when contemplating the extent of the bloodshed which is to be inflicted by "the throne of iniquity" "which frameth mischief by a law" (Ps. 94), and causes its upholders to "gather themselves together against the soul of the righteous and condemn innocent blood" how then the prayer (same Ps.) shall ascend "O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth; O God, to whom vengeance belongeth, show Thyself. Lift up thyself, Thou Judge of the earth; render a reward to the proud. Lord, how long shall the wicked, how long shall the wicked triumph? How long shall they utter and speak hard things? and all the workers of iniquity boast themselves? they break in pieces Thy people, O Lord, and afflict thine heritage. They slay the widow and the stranger, and murder the fatherless. Yet they say the Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it." Then comes the response (same Ps.) that God does hear and see, and that "He shall bring upon them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; yea, the Lord our God shall cut them off." Yes, and even before the vials of God's wrath are poured out upon this last great enemy we find those delivered who "had gotten the victory" (strange but glorious victory through death) "over the beast and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God," etc. (see Rev. 15:2-4 and comp, e.g., with Rev. 16:2). They, owing to faithfulness, shall see their prayer answered—shall behold the outpouring of the judgments "upon the men which had the mark of the beast and upon them which worshipped his image," and "upon the seat of the beast"—shall witness the awful overthrow of the once mighty enemy forming "the supper of the great God" for the fowls of heaven (Rev. 19:17). What an astounding change from persecution to inexpressible glory, and in glory to behold the burning, devouring wrath of a justly incensed God descend upon a self-exalted, self deifying and vilely murderous Humanity.

Obs. 6. The Papacy too, however faithless and unchristian, however apostatizing and antichristian in the past, and future, shall also fall beneath this Antichrist. The Papacy, with all its arrogant claims and its persecution of the saints, is too Christian even for this lawless, godless Leader. Whatever aid (as many believe) it may at first extend in paving the way for the development of the Antichrist, it is in antagonism with his ambitious projects and his personal claims to universal homage, and it, too, finds in him a deadly enemy. The proof of its downfall and destruction is distinctly given in Rev. 17:15, 16, and having already called attention to it, a repetition of argument is unnecessary. The line of punishment falls in with that of previously committed offence; strenuously opposed to "religious liberty" and ready, wherever it had the power, to crush it as a dangerous and deadly crime, the Papacy now in turn feels the effective and crushing blows of a Tyrant who also will not tolerate "religions liberty." Instead of the Pope as the vicegerent of Jesus Christ on earth, now One arises claiming to be God, who will not permit any such claimant to honor and power to exist contemporaneously with himself. The Papacy, therefore, is doomed to perish; the beast and the ten horns (so Bengel, Stuart, etc.) shall hate her, shall make her desolate and naked, shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. This, we are assured, too, is fully determined (Rev. 17:17) by God Himself.*

Obs. 7. The world, the nations, shall not escape this tribulation. Led on by their rejection of the truth, they willingly place themselves under the yoke of this Antichrist, and the result is, that they shall feel the tyranny of their received master, be participants in the reception of the avenging vials, and finally fall under the contest with the Lamb. Jesus tells us, Luke 21:25, that there shall be "upon earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them from fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken." With this the prophets all agree, giving us when brought together a most gloomy and fearful portrayal of wickedness, misery, suffering, and punishment. If any desire to look at the Divine description, let them read, e.g., the pouring out of the vials—Rev. 16, or the overthrow by Christ Rev. 19, or the opening of the sixth seal Rev. 6, or the utterances of the prophets Isa. 24; Ps. 2; Zech. 14; Joel 3; Zeph. 3, etc. Having already referred to Scripture (Props. 147, 133. Obs. 8, (11) 160, 161, 130, etc.) relating to this matter, it is unnecessary to repeat what is so plain. It is pre-eminently the day of God's vengeance, the period of God's controversy with the nations, the time when God rises up to the prey, the season when God's anger and fury and indignation shall be poured out, when fire and sword and plague and all manner of evil shall find its affrighted victims, and when the once weeping, dying, loving Jesus shall come with His mighty messengers "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Let men say what they please, God is abundantly justified in thus exhibiting a dreadful day of vengeance. Behold the situation as the Spirit describes it. Here upon this very earth created by God, the people, for whom He even provided a Redeemer, rebel against and actually disown him, contemptuously reject His Son, the Son of His love whom He designs as the Theocratic Ruler, and proceed to manifest this disregard and hatred by elevating a man into the place of God, and brutally putting to death all who will not worship him. Is it any wonder that God is angry? Is it a matter of astonishment that "the earth shall be devoured with the fire of His jealousy," seeing that another is exalted to His place? Should it be a matter of surprise, that the Theocratic King—the One to whom the honor of ruling the nations justly belongs—should come in wrath against this arrogant and boasting claimant and his adherents? No! it is only a matter of wonder that the long-suffering of God, the patience of Jesus, should endure so long, and allow such encroachments upon the Divine prerogatives. The solution of this, we are told, is found in God's desire to complete the number of His elect, to test the faith of His people, to permit human nature for its own punishment to set up and try its saviour, to indicate more strikingly the impotency of man and the greatness and majesty of His own power, to teach the race the impressive lesson that He is a Covenant-keeping God,

who has mercifully held that Covenant in abeyance for purposes of mercy but who, when men in the highest of earthly relations deny Him and substitute another to be their God, vindicates His own sense of justice by destroying those enemies and fulfilling His Covenant promises both to the Son and the Son's brethren. An expressive declaration that also teaches how desperately blinded and wicked the nations are when entering under the judicial visitations of God before the final catastrophe, is found in the words: "they repented not to give Him the glory"—they "repented not of their deeds," but continued on in "blaspheming the Name of God." For the destruction of such unmitigated rebels, God needs no justification; if, in justice and love to the martyrs, to His Son and to Himself, He did not do so, then and then only might we question both the justice and love of our God.

Obs. 8. The reader need not be detained for us to prove that this tribulation immediately precedes the re-establishment of the Davidic throne and kingdom. This has been done under various Propositions and in numerous Observations. It is sufficiently clear that immediately after the tyranny and persecution of this last head of the beast, and that after the overthrow of the confederation under this Antichrist, the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus appears with its Millennial blessedness, and extends itself over the nations of the earth. Leaving the abundant Scripture already presented, we confine ourselves to a solitary illustration, which forcibly describes this period of the enemies' triumph, their overthrow, and the peaceful kingdom that succeeds. Take Ps. 46 and consider how the Spirit describes the confidence of the true believer in a time of unparalleled trouble and commotion, precisely such as attends this period of tribulation. It is a time when "the heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved," and God helps His people amid the waving, troubled and swelling waters "when the morning appeareth" (marg. reading, comp. Prop. 139) and He breaks to pieces the warlike equipments of the nations, exalting Himself among the heathen—that "a river (i.e., a kingdom), the streams whereof shall make glad the City of God," appears and is firmly established, because "God is in the midst of her." (Comp. other versions which, with some change, even make it more expressive as e.g., Luther's, that the City of God, in which are the holy habitations of the Most High shall be joyful, etc.). The testimony on this point is overwhelming, and to an extent too that leaves every one who rejects it inexcusable. There is no doubt whatever that so much is said respecting it, that when the hour of the sorest trial comes to the Church, she may console and encourage herself by the glorious prospect before her.*

Obs. 9. This subject now so much neglected, even despised by many, will at a future time be made the special subject of preaching. Holy Writ informs us that on the withdrawal of the 144,000 (Rev. 14), the Church will then so definitely know its nearness to the tribulation under Antichrist, will be so profoundly impressed with the greatness and imminency of danger—will so accurately realize what are the cruel demands of the Antichrist, that the most extensive proclamation is not only made (vs. 6, 7.) to fear and worship God because "the hour of His judgment is come;" but in the plainest of terms (vs. 9–13) the Antichrist is pointed out, and men are exhorted by the most powerful of motives not to worship the beast or his image and not to receive his mark. Then believers, instead of neglecting these prophecies and ridiculing those who engage in their study, will earnestly investigate and compare all that the Spirit has mercifully given, and will acknowledge the wisdom of those who honored God's Word in accepting of the testimony. The preaching will give no uncertain sound; the classes symbolized will faithfully proclaim the message, and, thank God, with so great success that they will persuade a multitude not to engage in the worship of Antichrist but to lay down their lives in honor of the truth, in love for their Redeemer, and in hope of speedy and glorious deliverance. By faith, we now see that noble band of preachers and hear the burning words of warning fall from their lips: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb," etc. By faith we see fathers, mothers and children, unbroken families, delicate females, feeble age and childhood, receive God's Word and trusting in it, spurn the worship tendered to them and fall beneath the bloody stroke of self-deifying Humanity. Then too, the seducing dream now proclaimed from so many pulpits by even earnest and honest hearts (viz., that the Church by present means and instrumentalities is progressing onward to sure triumphs over the world) will be heard no more giving place to the warnings, the threatenings of Antichrist's brief victory over the Church (for he shall overcome the saints and the godly shall cease), and to exhortations to faithfulness and steadfastness in the coming bloody drama. And, of this too, we feel assured from the complexion of the predictions implying it, that the sense of a common danger, that the knowledge that all believers without exception are now to enter the great tribulation, that the fact that all who love Jesus more than Antichrist must suffer, will unite all believers the more firmly together in love and fellowship. Before the incoming Antichrist, that mighty enemy who shall so freely and unsparingly shed the blood of the faithful, the differences of confession, worship, government, etc., will sink into insignificance before the great and vital point now alone insisted upon, viz., Have you such faith in, and such love for, Jesus Christ that for His sake you are willing to die? All, all, who have such faith and love, who are determined by grace sustaining them not to worship the beast or his image, are then indeed and in truth brethren, and in their common trial will mutually encourage each other. God help them to triumph.*

Obs. 10. Lastly it may be proper to dwell, briefly, upon a single point connected with the worship of Antichrist, viz., that of the worship of the image. The image is made to represent the revived first beast (Rev. 13:14, 15), and the second beast or false prophet "had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." This is an image of the revived last head of the beast, or of the personal Antichrist; and it is expressly designed to contribute to the honor and worship of this last head. Without being able to describe, precisely, in what this image will consist; without being able to tell what is meant by giving it life (unless foreshadowed by the attempt

of those Spiritualists to make an image through which communications might be derived); yet from the tenor of the prediction we strongly incline to the view that it embraces idol worship, and in this position we are sustained by other predictions. The original word denotes an image, an idol image (Barnes and other coms.) and it being an object of worship, representative, in some way, of this last personal head, it then becomes an idol, i.e., something that is revered, etc. If this were the only prophecy descriptive of the worship of these last days, there might be some hesitancy (seeing that it might be taken symbolically) in ascribing literal idol worship to this period. The proclamation of Rev. 14, to worship God implies a return to idol worship in the phraseology that is used, although it may have exclusive reference to the coming worship claimed by Antichrist. It denotes, at least, that men shall now be called upon to worship something else than the true God. Before deciding how far we are to limit this, it is necessary to look over the predictions relating to the same time, and in doing this, we find such intimations given of existing idol worship, that, whatever, difficulty there may be to explain the language in its allusions to the future, we must be inclined to the belief that an image erected to a personal Antichrist refers to one set up for worship as a kind of test of and authoritative medium to Antichrist's worshippers. It is supposed by some, that Antichrist being lawless and godless, will have no idolatry. Thus, e.g., Chrysostom (Ency. Britan., art. Antichrist) observes on 2 Thess. 2, "that Antichrist will not lead men to idolatry, but will rather abolish the worship of false gods as well as that of the true God, commanding the world to worship himself alone as the only Deity." This entirely misapprehends the spirit and intent, of the prophecy, which expressly affirms the retention of a religions element and worship, but has it directed as a climax to the worship of "the man of sin," without specifying, as John does, through what medium this worship shall be presented. Paul tells us that he will set aside all worship excepting that directed to himself; and John informs us that this will be done by him but through the agency of a remarkable image worship which is representative of himself. Chrysostom is only correct if the ordinary past idol worship is meant by him; for that idolatry, the use of images, is retained in Antichrist's worship is not denied by Paul, seeing that he does not explain the manner in which the worship is tendered, whether direct or indirect. Why is it that in so many passages allusions to idol worship are made, if it is not designed to teach us that when men are once prepared to deify a fellow-man, they are also in a condition to do this through the instrumentality and reminding influences of images? Look, e.g., at Isa. 66:17, and 65:11–17 in their connection as they stand related to the period immediately preceding the Coming of the Lord to consume His enemies in anger, to deliver His people, and to create the New Heavens and New Earth, and directly it is asserted, however we may explain the details, that, in some way, idol worship is then exhibited, and is one of the things which provokes the anger of the Lord. Indeed all commentators, however difficult they find the passages, however much they vary in their renderings, however much they differ in their application, are agreed that it is (Barnes' loci) "a general description of idolatry and of idolaters as the enemies of God, and that the idea is that God would come with vengeance to cut off all His foes." (Comp. Fausset, etc.) More than this, obscure as the passages are (it would be desirable, if some one competent for the task would aid in deciding their definite meaning) yet sufficient remains, as is seen in expositions, to show that reference is had to a singular and hitherto unexplained worship; for under the notion that it is something that has transpired numerous conjectures have been offered in explanation, none of which finds its mate in past history. If it be said, that these references more particularly relate to the Jewish people, this is admitted with the remark: that the Jewish nation, like all others, who are not believers in Jesus Christ, will be forced into the worship of this beast and image, which is one reason why they, in punishment, suffer under this Antichrist, who, for some reason, turns against them in his anger. Whatever this may be, the difficulty in explaining the details of this worship, the general affirmation that it shall prevail, remains true, and is found even in such passages as Isa. 45:16, 20, which in their fulness of meaning with the context are not exhausted until the salvation promised is fully bestowed; or Isa. 44 and 46, and 56, Jer. 10, etc., for whatever inchoate or typical fulfilment are assigned in the past they have such a striking relationship to some great manifestation of idolatry which shall excite the special vengeance of God, followed by a glorious deliverance of His people, that we are at no loss how to estimate their fitness in portraying this very period, at least in spirit. The freedom of the Jews from idolatry since the Advent of Jesus and the destruction of their city, has been their particular boast, especially in these days from Rationalizing pens; this boast shall also be taken from them, and John 5:43, be verified, in that rejecting Jesus who "came in the Father's name," they will, in this Antichrist, "receive another who shall come in his own name." 'If the reader still doubts the prevalence of idol worship at a period still future, let him turn to Isa. 2, and read how in connection with the Coming of the Lord in His terrible Majesty to humble the loftiness and haughtiness of man and to exalt Himself, etc., "the land is full of idols" and "they worship the work of their own hands" and "the mean man boweth down and the great man humbleth himself" before them, viz. (v. 20) "idols of silver and idols of gold" which they made for their worship (comp. Ps. 97:7; 96:5; Hos. 13:8; Zech. 10:2; Rev. 9:20; Isa. 17, etc.). And in verse 6, the Jews are especially implicated as also being engaged, joining hands with strangers, etc. (comp. diff. versions, and notice the Chaldee, "their land is filled with idols as at the beginning"). Men may now ridicule the idea that enlightened nations should again return to idol worship, just as they may that of nations accepting of and worshipping a self—deifying man. They may tell us that the notion is too disparaging to the human understanding to be credited. But it stands recorded that man's depravity shall then lead him into the grossest delusions, and into believing and trusting in damnable lies. The falling back upon heathen philosophy, the denial of the personality of God, the exaltation of Humanity, etc., is clearly paving the way for a modified form of idolatry. We have no idea that it will be introduced in the form in which it once existed, or, that it can be accepted by the people without the special wonderful co-operation of the False Prophet. It will be suited to the professed enlightenment of the age—it will be made subservient to the exaltation of the Antichrist; it will, in all probability be claimed to be a mere directory and acknowledgment of worship to the beast; that the idols themselves are not worshipped but only used as a test and medium of worship to him to whom it is then legally awarded. Human nature repeats itself; and when men thus boldly deny God

and elevate one of their own number to the position of a God, the great representative of a worshipped Humanity, then the greater may well include the lesser offense, viz.—that with the mark received, with the acknowledgment of this usurper of God's rights, and with the worship rendered unto him, each one should keep in his house an image to this beast, through which (as Romanists now through images operate) such worship is made manifest, so that in the persecution of unbelievers, the faith and spirit of a true adherent of Antichrist's may be exhibited. The religious element in man cannot be entirely crushed, and the masses must have something to satisfy an inherent craving; this is afforded in the substituted worship, artfully constructed to increase the greatness and power of its directing head? It may require ten thousand additional powerful pens to teach the non-personality of God and to deify law, or nature, or man, before the people are fully ripened for such a manifestation; it may yet require a vast amount of "false philosophy" Spiritualism, formative principles of "the New Religion of Humanity," etc., before such a worship can be instituted; it may yet call for repeated attacks upon the Bible, its God and its Messiah, scattered by willing hands over the earth to root out a sense of accountability, before such a transfer is possible, but it will come, sooner or later. How enlightened reason will act in its hatred to the truth can be seen in the past; and we may rest assured that the same spirit which led men, proud of their reason, to worship It in the person of a harlot at the French Revolution, has not yet perished, but that it lives, widely extended, and only needs the miracle working power of the False Prophet to concentrate and direct it in the way predicted. Alas! men, unthinkingly and rashly, are engaged in the destructive work of paving the way—by their efforts against the teachings of God's Word and to lessen its authority among the people—for an incoming worship and persecution, which, if they could see it in all its vileness and horror as it will exist, would fill them with remorse at the initiative of their own labors.

PROPOSITION 163. This Kingdom will be preceded by the predicted "battle of that great day of God Almighty."

This Proposition is given not to prove that a great conflict will ensue between Antichrist with his confederated forces and the Lord Jesus Christ and His army (for this has been done in previous Propositions, as e.g. Props. 115, 123, etc., and is too plainly predicted, as e.g. Rev. 19:15–21; Rev. 17:14, and 16:14, etc., to require additional notice, but to direct attention to some particulars connected with it.*

Obs. 1. The greatness of this Antichrist in his civil and military aspects, which are, as we have shown, sustained by the religious, is also predicted. The Spirit beholding in prospect the coming of this gigantic power says (Rev. 13:3, 4), that "All the world wondered after the beast" and "they worshipped the beast, saying: Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with the beast?" The beast is a civil polity; it is, as we have shown Prop. 160, the revived Roman Empire in a modified form; and the last head, the virtually eighth, is, as the controlling head or the representative of it, this beast. It is by virtue of his being thus the head of civil government that he is enabled to make and carry on the extensive military preparations announced by Daniel (latter part of ch. 11, see Prop. 160) and the prophets. He will surely overcome all opposition that other civil powers may excite, for it is written: "and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." We are told that he will not reach the climax of power and arrogance without meeting foes whom he will overcome with much bloodshed. But in the wars carried on, he shall be successful, being prospered beyond all precedent. This is purposely allowed both as a punishment to the nations (inflicting the predicted distress of nations), and to make the final overthrow of Antichrist the more impressive in the eyes of the world. Under the most specious pretexts, including that of religion, he will exterminate his foes, and seat himself upon the pinnacle of power, preparatory to the final conflict. While he is thus meeting with success and elevating himself to the most lofty and commanding position, believers will ponder such passages as Joel 3:16; Ps. 92:7–9, Micah 4:11, 12; Ps. 37 and 73; Heb. 1:12–14; Isa. 35:4, etc., anticipating, by faith, his utter destruction. It seems that God intends to show in the most striking manner, both by allowing this ascendancy and by the subsequent overthrow, how utterly vain and false are the high-swelling expectations inculcated by rebellious reason in behalf of "Collective Humanity," unified and deified in the person of the last head.*

Obs. 2. The extraordinary power of this Antichrist could not be obtained without the concurrence and co-operation of other civil rulers. Hence, the Spirit expressly predicts the formation of a mighty confederation under the auspices of this last head, as e.g., in Rev. 17:12, of which it is asserted: "These (i.e., the ten horns) have one mind and shall give their power and strength unto the beast." Let the reader too notice that as these "receive power as kings one hour with the beast," i.e., but for a short, brief period of time, and as they are associated with this last head in his conflict with the Lamb, the formation of this confederacy is still future, and hence, not knowing who they are, it would be rashly premature to attempt even to designate any of them. Many passages refer to this last confederation, and to the result. Whatever confederations have existed in the past, the Spirit, while not excluding these (as, e.g., 2 Ps. quoted by the Apostle as having an inchoate fulfilment), yet looks onward to that last great array of the kings of the earth against the Messiah. The fulness of the 2d Ps., as is seen by comparing with the occurrences at the open revelation of Jesus (Rev. 19) is to be verified in the future when this confederation is formed and "the wrath" of the Son is manifested; when He shall break "the nations" that "rage" (or "tumultuously assemble") and "the people that imagine a vain thing" "with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel" (comp. Rev. 2:27, etc.) The same is true, Hab. 2, of "the vision that is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak and not lie; though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry" and which is related to "the

proud man" (so proud that he makes himself a god) "who enlargeth his desire as hell, and is as death" (martyrdom), "and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations and heapeth unto him all people," and thus becometh (ch. 3) "the head over the house of the wicked." Other references are found in Isa. 54:15, where it is said: "Behold, they shall surely gather together but not by me," etc. (comp. Rev. 16:14); in Ps. 118, where in view of the destruction that shall most certainly befall all those (comp., e.g., Zech. 12:2, 3) who array themselves against the people of God, and because the mercy of God is extended and His right hand doeth valiantly, it is said significantly of this time of trusting in and worshipping of man and confederating against believers and the Lamb: "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man. It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in princes. All nations compassed me about; but in the name of the Lord will I destroy them. They compassed me about; yea, they compassed me about, but in the name of the Lord I will destroy them. They compassed me about like bees; they are quenched as the fire of thorns; for in the name of the Lord I will destroy them." The impressive repetition is indicative of the greatness and formidable nature of the confederation, it being added "thou hast thrust sore at me" (as, e.g., in the martyr bloodshed and the tribulation of the Jews) "that I might fall; but the Lord helped me. The Lord is my strength and song, and is become my salvation," etc. In many places the confederation is implied, as e.g., Ps. 48:4; Ps. 59, etc., and in others, as many believe, typically represented, as, e.g., Isa. 13; Nahum 1, 2 and 3, etc. In Isa. 17:12–14, the connection with the "evening tide" as the time of "trouble," and with the "morning," as the time of the utter removal, fixes (Prop. 139) the period when this "rushing of the nations, like the rushing of mighty waters" shall take place and God "shall rebuke them."

Obs. 3. This confederation arises "out of, and forms part of, the revived Roman Empire, because the "horns" or kings appertain to the beast (comp. Prop. 160) who is said to have "ten horns." And of these horns, in order to avoid the very interpretation usually engrafted, and to mistake them for a succession in the past, it is said by way of explanation, and to indicate their diversity in this respect from the successive heads, that they exist simultaneously or contemporaneously. They arise only when the beast for some time—how long it is not stated—has been headless, i.e., has ceased to exist, or is not recognized as an empire. They arise only when the last head appears, being limited to a brief existence, and as they and the head both fight with the Lamb at His Coming, they are still future, coming after the Empire has become broken and enfeebled. But in the revival of the beast there is a most astonishing change presented, indicated by the transference to the horns of the diadems formerly belonging to the heads, thus showing that they are strong kingdoms, or that they are to exercise supreme rule, in conjunction with the eighth head, over men. This remarkable transference does not prove, as some would have it, that the heads are ended, for it is expressly asserted that while the seven heads are ended, yet an eighth, which, in some way, is still related to the seventh, is still in existence, and has greater power than all the heads before it. Therefore, as repeatedly stated (and let not the reader consider this a small matter, seeing that, as the Spirit says, it requires and embraces wisdom, being one of the points of identification), the virtually eighth head which is of the seven sustains such a peculiar relationship and headship over the others that his official position and dignity, as assumed and exercised, transcends the former Imperial rule. He is more than a mere Emperor; he professes to be and is worshipped as a God. Great as the rule of the horns is, that of this head is superior, and is so acknowledged by the horns who give their power and strength to him. There is here a wonderful transition in the form of government under which these confederates act. In what this shall consist, it is premature to say, excepting that the supreme political power shall be wielded in conjunction with the religious power, and that to sustain and extend especially the latter the False Prophet will arise as a chief confederate. Revolutions may be anticipated in order to the revival of this beast, and the formation of the allied confederates, and the relation that this new virtually eighth head sustains to the seventh may be in the fact, that aside from his religious (or if we may so call it, for even unbelief speaks of its own "Church of the Future") ecclesiastical rank (which makes him differ so materially from all other heads) he retains and exercises the same Imperial sway—more extended—as the seventh head, viz., has civil jurisdiction over the whole vast Empire. This head and these horns arise about the same time and owing to the remarkable features, the modifications introduced, and the concentration and exercise of absolute, despotic power, the one subordinately to the other, will excite universal surprise. One feature more: the prophecy proclaims that this beast and the horns come into existence after a period of non-existence; this teaches us to discard the theories which give the horns to the beast in the past, and trace them among the several kingdoms of Europe, because in that case the beast would not have had a time of non-existence, seeing that those very kingdoms so generally adduced have continuously existed. We see, however, now the beast headless and non-existing, and this fact, so much overlooked, is a startling sign corroborative of our general position (Prop. 160). It is precisely the condition in which we are to see the Roman Empire before it is possible for this last head and its confederated chiefs to arise, and so cruelly treat the Church and the world. And it is this condition which makes it certain to the prophetic student, that important political changes must take place in Europe before this organization can be effected. What convulsions shall agitate the nations, what revolutions must ensue, what conflicts between kingdoms must arise before this beast is revived and obtains his head and horns, we cannot tell. Statesmen, the most profound, inform us of the unsettled, insurrectionary, revolutionary tendencies at work among the masses in all these countries; this spirit, now so busy, may break forth, and lead the way for the predicted result. God only knows the details.*

Obs. 4. We feel impelled by a sense of duty to warn the reader against allowing himself to be misled into the idea, advocated by very many, that it is only at the close of the twelve hundred and sixty days (years they make it) that this beast is to form this confederation, etc. Now, whatever inchoate fulfilment persons may be pleased to engraft upon these predictions, one thing is self-

evident, that the twelve hundred and sixty days in their strict fulfilment cannot be applied, as given by John, to the past history of the beast. The reason is conclusive: John describes the revival of the beast under its last head, and it is of the beast in its revived form that he asserts that it is "to continue (or make war) forty and two months." All interpretations which ignore or violate this simple fact, viz., that these months and days are descriptive of the duration of the revived last head in the exercise of his extraordinary power, are in so far, at least, untenable. This at once sets aside a large number of ingenious and plausible calculations based upon the supposed beginning and ending of these days, as well as the deductions derived therefrom, and leads us to look to the future for their fulfilment. It is at the close of these forty and two months that the conflict takes place between the beasts allied with his confederates and the King of kings, the time previous being occupied with his wars and persecutions, etc. The time is thus purposely shortened, owing to the severity of the judgments.

Obs. 5. The critical student will also notice that the confederation arises after (Rev. 17) the harlot has been supported, as in the past, by the beast, and yet before the fall of Babylon (in which fall it participates), and (Rev. 14) before the universal demand to worship the beast and his image, and therefore previous to the persecution of the saints. The beast in revived state hates the harlot, which it formerly aided to power, and this indicates that there will be a gradual undermining of the Papal claims over the nations, and especially in its attitude of superiority over civil jurisdiction. This evidently will be resisted, and lead to a conflict resulting in the utter demolition of the Papacy. Whatever aid therefore, may be extended by the Papacy in assisting the development of this beast and confederation, or whatever resistance it may offer at any period of the same, it is fated to fall, owing to the antagonism of its claims, and the loss of power over the nations. That it continues to have adherents, and even strong ones, down to the fall, is apparent from the lamentations over her, thus indirectly indicating to us the great power of this confederation in suddenly producing such a result, and that it will not be accomplished without a measure of opposition. But it teaches us also, seeing that the beast under its revived form is the one that shall slay the witnesses, that the witnesses (who may include, Rev. 16:6, both saints and prophets) are slain, not because they refuse to worship the Papacy (as some suppose), but because they reject the worship of the beast and his image. This is seen by this (slaying not merely persecution) following the fall of Babylon, the closing of the forty-two months, and the mention of it in connection with the worship of the last head as, e.g., in Rev. 16:2 and 6. The witnesses testify against a more arrogant and cruel power than the Papacy—the culmination of all wickedness. This, too, on account of the apparent success in overcoming his enemies and the saints, will prepare the way for the first desperate battle.

Obs. 6. The design of this confederation is only stated in general terms; that it shall materially aid in strengthening and extending the power of the beast; that it shall assist him in his overthrow of the Papacy; that it shall co-operate with him in overcoming the saints, and that, finally, it shall with him and the False Prophet, as leaders, make war with the Lamb. Much is left to be inferred; much is implied in the filling of details, but the great outlines are so plainly drawn by the Spirit that no one can possibly mistake them. The design actuating these confederated powers is that of self-aggrandizement, the exaltation of Humanity, in the person of a recognized leader, above that of God Himself, the bringing of all nations in subjection to this denial of the true God and His Christ, and to the acknowledgment of the deification of Humanity in this last head. In the accomplishment of this purpose they resort to various means, in order to break down all protest and opposition to their wicked procedure, so that Hab. 1:15 will be pre-eminently verified: "they catch them in their net and gather them in their drag, therefore they rejoice and are glad. Therefore they sacrifice unto their net and burn incense unto their drag; because by them their portion is fat and their meat plenteous. Shall they therefore empty their net and not spare continually to slay the nations?" And this includes the "dealing treacherously," and "devouring the righteous." In describing "the man of the earth," Ps. 10, who shall be crushed by the king that he may no longer oppress, he is represented as one who "persecutes the poor," "boasts of his heart's desire," proudly (marg. reading) thinks that "there is no God," cannot discern God's judgments, "puffs at his enemies," exalts himself with the idea that he shall never be moved, produces cursing, deceit, fraud, mischief, and iniquity, "murders the innocent" makes "the poor to fall by his strong ones," and "contemns God," which characteristics belong to all his associates and abettors. In order to develop their plans of worship, persecution, and conquest they will (Ps. 64) take "secret counsel" to "encourage themselves in an evil matter," and "they commune of laying snares privily;" "they search out iniquities; they accomplish a diligent search (comp. marg. read.), both the inward thought of every one of them, and the heart is deep." The result of this counselling, plotting, and searching is found in the rejection of God and the institution of man and image worship under the direst penalties, thus forming that dark and terrible persecuting confederation more particularly described by John. The culmination of all is found in the daring to make war with the Lamb Himself.*

Obs. 7. The war with the Lamb being mentioned, separately and distinctly, is not to be confounded with a previous persecution of the Church. The making war with the saints is specially mentioned, and in this war the Antichrist and his confederates are victorious, for it is expressly foretold that he shall "overcome them" (as e.g. Rev. 13:7); while the making war with the Lamb, separately stated, results in "the Lamb shall overcome them," Rev. 17:14 and Rev. 19. The Lamb, therefore, as we have hitherto abundantly proven, is not merely a representative of the Church, and one who makes war with those enemies through the Church. The Lamb is personally denoted, as the doctrine of the Sec. Advent unmistakably teaches, coming with His redeemed people to destroy the confederation arrayed against Him. The pledge that He will thus come, aside from other prophecy, is given in Zech. 9:9. The connection of this verse with the context which declares the complete destruction of the enemies confederated against the people of God and the restoration of the Jews, shows us that the triumphal entry of Jesus at His First Advent into Jerusalem "lowly and riding upon an ass

and upon a colt, the foal of an ass” is presented to us as the pledge and earnest of another and greater triumphal entry, when He also, “the Lord shall be seen over them and His arrow shall go forth as the lightning,” etc.*

Obs. 8. The cause of this war, this final conflict with Jesus Christ, is found in the hatred to His truth, in the hostility to His person, because the same are in direct opposition to the fundamental principles underlying the government and Worship of this Antichristian confederacy. Let the reader but consider how many things, now but obscurely understood, will be clearly proclaimed by the Church before this Antichrist appears and the confederation is formed, and he will see abundant reason why Antichrist shall be filled with bitterness and enmity toward Christ. Thus e.g. the withdrawal of the 144,000, followed by the earnest proclamation of Antichrist’s career, the faithful portraiture of his wickedness, etc., the accurate knowledge then entertained respecting the Kingdom of God which is speedily to come in accordance with the covenanted Word—these things will so enrage (comp. Rev. 11:18 “the nations were angry,”) the Antichristian powers that they will put to death these confessors, and prepare themselves to resist the promised incoming kingdom. Here is the clew to the final scene, and to the animosity toward the Jewish nation. Antichrist, and the False Prophet, and the allied Chiefs, will not forget this faithful preaching, and especially this anticipated kingdom. They will not overlook the fact, that this Theocratic ordering is to be initiated at Mt. Sinai (Prop. 166), and that to perfect it, a restoration of the Jews is necessary. What news may reach them of God’s already “strange work” commenced at Mt. Sinai we cannot tell, but that they are not ignorant of something being inaugurated at Sinai, which looks forward to the re-establishment of the covenanted Davidic throne and kingdom, is abundantly clear from the tenor of the predictions. Whatever ideas Antichrist may have had respecting the real power then concealed (in all probability very low and contemptuous ones), he in self-protection, having a sufficiency of proof that some power hostile to himself is then concentrated, proceeds to forestall the danger by making special arrangements (Rev. 16:13, 14) in gathering the nations, and marches in the direction of the threatening cloud, and, as a first measure, to insure the failure of such a kingdom being realized, triumphantly seizes upon Jerusalem and Palestine. They plot against the predicted king (which, perhaps, may be attributed to the vain and human expectations of some who are secretly striving to have it realized); “they (Ps. 62:4) consult to cast Him down from His excellency,” and in so doing, the Spirit informs us, (Ps. 83) that in their hatred “they have taken crafty counsel against thy people, and consulted against Thy hidden ones. They have said, come and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance. For they have consulted together with one consent (or heart); they are confederate against Thee” (then follows, under the familiar names of enemies, those still future, and their fearful doom). By this we know, that a leading motive in exciting this war springs from the knowledge of Antichrist respecting the prophecies and faith of believers that Christ Jesus, as promised, will rebuild the fallen tabernacle of David into a world-dominion. Rejecting these prophecies and this faith in scorn (as some even now do) as visionary, so far as God Himself and His Christ are concerned (for he denies the Father and the Son), yet he apprehends trouble so long as the Jews are permitted to occupy Jerusalem, and so long as the anticipations excited by the faith in the Sinaitic ordering, and the reports reaching the ears of the nations from thence, are not crushed. Believing that those “hidden ones” form the nucleus of a dangerous inroad upon his own prerogatives and claims, the Leader prepares to crush it. As Faber and many others have justly called it, there arises “a religious war” (Baron Bunsen, Signs of the Times, II., 235, predicts a religious war impending over Europe)—a war against the saints, and then more directly against Christ, verifying Ps. 2: “The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against His anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us” (comp. Micah 4:11, 13, Luther’s version, Ps. 21:11, etc.) This spirit is fostered and excited to the utmost by the wonder-working power of certain agents (Rev. 16:13, 14) sent forth on their mission of miracle performance and deception of the kings and nations. It is still premature to fix with any degree of certainty, upon the exact nature and mode of operation of these agents, but when they come they are recognizable by the special charge committed unto them, viz., of urging those to whom they are sent to enter upon this religious war of extermination. Their “miracles,” however astounding and well calculated to entrap the unwary and unbelieving, will not deceive the humble believer in the Word of God, simply because these scenes and agencies are too plainly foretold.

Obs. 9. The objective march of this last great enemy and of his forces gathered for the final battle, is, from a comparison of Scripture, easily ascertained. The place is expressly designated in such a way that we cannot properly misapprehend it. One of the prophets (Daniel 11) declares that the Antichrist shall come to his end “between the seas in the glorious holy mountain;” this Joel 3:2, 12, tells us is in “the valley of Jehoshaphat;” Ezekiel (chs. 38 and 39) informs us that he “shall come against the land of Israel” and that he shall fall upon the mountains of Israel;” Zechariah (ch. 14) has him at Jerusalem, which he has taken, or at least not far distant, placing the final action in Palestine; Joel also (ch. 2:20) has him destroyed between two seas; John (Apoc. 16:16) has them “gathered together in a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon” and, finally, John (Apoc. 14:20) in the treading of the vintage wine-press (which synchronizes with the same overthrow) has the blood to come out of the wine-press “by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs,” i.e., two hundred miles, which as Faber (Diss., vol. 2, p. 241) and many others, and even Jerome, have remarked (and recent surveys have attested) is the length of Palestine between the two seas. Taking all these predictions together, we need not be surprised the Fathers so universally held to the idea that Antichrist would fight the last battle and perish in Palestine. It is when he comes to Jerusalem and takes the city that the Lord appears to fight against him, either immediately after, or after a brief interval. Probably it is impossible for us to definitely fix, owing to conflicting views, the exact locality of this battle. Jehoshaphat may, as some contend, be only a descriptive and not a proper name, signifying “the judgment of the

Lord." We incline, however, to the view that it is a proper name, and that Antichrist's career is closed at or near the city of Jerusalem. However this may be, the prophets unite in making the decided impression, that he shall certainly fall in Palestine, and such will be the vast slaughter that special provision (Ezek. 39:11–16) will be made to remove the annoyance caused by it. Indeed, the Spirit gives incidental reference (in connection with the direct), which also teach that his overthrow is witnessed in Palestine, as e.g. Ps. 76:3, Isa. 10:26–34, Ps. 46:4–6. It is true that at this period a dreadful slaughter shall also be witnessed in Idumea, (Isa. 34, 63, etc.) and has led some (Reineke) to suppose that the battle will be fought in that locality. But this is easily reconciled if we keep in view the exact position of the parties. Antichrist arrives at, and takes, Jerusalem, he immediately sends (or probably sent before the fall of the city) a portion of his vast army under some of the kings toward and into Idumea, for the purpose of crushing any opposition that may develop itself from Mt. Sinai. It is at this crisis that Jesus and His brethren proceed toward Jerusalem, and on the road meet and fearfully overwhelm a large body of the Antichristian host, and then advancing to the Mt. of Olives, confronts His daring adversary, and crushes him there as the prophets declare. It would only be a repetition on a grander scale of the fighting in the wilderness, and in the land itself under the first Theocratic march from Mt. Sinai.

Obs. 10. While compelled by the force of authority to differ from Reineke and others in the locality of Antichrist's fall (all, however, being included in the expressive phrase "the battle of the great day of God Almighty," viz., the slaughter in Idumea and that in Palestine) yet we agree with him that a prevailing mistake has been long current and adopted, unthinkingly, by able writers, viz., that this gathering of Antichrist's forces is to Armageddon, from whence springs the popular phrase, "the Battle of Armageddon"—a phrase not found in the Bible, but still adopted as the title of some books, under the plea that it is biblical. Without detaining the reader, let us observe that nothing is more certain than this, that the adoption of the phrase is derived from a total misapprehension of Rev. 16:16, "and he gathered them," etc., it being supposed that the one gathering refers to the seducing spirits, and those gathered to the kings of the earth, mentioned in verse 14. But the singular construction rather requires, as many critics contend, a reference to some one person who gathers, and hence Hengstenberg and others suggest, that one only performs this, referring it to God or Christ. Others feeling the difficulty of applying it to the plural spirits, think that Satan, or the sixth angel, or the beast must be denoted. Now from Propositions which are given (Props. 166 and 130, on Mt. Sinai and Translation) it is found that previous to the overthrow of Antichrist, the saints (even those who have been persecuted and killed by him, as is proven by Rev. 15:2, comp. with 16:2, etc.) shall be gathered by the Lord Jesus Christ and be brought to Mt. Sinai the original founding place of the Theocratic ordering. Notice again, that the appearance of Jesus and the gathering of the saints unto Him are united in the Scriptures (as e.g. 2 Thess. 2:1, etc.), and as this gathering is preceded by the Advent phraseology, "Behold, I come as a thief," etc., the gathering that immediately follows has sole reference to that which legitimately flows—being in many places united with it—from the Advent of Jesus, viz., is a gathering of saints, even of those who have suffered under this Antichrist. Jesus is the one who gathers them, and He comes in a thief-like manner, because the time has not yet come for His open revelation with the saints, which occurs only when Antichrist has reached Jerusalem, etc. Therefore we must regard these verses 15, 16, in this light: Having portrayed the gathering of the forces of the Antichrist, the Spirit assures us in these verses that Jesus also gathers His army preparative to the conflict. Mentioning the one party preparing for the battle, it was natural, suggestive and striking to specify that preparation—a gathering—was also in progress on the other side. It might be almost designated parenthetical, introduced to show that both parties were alike engaged in marshalling their hosts for the impending battle. The conciseness of the description, in view of other predictions, should not mislead us. Again; those that are thus gathered are, as we shall show (Prop. 166) taken to Mt. Sinai to be introduced into the initiative Theocratic arrangement; now is Armageddon in the Hebrew tongue an equivalent or expressive of Mt. Sinai? We think that Reineke (Proph. Times, vol. 2, Nos. 3 and 11) has clearly shown this when he says: "It (i.e., Armageddon) is evidently composed of two parts Ar and Mageddon. That the Greek Ar stands for the Hebrew Har, which signifies 'a mountain,' is so plain that it may be taken for granted. We have then the Mountain of Mageddon. But what is Mageddon? It is evidently a participial form, although it is no regular derivative, and nowhere occurs in the Hebrew Bible as such. It may be derived either from the word magad, which means 'to be precious, costly, glorious,' or else, which is more likely, from the verb gadad, which, in the Hithpael, signifies to 'assemble.' We may, therefore, translate Armageddon either 'the Mount of Assembling,' or 'the Mount of Glorious Gifts.' " (See his remarks on the word Megiddo, etc., and then comp. the derivations of Faber in his Diss., and of commentators generally, the derivation being one of conjecture, so that Dr. Clarke, Com. Rev. 16:16, remarks: "The original of this word has been variously formed and variously translated. It is har megiddon, 'the Mount of Assembly,' or chormah gedehon, 'the destruction of the army,' or it is har megiddo, 'mount megiddo.' " (Faber makes it the "destruction of Megiddo."). For, in a matter so largely dependent upon conjecture (so that, as Reineke informs us, it had been even made the "synonym for the New Jerusalem, and an old German commentary suggests that Armageddon is substituted for Harmeged, 'the mountains of costly and precious gifts.' "), that conjecture is the best founded, which agrees with the general analogy of the Word. Having shown that a gathering takes place at the first stage of the Advent; that these are taken to Mt. Sinai; that there will be an assembling of the saints at that mount previous to going forth to the destruction of Antichrist; that this gathering here is also one allied with the Advent, it is reasonable to conclude, that the gathering here is to the same "mountain of assembly," where precious gifts are indeed bestowed.*

Obs. 11. This then brings out in forcible contrast the two armies in the process of gathering. The statement that the kings of the earth are gathered for this battle, suggests the party which is to oppose them in it, and those two are being gathered for that battle.

In ch. 19 both parties, gathered as represented, enter into the conflict; on the one side the beast, the false prophet and the kings of the earth with their hosts; and on the other, the Son of Man and His glorified ones. These saints in the army of King Jesus, and co-judges with Him, are kings. This may give us a clue to that variously explained passage (Rev. 16:12) just preceding this gathering of the kings of the earth, viz., "And the sixth angel poured out his vial on the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the Kings of the East (or from the sunrising) might be prepared." The interpretations usually given to this verse (as applying to the nationalized hierarchies, Turkish Empire, etc.) are founded on a misapprehension of its chronological position in the Apocalypse, it being supposed to be either fulfilled or in the course of fulfilment, when the most positive assurance is given that not one of those vials has yet been poured out (which is seen by comparing Rev. 15:2, etc., with Rev. 16:2, showing that before they are poured out the Antichristian worship, etc., of the last head has been manifested.) Now if we are allowed to conjecture its meaning, judging merely from facts that shall occur, it would be something like the following: the Euphrates stands related to the modern Babylon, just as the ancient river Euphrates did to ancient Babylon; the drying up of this river, indicative of the alienation and abandonment of her supporters who defend her, is a symbolical representation of the entire withdrawal, complete alienation of the faith which the supporters once had in Babylon. Let the reader notice, that when Babylon falls we are told that many shall lament over her fall, they still have faith in her, etc., but this is to be changed; the waters (i.e. people) that strengthened and defended her, shall be absorbed in that (Rev. 14) universal worship of the beast that immediately succeeds the fall of Babylon. This absorption takes place preparative to the gathering of the kings of the earth; indeed one of the means employed in performing this work is the sending forth of those seducing spirits to these kings. If the question is asked, how does this prepare the way for the Kings of the East, or the kings from the sunrising, and who are those kings, the answer would be: the kings are the saints who shall reign as such with Christ; they are kings pertaining to the rising of the sun (so numerous critics, versions, etc., as e.g. Luther, "den Königen von Aufgang der Sonne"); they are kings appertaining to the Sun of Righteousness, who is to arise and shine forth when the terrible day of the Lord has come (Mal. 4, etc.) i.e., they come with, belong unto, and proceed from this rising sun; the way is prepared for their coming by the drying up of the Euphratean waters, i.e., the entire alienation of faith and desire in a restored Papacy, State Churches, etc., and the yielding up of the world (excepting true believers) after the fall of Babylon, and this absorption (Rev. 14) to the worship of the beast and the killing of the righteous. That which appears adverse to the coming of these kings and to render it hopeless, viz., "the universality of Antichrist's worship (now swelled by the millions of Papists, etc.) and rule, really prepares the way for the speedy fulfilment of the gathering and hostile array of Antichrist and his overthrow by the coming of the King (the Sun) with His associated kings. Such an interpretation heightens the beauty and force of the contrast presented in these verses: first we have the kings of the sunrising presented as already existing, waiting until the culmination of wickedness is reached, through the complete absorption of the Euphratean waters and the gathering of the earthly kings is effected by the seducing spirits; then, and only then, are they ready for decisive action. Next in contrast to these kings, are the kings of the earth forming a vast confederacy to be engaged in the battle of the great day. Next, having specified the gathering of the kings of the earth and the agents through whom performed, the Spirit also tells us that the gathering of these kings pertaining to the rising or the sun is also in progress, and that the Agent by whom it is effected is the Saviour Himself, who comes in a concealed manner (previous to His open manifestation) to perform this work, and that He gathers them, in the meanwhile, to "the Mount of Assembly" or "the mountain of precious gifts," or "the Mountain of Decision."*

Obs. 12. The two armies when gathered are fully delineated by the Spirit. On the one side, there is the beast, the false prophet, the kings of the earth and their armies (Rev. 19:19, 20), including the worshippers of the beast and his image, those who receive his mark, "kings, captains, mighty men, men both small and great." The vastness of this army can be readily appreciated by referring to the passages which liken it to a fearful flood of roaring waters, a tumultuous incoming sea, etc., as e.g., Isa. 17:12–14, Hab. 3, etc. The extent of the confederacy, already closely exhibited in such passages as Rev. 16:14, Rev. 13:7, Zeph. 3:8, etc., is so graphically presented by Joel 3:2, 9–16; that a universal uprising for this war, this final contest with the Lord Himself, is certain to take place. The prophecies unite in describing it to be so great as to be unexampled in the history of the world; and this is purposely allowed and encouraged (as e.g. in permitting the saints to be overcome, the miracle working of the agents, etc.), in order that the impotency of man and his punishment as a rebel may be the more strikingly displayed. They assemble in their vastness to utterly destroy the last remnant of the worship and name of God from the earth—this is their design in furthering self-exaltation; God's design is that they shall assemble for Him to execute His judgments upon them. They being gathered (Micah 4:12) "as the sheaves in the floor" for the terrible threshing that shall follow. On the other side, there is Jesus the Christ, the Mighty One, and His saints, the associated kings pertaining to Him. They are represented, e.g. in Rev. 19:11–14, as the "Faithful and True" (i.e. coming to fulfil His promises and threatenings), "The Word of God," (i.e. the One through whom the purposes of God are to be accomplished and manifested), and "King of kings and Lord of lords" (i.e., kings and lords are subordinately associated with Him), who "in righteousness doth judge and make war," and "the armies which were in heaven" (the reader will consider the symbolical import of "heaven" as given by numerous writers that it signifies, so Faber, ch. 2 Diss., etc., "the body politic"—to such a body these armies belong, seeing that the Theocratic ordering or government has, previously to this coming, been initiatively inaugurated (Prop. 166) at Mt. Sinai, embracing the sun, the moon, and the stars belonging to a heaven. The symbolical import and consistent use of the word "heaven" and "heavenlies" and its relationship to the Theocratic idea, is yet an interesting field for some students to enter) "followed him upon white horses" (symbolical of their triumphant exaltation and co-heirship with Jesus, coming in the same manner as He does) "clothed in fine linen,

white and clean" (comp. v. 8). These are "the Lord Coming with ten thousand of His saints to execute judgment" of Jude 14, 15; "the Coming of the Lord and all the saints with Him," of Zech. 14:5; "the Coming of the Son of Man in the glory of His Father with His messengers," of Matt. 17:27, etc.; "the revelation of the Lord Jesus with the messengers of His power to take vengeance," of 2 Thess. 2:7, 8, etc., etc. This strange, stupendous array was long ago described, through the Spirit that foreseeth all things, by Enoch, Moses, the Prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles. The Jews (Prop. 125) are also incorporated with this army after the first assault.

Obs. 13. The battle itself and the result are unmistakably presented. The Lamb and His army "shall overcome (Rev. 17:14) them" (the beast and his army), "for He is the Lord of lords and King of kings, and they that are with Him are called, and chosen, and faithful." The triumph and the catastrophe are presented, Rev. 19:15–21; Rev. 14:17–20; Dan. 7; Ezek. 38 and 39; 2 Thess. 2:8, etc. The Bible reader must be familiar with the Scriptures, which describe on the one hand the joy and exultation of the righteous over the defeat of the wicked; and on the other, the grief and despair of the Antichristian forces when they find themselves suddenly confronted by the—to them—terrible revelation of the once despised Jesus in the power of His majesty and of the glorified saints, many of whom were put to death by them. A mortal army, with all the advantages of military resources wielded by a vast multitude, melts away before the might of an immortal army, as the snow disappears under the heat of the sun. Owing to the conciseness of the predictions and the intermingling of figure and symbol, it is difficult for us to enter into details, to give even the precise order in which the encounters between the two hosts shall be conducted (although the hints seem to convey the idea that part of the enemy are met on the way to Jerusalem from Mount Sinai, the Antichrist and another portion at Jerusalem or near it, and that other portions are attacked and defeated by the Jews; the principal engagement, and that which decides the matter, being by Christ and His saints), or to show in every case how much is literal and how much figurative. Thus, while some latitude must be allowed to application, because of our imperfect understanding of language, yet one thing is certain, that the general description, as well as the minor details, whether figurative or not, convey the notion of a terrible conflict directly carried on between these two hosts, and which results in complete victory to Christ and His army, and in utter destruction to Antichrist and his forces. What agencies are exerted, in all cases we cannot tell, but that natural and supernatural ones are both employed is so evident from the Scriptures that it needs no argumentation, seeing that the very Advent of Jesus and His glorified ones is supernatural, and stamps the whole drama with a powerful, overwhelming, supernatural cast. Even whatever agencies of a natural order may be employed, these, too, are directed and made invincible by the power of King Jesus, so that truthfully, whether His might in some things is exerted directly and in others indirectly through animate and inanimate agents, the entire result is attributed solely and exclusively to the greatness and almighty power of the descended Jesus, "the Christ." Let any one sit down and endeavor to collate the Scripture illustration of this tremendous and sublime "battle of that great day of God Almighty," and if he can enter into the spirit of the same sufficiently to anticipate it by faith, then his heart must sink and his cheek pale when he endeavors to comprehend the awful terrors of that great day of wrath and vengeance (he will in a measure feel like the prophet who described them, Hab. 3:16). Is there anything in human language so expressive of the terrific as Rev. 19:15–20, or Isa. 63:1–6, or Rev. 14:18–20, or Isa. 49:24–26, and kindred passages? The Spirit, in the abundance of warning, and evidently to impress upon us the correct idea that it will be the most fearful of all times that the world has ever witnessed, employs the most powerful language in delineating it that can be produced. "Treading the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God" (Rev. 19:15); His garments sprinkled with the blood of His enemies (Isa. 63:3); in brief, "slaughter," "tempest," "whirlwind," "fire," "lightnings," "hailstones," "earthquakes," "pestilence," "plague," "madness," "wailing," "the indignation of anger," "rod of iron," "the day of vengeance," "anger with fury," etc., etc., are some of the impressive utterances to awaken within us a lively sense of the greatness and dreadful nature of this period to the wicked. We are assured that when it takes place and the world has seen this extraordinary, supernatural manifestation, men shall be afraid (Isa. 2:10, 11, 19, 21; Micah 7:16, 17) before the majesty exhibited, and fearing and trembling (Jer. 33:9; Isa. 66:19; Isa. 26:9 etc.) they shall acknowledge God's just judgments and praise Him for His wonderful doings. For, in the midst of deserving wrath, God still, as He is wont to be, is merciful, sparing some of Antichrist's hosts (Isa. 66:19) to be the bearers of the news of the conflict and its result to all nations. While this is "the day of vengeance," it is, blessed be God, the time of deliverance, because "the year of the Redeemed is come" (Isa. 63:4); and therefore it is that, after the utter rout of this beast and his army, John describes the reign of Christ and His saints and the introduction of millennial blessedness. With this all the prophets agree—as e.g. Daniel 7, Joel 3, Isa. 24 and 25, Zech. 14, Zeph. 3, Ezek. 38 and 39, etc.—describing the fall of the Antichrist, the last great enemy, followed by a glorious restoration of God's Kingdom under the Messiah and the happy condition of those who believe in God. In the mean time, we may contemplate those war Psalms which contrast the two parties, and tell of the grand issues flowing from victory, as Psalms 2, 21, 76, 110, etc., feeling assured that our King shall be exalted over all His enemies, that David's Son is indeed "most blessed forever" and "set for blessing" whom "all nations shall call blessed." Then will be verified the saying against "the multitude of all the nations that fight against Mount Zion" (see Isa. 29) and "the meek also shall increase their joy in the Lord and the poor among men shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel. For, the terrible one is brought to nought" (as stated in verse 5 be made "like small dust" and "as chaff," and this "suddenly" corresponding with the open revelation of Jesus, which occurs suddenly), "and the scorner is consumed, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off," etc.

Obs. 14. Finally: let no one who is a believer in the Word think that this subject, upon which the Spirit so largely dwells and

endeavors to impress by the use of figures, etc., conveying terrible realities, is unworthy of his serious and earnest attention. While much of folly has been penned in reference to “the battle of Armageddon” (as e.g. in the name, and locating the battle in the United States, in the valley of the Mississippi, in Italy, as well as formerly at Moscow, Waterloo, in the French Revolution, etc.), the mistakes of men do not vitiate that which is clearly predicted. Men may transplant the scene of the conflict from the place designated by the Spirit; they may change the actors in it and the results flowing from it; they may antedate its occurrence and spiritualize away its meaning, but all this cannot affect the ultimate fulfilment or diminish the fearful and actual realization of it as described. Whether able or not to fully understand how this or that particular is to be accomplished, it becomes us to receive in faith the unerring description of Holy Writ, and ponder well that future which culminates in a conflict the most tremendous, both as to extent and consequences, that is on record anywhere. When the spirit of hatred, which leads to this battle, is already so widely prevalent (we append but a single illustration, owing to the peculiar language employed, The Banner of Light, Dec. 8th, 1861, says: “Once mankind clung to the cross, and adored the form of Him who was crucified on Calvary as a God. But reason has asserted its supremacy, and the world has declared it would not have this man to reign over it any longer”) and extending itself, when this battle with its confederated hosts shows the absurdity of putting, trust in the development theories of men, when, in brief, all things are tending in the direction to bring forth the rejection of Christianity and the self—deification of humanity, thus making the fulfilment in the line of existing tendencies, it is folly, yea worse, to ignore the testimony of Jesus and the prophets on the subject. Let men sneer at it now; let professed believers turn away from it as an unwelcome subject; yet the time is coming when men shall profoundly study it in order to comfort and sustain themselves under Antichrist’s fearful persecution. With the hope, therefore, that what we now write may be of service in strengthening the hearts of some who shall be willing to die for Jesus’ sake, we are willing to endure the incredulity (even worse) of the world and of many (saving a few here and there) in the Church. Let us even say, to increase, if possible, the unbelief of the unbelieving, that, whether dead or living when this time of the end shall come, we expect, if faithful to the end, personally to see this very battle that we have, in weakness, attempted to describe. (See Props. 126–130, etc.)*

PROPOSITION 164.—This Kingdom ends the Gentile domination.

This has been noticed under various Propositions, and is thus distinctively presented to impress the fact upon the reader’s mind. Such a Theocracy, as God contemplates, to bring back the world under His special manifested rule to its Paradisaical state, is utterly hostile to the notion that worldly empires outside of it shall control large portions of the earth under separate and distinct governments, whether Kindly or republican. King Jesus is the covenanted King, not only over His special inheritance, the Jewish nation, but also over all the earth; and, as already abundantly proven from Scripture, the time is surely coming when all governments will be overthrown, making place for the universal Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Obs. 1. The inheritance of David’s Son (from whence His royalty is to be manifested) is left under Gentile power until “the times of the Gentiles” are completed (Prop. 66); until the number of the elect is filled up (Props. 65, 86, etc.); until the time of the resurrection and rewarding of the saints (Rev. 11:15–18; Props. 126–130); until the time of the Second Advent (Props. 74, 121, etc.); until “the end of the age” (Prop. 140); until a people is raised up to sustain the dignity, etc., of the Kingdom (Props. 124, 154); until the power of Christ is exhibited (Props. 120, 121); until the destruction of Antichrist (Props. 123, 161); until the revelation of the Judgeship of Christ (Prop. 132) and “the judgment-day” (Props. 133 and 134); until “the day of the Lord Jesus” (Props. 138 and 139) is to be ushered in; until the last great battle is fought (Prop. 163), etc. It is significant that the fulfilment of the predictions relating to the inheritance of David’s Son has been continuously witnessed for many centuries, and that it is presented before us, still confirmed, this day. This increases, with other reasons, our confidence in the fulfilment of the remainder, viz., the deliverance and exaltation of the same over all the earth. If, as a punishment, and for purposes of mercy, God can so minutely foretell and historically overrule the overthrow of the Theocracy and Theocratic people, He can as readily predict and bring to pass the restoration of the same and the overthrow of the Gentile powers.

Obs. 2. The predictions relating to this point are so numerous, so plain and decisive, that a mere reference to some of them, in view of what has already preceded, is all-sufficient. There is to be a shaking and removal of earthly kingdoms (Prop. 147) making place for the universal establishment of the Messianic Kingdom (Prop. 116), in which saints as co-heirs with Christ shall gloriously preside (Prop. 154), thus fulfilling Dan. 7:14, 27 (comp. Props. 121 and 123). The supremacy of the Jewish nation (Prop. 114) and the place of manifested royalty (Prop. 168), in view of the homage, worship, and tribute rendered, can only be satisfactorily explained by the Theocratic ordering, uniting Church and State over all the earth under one central Head. Such a visible Theocracy (Prop. 117) can, in the very nature of the case, only allow its own form of government to exist, seeing that its design is to restore through it (Prop. 119, etc.) all forfeited blessings, and to insure to man the much-longed-for perfect government on earth (Props. 202, 203, 206 and 207), as well as to exalt the blessed King (Props. 203, 204, 205). Hence such a change of domination is included in “the New Heavens and New Earth” (Props. 148–152), in “the world to come” (Prop. 137), in “the Restitution” (Prop. 144), in “the Regeneration” (Prop. 145), in the removal of the curse from creation (Prop. 146), etc. The testimony is so abundant and cumulative that not only every Millenarian writer has accepted of it, but even many of our opponents, who advocate that a time is coming when Church and

State shall be happily united, etc., affirm that present governments will give place to another and higher form, having some central point of unity on earth. That unity of the race, dreamed of even by humanitarians, etc., can, however, only thus be secured.

Obs. 3. These present “times of the Gentiles” are not perpetual; they must come to an end. This is evidenced both by the election of the Jewish nation (Prop. 24, etc.) and by the oath-bound covenant of God with David (Props. 46, 47, 48, 49), which will yet be realized at the Sec. Advent (Props. 66, 60, 72, 75, 121, etc.). This being “the times of the Gentiles” (i.e. the period in which Gentile nations shall rule over the world and no visible Theocratic Kingship shall exist), and as these “times” are to end, giving place to covenant fulfilment—this serves to remove the objection alleged by unbelief, viz., that in the history of the Jewish nation and in that of the Church nothing has been witnessed commensurate with the grandeur, etc., of prophetic announcements, and that hence the prophecies are mere Oriental exaggerations. The reply is an old one, given even by an Augustine: discriminate the times, and the Scripture utterances will reconcile themselves. For the times of triumph are not in “the times of the Gentiles;” the latter are “times” of trial and testing, “times” in which the institutions of the world hold their sway, in which the saints are “pilgrims and strangers,” and which are also plainly delineated (comp. Props. 174, 175). The Word of God forbids us to look for the fulfilment of a covenanted Kingdom and the triumphant Millennial glory during these “times”; if we do, we then embrace mere delusion and do violence to Holy Writ. We must patiently await the ending of these “times,” and then, and then only, will “the sure mercies of David” be realized in the Theocratic ordering and the rich blessings resulting therefrom.*

Obs. 4. This again reminds us of the folly, so widely prevalent, of exalting this present period of time—embracing as it does “the times of the Gentiles”—above the position assigned to it in Holy Scripture. Eminent and good men, overlooking the utterances of the Spirit of truth, and in their eagerness to honor the Church, call that “day” which the Spirit designates “night” and that “light” which the Word recognizes as “darkness.” This dispensation includes “the times of the Gentiles,” for they are only closed by their fearful overthrow at the Second Advent (Rev. 19, etc.), and while in this dispensation the Church, with all her blessings and privileges, is still in “the night,” surrounded by darkness (herself led by “the light shining in the dark place,” and by “the day-star,” 2 Pet. 1:19, or by “the light” 1 Jno. 1:9, etc.), looking for an absent bridegroom, fighting, struggling, and pressed with the curse, it is certainly unwise, both against Scripture and existing fact, to appropriate to her blessings which only belong to her after these “times” are ended.

Obs. 5. This fact, viz., the positive end of Gentile domination to give place to the Theocratic reign of Christ and His brethren, will become more and more impressed upon, not only believers, but the world. Already deep thinkers have received and boldly advocated what is so eminently Biblical; devoted men in all denominations proclaim the same; and this will become more intensive as infidelity, etc., advances. This fact in its historical connection, and as part of the Divine Plan, will especially be unwelcome to the kings of the earth and to nearly all who are in power, ecclesiastical or civil. This, too, will evidently be one cause of that deep hatred against Christ, and result in the widespread confederation and gathering of the nations against Him (Props. 161, 162, and 163.) The kings and mighty men of the earth (Rev. 19:19, etc.) will be unwilling to yield up (Ps. 2:2, 3) their power and submit to the rule that must be imposed for the good of man.*

Obs. 6. But the nations, in their selfishness and opposition to the truth, refused to recognize what at the same time is so plainly revealed, viz., that while Gentile domination ceases, it simply ceases because the new order or dominion introduced is immensely its superior in securing the happiness and glory of the Gentile nations. This has been so clearly portrayed in various propositions (as e.g. Props. 119, 142, 144, 154, 156, etc.) that it is unnecessary to repeat. Paul rightfully presents this point in Rom., ch. 11, because when the Redeemer comes and restores the elect people, His dominion will perform that for the nations (Props. 120, 144, etc.) which mere human governments, with all the aids that man can possibly apply, can never accomplish, viz., remove the curse and introduce the millennial blessings. But the enmity of man, while recoiling upon himself in deserved punishment, cannot prevent the abounding grace of God from bringing in a dominion designed both for his benefit and his glory. And in this government, the ancient promise (Gen. 9:27) will still hold good, viz., that God will enlarge Japhet, but specially, yea personally, dwell with Shem as He did in the past, and again will, Ps. 132:13, 14, etc.*

Obs. 7. Reference has been made several times to the guarded manner in which the primitive Christians, including even Jesus and the apostles, spoke of the downfall of Gentile dominion. This was done in order to avoid the hostility and persecution of the Roman Emperors. Yet the view was more or less distinctly proclaimed by the believers, and was one reason why the millenarian doctrine fell into disrepute, especially after a union of State and Church, with those in power. To illustrate how, nevertheless with reluctance, this truth was proclaimed, Lactantius (De. Instit., ch. 15) expresses himself: “The Roman Power which now governs the world (my mind dreads to declare it, yet I must speak it, because it will surely come to pass)—the Roman Power will be taken away from the earth, and the Empire will return to Asia, and the East will again have the chief dominion, and the West will be in subjection.” The general sentiment with all millenarians, based upon Dan., Isa., etc., was that King Jesus with His subordinate rulers would sway an undisputed sceptre over all the earth, the Gentile dominion being crushed by an overwhelming manifestation of divine power and vengeance, owing to its final array against the truth, etc.*

Obs. 8. The reader may regard it as significant that the Theocratic King was born at the very time that the Gentile dominion was in its most extended and consolidated form. The fairest portions of Europe, Asia, and Africa then known formed one vast Empire—the

Roman—when Jesus, “the Christ,” appeared and tendered the Kingdom to the elect nation (Props. 54, 55, etc.) which, if accepted (by a national repentance), would have broken the Roman Power with irresistible force. The One through whom that Gentile dominion is to cease, comes singly and alone, when at its height, and then, owing to the sinfulness of His own inheritance, permits this dominion to continue on and on until He shall come the Second time. And this, too, is done both as a punishment to His own rebellious people, and that special grace and mercy should be extended to the Gentiles. When He comes again, the time selected is also one in which this Gentile dominion shall be manifested in a vast confederation (Prop. 160, etc.), and when, humanely speaking, the Church shall so experience its persecuting power that no hope for its continuance appears possible.*

Obs. 9. It is a significant fact, fully attested by history, past and present, that no Christian nation has ever existed among the Gentiles. No matter how largely the laws of Moses and the precepts of Christ have been incorporated, and no matter how men of a Christian spirit have endeavored at times to legislate and execute laws in a proper spirit, it still remains true that the design of this dispensation has never been to convert nations (Prop. 86. etc.), and that every nation, however professedly Christian, has been guilty of oppression, injustice, and wickedness. The spirit of self-interest, aggrandizement, earthly glory, etc., has led nations into paths of sin, violence and cruelty, and with the principles at work they are utterly unfitted to co-operate with a pure Theocratic Kingdom, and hence their domination must come to an end.*

Obs. 10. The reader will not fail (which we repeat, in order to impress) to observe, that while civil government is ordained by God as something that necessarily proceeds from the nature of man and of society (next Prop.), yet as the forms of it are of man's ordinance, and subject more or less to depravity, God has nowhere, excepting only the Theocratic form, given His approval to any special one. If we open the Old Testament, and read the numerous passages in which God praises and eulogizes this form, we find that this exception indicates most forcibly the form of government that, above all others, meets the divine approbation.*

Obs. 11. Turning back to Props. 131, 154, 159, and others (e.g. Prop. 201, 202, 206, etc.) of similar import, it will be seen that a Theocracy embracing a pure Infallibility, administered through righteous and glorified agents, is to possess the rule over the earth. Fallible Imperialism, with its weakness and vices, will be crushed under its force; Constitutional Monarchy, with its utter inability to meet the clashing interests of classes and Republicanism which suffers from the suffrage of self-interest and ignorance being made the basis of its ordering, all forms of government, unable to remove the evils under which their subjects are groaning, must be subverted and give place to this one, which in itself honors God and blesses humanity with a perfect government that fully performs, yea immensely more, what others promise. This is clearly taught. All that oppose this coming Kingdom and its august Ruler shall be destroyed. Kings and nobles, high and low, rich and poor, who resist, shall fall beneath its invincible power—a power which will settle all difficulties between nation and nation, aristocracy and commoner, capital and labor, man and man.