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PREFACE.

The works of God are outward signs of the invisible. Creation is a mirror in which the eternal power and Godhead are seen reflected, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy work." This is a manifestation which God has made of himself in a language universally intelligible. He has not left himself without a witness to the senses and reason of mankind.

There is another manifestation to which the Psalmist also refers, not higher as to the object, but fuller and more precise as to the mode of revelation, not evident however to the eye of sense, but to be beheld only by the eye of faith. The Word of God is a manifestation of the Deity, not only revealing but revealed; not only declaring in its preceptive form what God approves, as, in his predictive, what he has ordained, but in each revealing what He himself is; in the former making manifest that in his moral character he is Love; in the latter, causing us to know that he inhabitteth eternity. That which is future and contingent upon the agency of responsible beings, is present to Him who could say, "Before Abraham was I AM;" succession is limitation—to Him there is an eternal now. This, I apprehend, gives us the
vi
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sublimest view of the nature of prophecy. We cannot comprehend how, without controlling free agency, God can predict future contingencies; we must say, "such knowledge is too wonderful for me, I cannot attain unto it;" yet, we may conceive, indeed we must admit, that such knowledge is essentially proper to Enejah: if He inhabits eternity the future is present to Him. It is for this reason, I humbly conceive, that Jehovah appeals to prophecy as the test of true Divinity, "Declare us things to come," &c.

To keep this thought in our minds while studying the mysterious revelations of the future cannot be without profit; it will serve to guard us against frivolous interpretations, and it may even render the style and genius of the prophetical scriptures more apprehensible to us. The revelations of the seer may partake somewhat of the character of the Divine mind whence they emanated, and incidents in the prophecies, which to a finite capacity appear imperfections, may, in truth, be disturbed reflections of the Eternal. If the sight of the glory, left a physical effect upon the countenance of Moses, may not the style of the prophets have traces of unsuccessive omnipercipience betraying whence their intellects were illumined? We must not, therefore, be surprised if the absolute distance in futurity, of the events predicted, be wholly unrevealed, if their relative contiguity be not very clearly defined; and even if in some cases their succession be not specifically noted.

The inquiry into the order of events during this probationary dispensation to which, more especially, the above observations apply has, therefore, much difficulty, and it
would almost appear, that as the Deity himself, in order to be apprehended, condescended to limitation in becoming incarnate, so, in like manner, the revelations of the Divine mind before they can be fully understood must become embodied in events.

Yet, here another difficulty presents itself. Can a finite mind grasp the relative magnitude of passing events? That which is the nearer, either as regards time or locality, is magnified, the more distant events are diminished. We strive, it is true, to argue from an analogy between the past and the future, but reasonings from analogy, always very liable to error, demand more than ordinary care and circumspection when we approach that great crisis which at present principally occupies the minds of prophetic students. Here analogy must almost entirely fail, for though we admit it has had its types, we cannot affirm that it has ever had its equal. These considerations, it appears to me, urge upon us the necessity of great caution in the application of history to unfulfilled prophecy.

But there is another extensive and most important branch of prophecy, "declaring the end from the beginning," which presents to our mind the idea, not so much of the fore-knowledge as of the fore-ordination of God, "who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will." Being in a great measure free from the difficulty which attaches to discovering and determining the succession of events; being in like manner unconnected with the passing scene, our judgment is not biassed by the undue importance of the times in which we live. Being, also, so different in character, we are not tempted to reason from analogy, but are, as it were, shut up to the more simple reception by
faith. Hence this is an inquiry, to which it would appear, much more certainty may be attached, it is, therefore, to this subject that the present work is principally confined, namely, "What does revelation give us to expect when the mystery of God shall be finished."

"Millenarianism," says Mr. Bonar, "may have no foundation in Scripture; but still anti-millenarianism may be equally baseless." A persuasion that these opposing systems are equally baseless occasioned my publishing a book about ten years ago, which in its general argument is similar to the present, of which, indeed, a great part is re-printed in the present work. During this long interval the subject has much occupied my mind, and the consequence is that I re-publish my sentiments, with somewhat of a paradoxical feeling of increased confidence and increased diffidence; that I should have a greater feeling of certainty is natural, if when my judgment is more matured my opinions are but slightly modified. But though the greater deliberation has not terminated with indecision, still a more lengthened study has powerfully impressed me with the consciousness of how small a part of God's ways is known.

When I had prepared the manuscript for the press my attention was directed to a work by the Rev. David Brown, entitled "Christ's Second Coming. Will it be Premillennial?" In which he describes me to be "One long known as a decided pre-millennialist," (p. 99,) at the same time quoting a passage from the Hor. Heb. inconsistent
with the pre-millennial theory. This illustrates a remark of his own as to "the liability of one's meaning being entirely mistaken when the object in view is overlooked." (p. 273, note.)

The work quoted, it is true, notices the subject briefly; but about two years afterwards, and about nine years before Mr. Brown's book appeared, I published the one already alluded to, expressly upon the subject of Messiah's kingdom; I might, therefore, have long been known as opposed to either the literal or spiritual hypothesis of a dispensation terminating at the close of the thousand years blessedness.*

But whether the opinions which I held a dozen years ago, be the same as those I entertain at present, can be of very little interest to any one; I have not, therefore, made even these animadversions upon Mr. Brown with the desire of self-justification, but rather to explain why I thought a more lengthened notice of his work advisable. I agree with him in some points in which he differs from millenarians, but, admitting the truth of some of his arguments, I was anxious to shew that they did not shake the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom; whereas I considered it equally desirable to point out, that other arguments which did tend directly to subvert that blessed hope, were fallacious and without force.

* Though Mr. Brown has not seen "things hoped for," he seems to have read some works which he supposed to be mine, but of which I cannot claim the authorship. I am not aware of having written any thing on the Jewish tabernacle, temple, or worship, excepting one essay, which extended to three octavo pages, on the Lavers in Solomon's Temple.
But, then, this difficulty arose, how could a book of nearly four hundred pages be satisfactorily reviewed? The old method of answering a work paragraph by paragraph, commencing even with the title-page, would be quite unsuited to the present illogical method of writing and indolent mode of reading. Having, moreover, all the evil consequences of a prolix style held up in terror before me individually, (Brown, p. 99,) I thought it desirable to examine only that which appeared the most important idea in each argument, leaving the minor features to share the fate of the more prominent. The objection to this method is, that a controvertialist may not always see the strongest points in his opponent's argument; his readers, it is certain, may not be sure that he has noticed them. I can only say, that I have examined what appeared to me the most important, and that I have not intentionally avoided any real difficulty.
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CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The difficulties in the interpretation of prophecy consist partly in the subject, and partly in the language. The difficulty of the subject arises in great measure from a finite mind being unable to estimate the comparative importance of events as viewed through the distance of either time or place, or from the combined influence of both. An event occurring in England would appear to us of much more importance than one of similar magnitude in China; or a calamity happening in our own lifetime would weigh upon us more heavily than one which took place ages ago. A limited and finite mind cannot divest itself of the effects of limitation, either from time or space; it must throw into perspective distant events. He alone who inhabits eternity, and fills heaven and earth with his presence, can view events in their absolute magnitude, and not in their apparent proportions.

Again, the intrinsic magnitude of an event may be different from its relative importance, as tending to develop the purposes of the Lord. Hence it becomes necessary for
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us to examine into the end which Jehovah has willed shall come to pass.

If we watch the motions of the heavenly bodies, supposing our earth to be the centre, how complicated all appears; the planets sometimes advancing, sometimes appearing to retrograde. But when we learn the centre round which they revolve, then we perceive "the harmony of the spheres."

Ezek. x. 13.

So in the wheel of Providence, if we suppose ourselves or even our own country the centre round which all events revolve, the changes and convulsions of nations may be inscrutable. We must learn the pivot of God's providence, then we may discover a harmony in the circle of events, similar to that which science has discovered in the "wheel of nature."

James iii. 6.

Prophecy in two parts.

This thought leads to the notice of a distinction, which, though very important, is not always preserved. Unfulfilled prophecy, in its extensive sense, embraces the whole doctrine respecting the future dispensation, as well as an investigation into the series of events during this present dispensation, which shall introduce the reign of blessedness: both what is to be, and how it is to be accomplished. These two, though really distinct, are very generally confounded.

Subject chosen.

My present inquiry is respecting the future dispensation: the other head only being taken up, so far as is necessary to establish the doctrinal view which I advance.

The doctrine as considered in the creeds.

This is a subject upon which I apprehend all ought to form definite ideas, it being considered of such importance as to be inserted into the symbols of our faith; yet many most inconsiderately repeat these articles in the creeds which are declarations of our belief concerning the future, who would perhaps tell you that they objected to the study of unfulfilled prophecy. "I believe," say they, "in the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting:" they also do not hesitate to declare that Jesus Christ "shall come again with
glory to judge both the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end;" and that they "look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

These declarations embrace all, of what I should call the *doctrines* respecting the future state of things, which are included in the study of unfulfilled prophecy. We may have different views respecting these events, but that will not alter them, from doctrines which are to be believed, into speculations which may or may not be entertained; nor will it be satisfactory to say, "I hold my doctrine because I do not inquire into these things, and you maintain a speculation because you study them."

The members of the Church of England profess to believe in,

1. The second advent of Jesus Christ, "He shall come again;"

2. Somewhat of the nature of that advent, "He shall come again with glory," &c.;


4. The perpetuity of that kingdom, "Whose kingdom shall have no end;"

5. A future dispensation, entitled, "The world to come;"

6. The expectation of life in that world, "The life of the world to come;"

7. The doctrine of the resurrection;

8. The co-etaneous rising of both good and bad at the second advent of Christ, "At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;"

9. The day of judgment—they "shall give an account of their own works;"

10. A future state of blessedness or misery—"They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."

Now many will exclaim, that some of these points were never considered by them to be prophetical subjects; but I
think it is because they have not formed distinct ideas of what is embraced in the study of unfulfilled prophecy: for confessedly the grand points of controversy in prophethical research are included in some of the articles above mentioned; yet I know not any definition of prophecy which will embrace some only of these doctrines and exclude others. It is not improbable, that people, averse to particular doctrines, avoid their consideration by fostering an indistinct idea in their own minds, which, when communicating with others, they shelter under a vague expression—that "the study of unfulfilled prophecy is unprofitable." But surely, if these points be of such vital importance as to be embodied in our creeds, it is desirable that we should attach definite ideas to them.

Nor are these observations wholly inapplicable to many who are searching into "what shall be hereafter;" for the 4th and 8th clauses, which I have quoted from the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds, appear to militate directly against the common hypothesis of most of those who are expecting the personal reign of Christ upon earth.

One of the principal difficulties in the language of prophecy, is the determination of the true limits of the literal, symbolical, and figurative. Perhaps we ought to commence a little earlier, and define the distinction between these three different styles. I would distinguish them thus:—If the language is used in its proper sense, and the idea is conveyed immediately, this I understand to be literal; but though the language be used in its proper sense, if a mediate idea be conveyed, this I suppose to be symbolical; lastly, if the idea conveyed is immediate, but the language is not used in its proper sense, this I apprehend is figurative. For example:

When our Lord says, "Foxes have holes and birds have nests," "fox" is used in its proper sense, and there is no mediate idea; thus the language is literal. But when He says,
"Go and tell that fox," the language is used in its proper sense, but there is a mediate idea; the idea of a fox arises in the mind, and then by reflexion the attribute of a fox is made characteristic of Herod. But when it is said the floods lift up their voice, or the deep utters its voice, the first idea that arises in the mind is of the ocean, but the language is used improperly; this is figurative.

Symbols are not suited for eloquence, being too cumbersome; the ideas are presented too slowly, which is the very reverse of figurative language; the metaphor in the one instance is applied to the noun, in the other to the adjective; the emotions are immediately roused by the figure, the ingenuity is first exercised in the symbol.

As it is admitted on all sides that no language is so literal as to be entirely devoid of figure, and no prophecies so strictly symbolical as to be without some passages purely literal, it might be supposed that the chief difference amongst students of prophecy, is mainly a question of degree as to how much is literal, symbolical, or figurative. This, however, is not at present the state of the case; that which was only a question of degree has diverged into two distinct and essentially different modes of interpretation, which the advocates of each opinion severally denominate literal and spiritual.

The literal or grammatical method is based upon the assumption that there are certain determinate ideas of things attached to certain words, and consequently, that the words are employed as the medium to convey the ideas which usage and custom have fixed and connected with those words. That it is, therefore, the duty of the interpreter to divest his mind of any preconceived ideas which may influence the meaning he would attach to the words, the ideas not being admitted as ingredients in fixing the meaning of the words, but, on the contrary, the words originating in the mind those ideas which usage has connected with them.
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Those portions of the Scripture which are not prophetical convey the same definite ideas which usage has fixed in other writings. And when God has been pleased to reveal to man, and through the instrumentality of man, somewhat respecting future facts, why should we not judge of God's meaning and of the facts which He states, though still future, as we should of man's meaning and of the facts which he states, when writing a history of the past? There is no necessary difference as to the mode of conveying the ideas of the future or the past. A history of the past may be sung in numbers, a prediction of the future may be without poetic ornament or figure; the only essential difference between a record of what has been, and a revelation of what shall be, is the divine foreknowledge, "which vieweth things which be not as though they were."

I will give an illustration: When our Lord spake of his rising from the dead, the disciples questioned "one with another what the rising from the dead could mean;" and again, when He had most explicitly declared that He was going to suffer, "they understood none of these things." The literalist contends, that whilst these assertions of our Lord were still prophecies, the disciples ought to have received the words according to their literal and grammatical meaning, just as much as that now they have become matter of history, all Christians do so receive them; and that no preconceived ideas respecting Messiah's abiding for ever, should have so possessed their minds, as to make the previous idea reflect back upon the meaning of the words, instead of permitting the words in the first instance to impress upon the mind those ideas they were calculated to convey.

This mode of interpretation is no doubt liable to abuse by the extreme of literality;—a man not perceiving the difference between the supernatural and the monstrous, may argue that, because a prediction that a virgin should conceive, has been literally fulfilled, therefore there shall be a
beast with seven heads and ten horns; but with the generality of mankind "intuitive consciousness will lead us to decide whether resemblance of properties, or identity of substance be intended."*

As to the less obvious distinctions between literal, symbolical, and figurative, there will be degrees of difference. "Some," says Waterland, "will fancy the plain and obvious sense, unreasonable and absurd;" the man that will fancy that which is plain and obvious to be unreasonable and absurd, must be himself deficient, either in reason or in faith; but we must not run into the error of supposing the obvious sense to be necessarily the literal sense; when our Lord calls Herod a fox, the sense is obvious, but not literal; some put a literal sense upon "This is my body," but there are many who deny that to be the obvious sense. Some have attempted rules for deciding between the literal, figurative, and symbolical;† I think there is a certain tact and discernment in seizing the spirit of a passage which is superior to any rules that can rigidly be laid down.

The question of spiritual interpretation is more complicated; its advocates should more rigidly define its nature.

Often there is a covert assumption of superiority in the claim for spiritual interpretation, which surely is not cor-

* Duffield on Prophecy, New York, 1842. This writer seems to me to have pointed out very clearly the essential distinction between the two modes of interpretation.

† I find one to this effect in the British Magazine for Feb. 1847, p. 180: "The language is to be considered figurative when a literal use of it would introduce an idea foreign, exterior, and thus repugnant to the class of associations connected with the subject of discourse; and literal when, on the contrary, conveying an idea which makes a part of those associations." This rule is very similar to Vitringa's: "We must never depart from the literal meaning of the subject mentioned in its own appropriate name, if all, or its principal attributes square with the subject of the prophecy,—an unerring canon," he adds, "and of great use."—Vitringa quoted by Duffield, p. 41.
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Term not just.

Spiritual opposed to material.

Sometimes "spiritual" appears opposed to "material," upon which I will quote some excellent observations of Mr. Brown; he speaks of "some tincture of that morbid spiritualism which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as though separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness. May not," says he, "the gnostic element—of the essential sinfulness and vanity of matter—be found lurking beneath it? Certainly, the glorified bodies, both of the Redeemer and the redeemed, derive their elements from the dust of this ground." And if it be no degradation for the Son of God to take it into his own person . . . if the dust of this ground is capable of becoming a "spiritual" and "glorious" meet vehicle for the perfected and beatified spirit, the sharer of its bliss in the immediate presence, and the instrument of all its activities in the service of God and the Lamb,"—there can be no essential sinfulness and vanity in matter.

I wish I could always approve as fully of Mr. Brown's sentiments; but among the many fallacies which lurk under the term "spiritual," as describing a peculiar mode of interpretation, one of its most dangerous forms is, as far as I know, peculiar to Mr. Brown. He supposes that the inspired prophets use an expression in one sense, but that the equally infallible apostles apply another meaning to the passage. If this be a sound canon of interpretation, instead of deriving any aid from the New Testament in fixing the
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direct and immediate scope of the old, it would be calculated to mislead us; instead of the context in the Old assisting us in discovering the recondite sense of the quotation in the New Testament, it would blind us.

Sometimes the "spiritual" amounts to nothing more than the undefined. "A spirit passed before my face"... "it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes." Sometimes the spiritual means the allegorical, analogical, or anagogical. The spiritual principle is, in fact, multiform, for its real intention and object is evasion. If the literal system is adopted, certain interpretations must be admitted: and this constitutes the essential difference between the two modes; in the spiritual method, the preconceived ideas form an ingredient in fixing the meaning of the words, instead of the words being the means of suggesting, or channel for conveying, the ideas.*

Thus the real intention of spiritual interpretation, and that which is its essential characteristic, is its real danger, for the same principle may be applied to the setting aside of any truth. There is, in fact, an end put to "the assurance of understanding," for the certainty of interpretation is derived from some necessity of signification, and the necessity of signification in words consists in the connexion between the words and ideas which has been fixed and established by usage and custom.

I will conclude this chapter in the words of Dr. Henderson: "There cannot be a doubt, that, in proportion as sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the word of God hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality and a more profound under-

* "The mystical sense, which indeed is incorrectly called a sense, belongs altogether to the things, and not to the words."—Bib. Reper. in Duffield, p. 36.
standing of Scripture, are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and untenable ground will be recognised, and the plain, simple, grammatical, and natural species of interpretation adopted and followed."—Henderson, *Minor Prophets*, p. x.
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DEFINITIONS.

I observed at the commencement that the study of unfulfilled prophecy is divided into two distinct heads. One, the doctrine concerning the future; the other, the order and series of those events which occur during this dispensation, as introductory to the next.

Passing events leave a very different impression upon the mind according to what the expectation of the final issue may be; they receive their hue from the clouds in the distant horizon. Those who expect the prevalence of the Gospel, see in the effort of Missionary and Bible Societies, as in the rosy streaks of morn, the dawning of a day, lovely and serene; whereas, others who believe the year of the redeemed will be ushered in by the day of vengeance of our God, discern that the sky is not only red but lowering, and they expect "a day of darkness and of gloominess, of clouds and thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains." Hence, as the development expected has so great an influence upon the aspect of events which are in progress, the consideration of the end should be the first in order, as it is in importance.

It would be difficult to state all the different shades of opinion which are entertained respecting the future, but they may be classed under two principal heads:—

Some expect a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation, at the expi-

1st view. A spiritual millennium.
ration of which they place the general resurrection and the
day of judgment, when Jesus will come and cast the wicked
into hell, take the righteous back with Him to heaven, and
annihilate the earth.

The opposite opinion is that we are to expect the advent
of our Lord at any time; that when He comes, He takes the
throne of David, and reigns upon earth for a thousand
years; that the saints rise and reign with Him; during
which time the power of Satan is entirely controlled;
though at the end of the thousand years, the evil one will
be loosed for a short time; after which the wicked shall be
raised and judged; the saints removed to heaven, and the
earth destroyed.

Before pronouncing any judgment respecting these two
opinions, I will define what I understand to be intended in
the first opinion by "a universal spread of the Gospel for a
thousand years before the close of this dispensation."

The "universal spread of the Gospel" corresponds with
the language of the prophet, who says, "The earth shall be
full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the
sea." When it is said, this shall be for a thousand years, I
do not believe the advocates of this view insist that it shall
be for that exact time, neither more nor less; for some
make it to mean much more, others perhaps comprise the
progress of the Gospel in this period. By saying it will be
"before the close of this dispensation," I understand it to
be supposed that this state of things will be brought about
by means similar to those at present in operation; such as
the preaching of the word and the distribution of the Scrip-
tures; but that these efforts will be more enlarged, and
probably much more extensively blessed, by an increased
outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the change, however, being
more or less gradual, not marked by a sudden and defined
transition from one state to another, and without the inter-
vention of any miraculous agency.
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With regard to the second opinion, I must define what I understand by the expression, "The coming of the Lord;" as also the "expecting," or "looking for," that event; and lastly, the entire expression, "Expecting the coming of the Lord at any time."

By the expression, "the coming of the Lord," I understand the removal of the Lord, in his bodily presence, from the heavens to this earth. When the angel declares that the same Jesus who was taken into heaven, should so come, in like manner as the apostles had seen Him go into heaven, we must understand "going" and "coming" in an analogous sense, namely, the removal of the Lord's bodily presence from one place to another. If, then, it undoubtedly sometimes has this meaning, why should not the word "coming," when applied to Christ, be as uniformly understood in its simple meaning as when applied to others? If any other than the common and natural sense of the words be affirmed, that uncommon meaning must be an exception, and it rests with those who maintain the peculiar view, to prove each particular instance.

When it is said, "certain came to Antioch from Judea," it is not thought necessary to prove that this denoted the removal of men in their bodily presence from one place to another. So in saying "we look for Christ from heaven," it is not necessary to prove that this expression implies a removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

Paul gave directions to Silas and Timotheus to come to him, and he waited for them at Athens; it would be unnecessary to set about proving that he expected their bodily presence; so, when it is said that we wait for God's Son from heaven, we need not prove that we mean the removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

I must next define what I understand by the expressions "expecting," or "looking for," and "waiting for." They do not only imply loving the appearing, but they embrace
something more; we might say, by way of illustration, that
Rhoda loved the appearing of Peter, but she did not expect
him, therefore she opened not the gate for gladness; but
"the people [gladly] received Christ, for they were waiting
for him."

That this is the natural and proper meaning of the expres-
sions, may be gathered from their use on other occa-
sions. The impotent folk around Bethesda were waiting
for the moving of the waters; doubtless they wished for the
appearance of the angel, but had they known that he would
not have descended for a thousand years, they would not
have been waiting. St. Paul, in like manner, "looked for,"
or expected Timothy to come with the brethren.

Nor are we to suppose the sense of these expressions
altered when applied to the advent of Christ. When Simeon
waited for the consolation of Israel, it is clear that he sup-
posed the advent was possible at any moment. In like
manner when "all the people were in expectation, and
mused in their hearts whether John was the Christ,"
surely it implies they were in expectation, because they
supposed that the advent of Christ drew near. John sent
to ask Jesus whether he was the Christ, or whether they
should look for another; John looked for the Messiah,
knowing that the time of his advent was at hand. So I
understand, with respect to the second coming, the expres-
sions "waiting for," and "looking for," do not admit of a
meaning which would put the possibility of Messiah's return
beyond the period of a natural life; but "expecting" im-
plies not only a possibility, but a probability within that
time.

When it is said, "We may be expecting the coming of
the Lord at any time," I conceive we must distinguish "the
coming of the Lord" from expressions denoting the moment
of the revelation of Jesus Christ, or of the rapture of the
saints; doubtless these events are part of the coming, but
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they are momentary. The coming, I apprehend, embraces a series of events.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances of the first advent. From what day should we date that event? Either from the annunciation to Zacharias, or to the Virgin; from the birth of John, or the day in which the Saviour was born; from the commencement of John's ministry, or the time when "Jesus himself began, being about thirty years of age?" Some might urge the time of the conception, or, at any rate, of the birth of Christ, and they might quote in support the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." And surely they would say, when embraced by Simeon in the temple, according to revelation, and worshipped by the magi as true-born king of the Jews, it must be acknowledged that the Lord Christ was come. Yet against this it might be advanced that the advent could not be dated before the ministry of John, because John was to "go before him," that is, in his ministry; for it was to be "in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers, &c." John, therefore, in his ministry, speaks of Christ's advent as yet future. And as to the prophecies, it appears clear that when Daniel speaks of Messiah the Prince, he refers to his entrance upon his public ministry.

How are we to reconcile these things? I think the fair answer would be, that the whole series of events must be embraced in "the coming of Christ." The first of them cannot be excluded from that category, yet the advent was not complete before the last. In some instances one event might be referred to, as when our Lord said, "The law and the prophets were until John;" that I apprehend related to the commencement of John's ministry; on other occasions there seems a delay until after the ministry of John was concluded; as, for example, when it is said, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee," in order to fulfil Isa. ix. 1, 2.
In like manner, with respect to the second advent, it need not be limited to the moment in which the Lord shall be revealed as a flash of lightning, but may embrace a series of events, issuing inevitably in that awful and glorious result. When that series shall commence is uncertain and contingent, and therefore known to no one but the Father; but this much negative information we may have: until the series does commence, we may know that the brightness of Christ’s presence is not impending; and, on the other hand, when that series shall begin, we may expect that all will be quickly accomplished, although the particular hour when the elect shall be caught up to meet the Lord will even then be unknown. When, therefore, it is said that we are to expect the coming of Christ at any time, I conceive the commencement of a series of events, having relation to the progress of the Lord, and terminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is intended.

Now to revert to the two opinions as thus defined, the former has the advantage of not militating directly against any article of our creeds; but this arises rather from ambiguity than from correctness; for though probably there is error in both of these statements, the latter appears to be nearer the truth than the former, because the whole difference may be resolved into the order of events; and in this respect I conceive the second view to be correct. The advocates of both opinions expect glorious things in the latter days; they both acknowledge that Jesus Christ will return to this earth some time or other; but the one party are "waiting for the coming of our Lord"—they are, in the first place, "expecting the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour," and a restitution of all things consequent upon that event; whereas the others are expecting that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord for a thousand years before the day of the Lord: they, therefore, deny the pre-millennial advent of Christ; for one cannot believe two
things which are essentially opposed to each other. It would be an abuse of the rational intellect to suppose a man could be in constant expectation of the Lord’s advent, and, at the same time, be looking for a thousand years of blessedness to precede that event. A man could not sincerely contemplate the probability of both hypotheses being correct, for one expectation is utterly destructive of the other. We will then assume, as a matter of course, that one who looks for a spiritual millennium is not waiting for the appearing of Jesus Christ.

There are, therefore, two great heads of inquiry:—is a spiritual millennium consistent with the character of this present dispensation?—or, on the other hand, is the speedy coming of our Lord a scriptural expectation?
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CHARACTER OF THE PRESENT DISPENSATION.

"O merciful God, grant . . . power and strength to have victory and to triumph against the devil, the world, and the flesh."—P把持

mal Service.

My first inquiry is, as to the character of this present dispensation.

For the Scriptures to be generally applicable to the condition of believers, it is evident that the Church must be under circumstances similar to those in which the faithful were placed, when addressed by the apostles. They must have the same relation to the world, be called to sustain a similar conflict, and to exercise identical christian graces.

Now the epistles were addressed to Churches when composed of individuals, few in number, suffering from persecution, temptation, inward conflict, and outward distress; and all the exhortations, warnings, encouragements, and consolations, are based upon the idea of the Church being in such an aspect.

The expectants of the glorious appearing of our Lord believe that the same relation between the Church and the world will remain, without any material alteration, until the introduction of the new dispensation, and that therefore all the exhortations, warnings, and consolations based upon that idea will continue in their undiluted force, until the sudden and entire change takes place; but those who look for what
they call a spiritual millennium, do not expect a distinctly
defined transition to the new and perfect age, but a gradual
amelioration, through the diffusion of the Gospel, during
this present dispensation; hence, according to their view,
all the relations between the Church and the world will be
gradually altered, the way to eternal life will become broad,
and there will be many to go in thereat.

But how different is the language of Scripture! St. John
addresses an exhortation to all classes of Christians; not
only to the babes in Christ, but to those who are strong, and
have overcome the wicked one, as well as to the fathers who
have known Him who is from the beginning; a charge so
solemnly introduced, is, we may be sure, of vital importance.
The injunction is, "Love not the world, neither the things
that are in the world." It is not, apparently, the material of
the world, or the furniture of the world, but the people of the
world, that we are warned not to love; that is the most com-
mon meaning of "world" in the Scripture, and appears to be
the sense intended in this passage, because it is so used in the
following context: "Therefore the world knoweth us not;" 1 John iii. 1.
again, it is that world which is subject to "the lust of the flesh,
the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," predicates which are
not suitable to the material of the world, nor to the furniture of
the world, but which do characterize the people of the world;
and, lastly, the world is here put in opposition to those who
"do the will of God." "The world," then, in this passage
denotes the people of the world.

St. John continues, "If any man love the world, the
love of the Father is not in him; for all that is in the world,
the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of
life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." We cannot
love opposites; if we love God, we love what proceeds from
God, and "every good and every perfect gift comes from
the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither
shadow of turning;" we cannot then love the world, nor James i. 17.
what proceeds from the world, for it is essentially opposed to God; the world is wholly influenced by "the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eyes, and the pride of life;" for St. John testifies that "all that is in the world . . . is not of the Father." Different phases and characters of wickedness may be formed by the predominance of one or other of these evil principles; but by them, in their different modifications, the whole world is actuated.

When St. John speaks of these being the characteristic features of the world, he must imply that they belong to the great majority of mankind, and that the Christian is the exception. "We are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness," or "the wicked one." The same language is invariably used by the other apostles. "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God," and, on the other hand, the preaching of the cross is folly to those who seek after the wisdom of the world. Conversion is described as "escaping the corruption which is in the world through lust;" and one grand feature of pure religion consists in "keeping oneself unspotted from the world." A great part of the conflict to which believers are exposed, is with the world, and they overcome, only because greater is He who is in them, than he who is in the world; the only ground of trust, therefore, is in the cross of Christ, by which the saint is crucified to the world, and the world to him.

On the other hand, the love of the world causes apostacy, which is evident, because "the friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever, therefore, will be the friend of the world, is the enemy of God;" for, as we have already observed, "the whole world lieth in the wicked [one]," who is therefore called the "prince of this world," and "the god of this world."

Now all parties agree that these characteristics of the world will cease when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea. But when all the
world are turned to the Lord, it is evident that these descriptions of the world, and the directions to the saints consequent thereon, will become obsolete; instead of its being our duty to "come out from amongst them, and to be separate," we shall be called upon to love them as brethren.

It is therefore very important to decide, whether these precepts will continue in full force during the whole of this age, and be entirely superseded by the introduction of another dispensation; or whether they will gradually fall into disuse by the progressive amelioration of the world. The expectants of Jesus maintain the former, the spiritual millennarians must admit the latter. The passage in St. John's epistle, with which we commenced, will decide the point; we are not called upon to anticipate the improvement of the world, but their removal, "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." At the close of this age, all that offends shall be gathered out of the kingdom; and "then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father." "For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it; but the wicked shall he cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Hence the whole of this dispensation is characterised as an "evil age," and the end of Christ's death was to take us out of it; "He gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us (or take us out) from this present evil world" or "age." Nothing can more strongly mark the character of the whole dispensation.

But if, at any time during this age, the knowledge of the Lord is to be universal, it would then cease to be an evil age; and it would be our duty to be conformed to it. St. Paul, however, urges on the Romans "not to be conformed to this age, but to be transformed by the renewing of their minds;" and the necessity of this metamorphosis is evident, because those who walk according to the course of this age "are dead in trespasses and sins, walking according to the Eph. ii. 1, 2.
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prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Hence this age of dominant iniquity will continue whilst Satan is "prince of the power of the air," and is energizing in the children of disobedience.

Thus, then, we have learned the extent and the duration of iniquity: until the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet, the whole world will be under the power of the wicked one, and this will be during the whole of this age. We must therefore conclude that the gradual amelioration of the world during this dispensation is not a hope warranted by the Scriptures.

The scriptural account of the relation which the Church bears to the world during this present dispensation, is in exact accordance with what we might expect from the character of the Church during the same period. It is an election out of the world. St. Paul states this in relation to the Jews, and St. James as regards the Gentiles. As to the Jews, there is but a remnant, and a very small remnant, according to the election of grace. It is true that a time will come when all Israel shall be saved, but when all or even most of the Jews are called, the elect can no longer be designated a remnant; the saving of all Israel, moreover, will not be gradual but sudden. "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

So with respect to the Gentiles, God visits them to take out of them a people for his name; the Gospel is to be preached to all nations, but only for a witness, before the end came, and as many as are ordained to eternal life will believe.

This peculiar standing of the Church in the world, is the occasion of much of the enmity of the world. "Because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." Their being the objects of God's special favour is one cause of malevolence; being
also in their lives preachers of righteousness, they condemn
the world, and are therefore hated. "If they have per-
secuted me," says the Lord, "they will also persecute you," John xv. 20.
which assertion cannot be confined in its application to
the apostles, for St. Paul repeats the same truth with the
most universal application, "All that will live godly in
Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." But if all, or even
the majority in the world, were brought to live godly in
Christ Jesus, who would be the persecutors?

It may, however, be said, that now the Church is not
persecuted. This is only partially true; in some places the
persecution is sufficiently bitter to give the stamp of genuine
Christianity to the sufferers. And we are not told that all
godly people are at all times to be suffering persecution;
nevertheless if the believer be not in that state, it should be
a subject of inquiry with him whether he is living godly.
We are taught to expect in the last days, more of the form of a
godliness than of its power, in opposition to which it is that
St. Paul says, "All who will live godly in Christ Jesus
shall suffer persecution." I am deeply persuaded that the
ture character and standing of the Church of God in the
world is already greatly lost sight of. What St. Paul says
to the Corinthians, with marked disapprobation, might be
urged against many of us in this day, "Now ye are full,
now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us; and
I would to God that ye did reign, that we also might reign
with you. For I think that God hath set forth us the
apostle's last, as it were appointed unto death; for we are
made a spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men.
We are fools for Christ's sake, but ye are wise in Christ:
we are weak, but ye are strong; ye are honourable, but we
are despised. Even to this present hour we both hunger
and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no
certain dwelling-place: and labour, working with our hands:
being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it;
being defamed, we entreat: we are made as the filth of the world, and the off-scouring of all things unto this day. I write not these things to shame you, but, as my beloved sons, I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel; wherefore, I beseech you, be ye followers of me." The whole upshot of this discourse seems to be, that this dispensation is not the time of reigning, and that a state of prosperity is a condition of danger, requiring warning; and that such a walk is to be followed as will meet with reviling and defamation from the world. Again, in confirmation of the truth of his doctrine, St. Paul puts a question which would hardly now be considered so unanswerably conclusive, "Then is the offence of the cross ceased?" We have so mistaken the character of this dispensation, that we have lost sight of the privilege of suffering for Christ. Many of us, I fear, so little contemplate these things, that we should think a fiery trial strange, rather than rejoice in being partakers of Christ's sufferings. Many appropriate to themselves, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" and "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" without applying the accompanying text, "As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." But surely if we are not always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, ought we not to inquire whether we are lively, or even living Christians? for the word of God gives no hope of an end being put to persecutions before the coming of Christ. "It is a righteous thing for God to recompense . . . to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels."

I have hitherto confined myself to those parts of Scripture which are considered more eminently preceptive, because many shelter their indifference to the doctrine of
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Messiah's kingdom, under the notion that whether true or otherwise, it is not of any great practical importance. I will not enlarge upon other portions of Scripture, but in order to show that they intimate the same truth, I will give one example from each of the three modes of setting forth the future, namely, the types, parables, and express predictions.

The temptations and defections of the children of Israel in the wilderness, were types of what the visible Church is appointed to encounter, as well as of the results of her trials during this dispensation: "Now all these things happened unto them for examples, (types, margin,) and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come, wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." The statement that the end of the world or age is come upon us, seems to have connexion with the context in this manner; as the events of the wilderness were types, there must be corresponding antitypes: but as the ends of the world or ages are come upon us, we cannot defer the antitypes to any future age. This present is the concluding dispensation, before the Church enters into her rest, during which, therefore, there must be the temptations corresponding with the typical trials in the wilderness, before entering the land of Canaan.

Now, putting by any consideration of the Moabites, and those who did not profess to worship Jehovah, how large a proportion of the professed followers of the Lord fell in the wilderness; how small a number endured unto the end! Out of the multitude that left Egypt, only two entered Canaan. The termination of the forty years was marked by a solicitation to evil which resulted in the excision of all that remained of those who had been delivered from the house of bondage; and was indeed the discriminating trial by which the rebels were purged out of God's congregation. It was the mingling of the Israelites with the Moabites.
which brought their last snare, as it was the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men which occasioned the flood. How earnestly, then, ought we to watch that we be not amongst those who previously to Christ's second advent, after having escaped the pollutions of the world, through the acknowledgment of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, will again be entangled therein and overcome.

Having given an example from the types, I will proceed to give one from the parables.

The tares are to grow together with the wheat until the harvest; which our Lord explains as denoting the mixture of godly and wicked in the kingdom of heaven,—here, I apprehend, denoting the visible Church,— until the end.

"The field is the world;" the field belongs to the man who sows the good seed; it is the world as belonging to the Son of man, the world in which his kingdom is to be established.

"At the end of the age," (not at the destruction of the material of the universe,) "the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom,—that kingdom where the good seed was sown, which kingdom is in the world,—" all things that offend and whom which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a flame of fire, there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth; then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father;" for "the righteous shall never be removed, but the wicked shall not inherit the earth." I will conclude with one example from the express predictions of the New Testament.

In the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, we are informed respecting the stream of corruption which will flow from the days of the apostles even until the revelation of that power which will be destroyed by Christ at his second advent.

The Thessalonians, it appears, were unsettled in mind, conceiving that the day of Christ was impending, or, I should say, actually commenced. Some commentators sup-
pose that the expression, "the day of Christ," does not refer to the day of the advent of our blessed Redeemer, but to the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet it appears strange how any one could suppose this perturbation of mind should have been produced in the church of God in Thessalonica, by the report of a providential dispensation of God being at hand in Judea; or how the destruction of Jerusalem by the heathen could be called the presence of the Lord to the Thessalonians; or how the congregating of the Roman armies round Jerusalem could be called the gathering of the saints of Thessalonica to Christ. * See also Phil. 1. 6.

The apostle, in urging upon the Thessalonians that their perturbation was groundless, takes occasion to show the different developments of evil, from his days even to the time of the second advent.

There was the mystery of iniquity already working when the apostle wrote;

There was also a withholding cause then in operation, which would continue until the revelation of the man of sin;

There must have come the apostacy;

There must have been revealed, the man of sin; who is farther defined by

(1.) Another designation, "The son of perdition;

(2.) Several characteristics. (ver. 4.)

The revelation of the wicked or lawless one would be upon the removal of that which then hindered:

"The wicked one" is to be

(1.) Consumed by the breath of Christ's mouth;

(2.) "Destroyed" or put down by "the brightness of Christ's coming."

* "What share were the christian converts [in Thessalonica] to have in the calamities of the rebellious Jews?" Simplicius in Bishop Newton, who adds, "Besides, how should the apostle deny that the destruction of the Jews was at hand, when it was at hand, as he himself saith, 1 Thess. ii. 16?"
Hence, as one end of the chain is rivetted to the times of the apostles, and the other to the period of the second advent, it is evident that one or other of these forms or developments of evil is to prevail in the visible Church from the days of the apostles, even until the second advent of our Lord. To which link, then, does the spiritual millennium belong? Is it to be under the apostacy, or under the man of sin?

Our first conclusion, therefore, is: That the expectation of a universal spread of the Gospel, during this present dispensation, is incompatible with the essential characteristics of the dispensation itself.

My next head of inquiry shall be, What is the Church's expectation?
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THE CHURCH'S EXPECTATION.

"I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

In a former chapter I stated what appeared to be certain characteristic features of this dispensation; I proceed now to point out what I conceive should be the longing anticipation of the Church with regard to the future.

"The grace of God which bringeth salvation" teacheth us, "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." If now, a man denied worldly lusts, and lived soberly and righteously, but yet was not godly—if he fulfilled all the duties of the second table, yet neglected the duties of the first—we should not hesitate to say that such a man was not taught by that grace of God which bringeth salvation: a man truly under the teaching of the Spirit cultivates both godliness and righteousness. But is this all that the grace of God which bringeth salvation, teacheth?—No; it also teaches us to be "expecting . . . the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," and, apparently, the text implies, that this expectation is as certainly and as universally taught, as is the denial of ungodliness and worldly lusts; there seems no difference; the hope respecting Christ's advent appears quite as prominently brought forward as the characteristic life and conduct of the believer,—indeed, I should say more so, for the one is in-
produced as the end at which the child of grace is aiming, the others are the means towards the attainment.

We may lay it down as a proposition, that only those who deny ungodliness can be expecting Messiah's advent, for if men cast not off the works of darkness, they continue in a state of darkness; they know not that the night is far spent, and that the day is at hand; for the service of God, and the waiting for Christ, St. Paul gives us as the two great characteristics of true conversion: "How ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven. But in this waiting, an anxious wish for the event is implied, as well as the belief in the probability of its immediate occurrence."

Taken conversely, the proposition is equally true. Those who are expecting Messiah's advent do deny ungodliness and worldly lusts; the expectation has a purifying efficacy; "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and [or but] it doth not yet appear what we shall be." We are now in possession of this most exalted privilege, although the present is not the season when the sons of God are manifested, the world now knows them not, any more than when He was on earth it knew Him. "But," says St. John, "we know that when

* The word in 1 Thess. i. 10, does not occur again in the New Testament, but it is found in the septuagint version of Job vii. 2, where the patriarch says, "As a servant earnestly desireth the shadow, and as a hireling looketh for [the reward of] his work, so am I made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed me."

"The compound word here used in the original denotes intensity. We not only await Him, expect Him, and are persuaded that He will come; but stay patiently and eagerly for his coming; we endure, because we long for it, and are sure that we shall not be disappointed."

—Vaughan, Church's Expectation, p. 11.
He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." I understand the last clause not as assigning the cause, but affirming the proof, of our resemblance; it is not the transforming power of the beatific vision, but the discerning power of the beatified spirit. To see Him as He is, to know Him even as we are known, argues an exaltation of our nature commensurate with the glorified humanity of the Son of God; "and every man that hath this hope in Him, [i.e. in Christ,] purifieth himself even as He is pure;" every one who has this exalting, exhilarating hope of being made like unto Christ at his glorious appearing, does now strive after, and in some measure attain unto, that purity which is in Christ himself. Hence St. Paul urges it, as the great motive to mortification: "When Christ our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory. Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon earth: fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry."

The passage which I have quoted from St. John's epistle, seems to refer rather to the expansion of the intellectual and spiritual capacity of the glorified believer; but there must also be a spiritual body—a body capable of being actuated immediately by the glorified spirit—a body of glory suitable for the perfected spirit. Such was St. Paul's expectation, and in setting forth his walk as an example, in opposition to that which ends in destruction, he implies that this desire of Christ's appearing, and of the consequent transformation into his likeness, was a great impelling motive to heavenly conduct, "for our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall transform our bodies of humiliation, in order that they may be fashioned like unto his body of glory." To attain to the hope, and to live in the expectation, of the advent, is, in short, that which characterises those who are not deficient in any spiritual gift. "I thank my God . . . for
the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in everything ye are enriched by Him . . . so that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

St. James speaks of patience as being the crowning and completing grace of the Christian, so that however perfect he might be, were he not placed in such circumstances as would elicit and call into exercise the grace of patience, he would be wanting in something, and so great would be the want, that the believer should joyfully exchange a state of peace for one of manifold trials, in order that he might have the opportunity of exercising this grace. "But," adds he, "let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing." What, however, can fortify the believer, and enable him to endure in the exercise of this perfecting grace, but the expectation of the Lord's speedy return? The same apostle says, "Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord; behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." St. Paul holds out precisely the same motive in support of the same grace: "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." In both these passages the consideration of the Lord's speedy advent to put an end to suffering and trial, is held out as the support of patience. And in neither of them is there a hint of a period of spiritual peace and triumph prior to the advent.

Precisely the same thought is held out for the consolation of those under bereavement: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others who have no hope, for if we
believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive [and] remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive [and] remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." To me it appears evident that the special ground of comfort here urged, is the prospect of speedy re-union with the departed brethren; and that, not by our being also absent from the body, and so present with the Lord, but by the return of Christ together with those who sleep in Jesus. Here, then, evidently, the whole consolation consists in the probability of Messiah’s speedy return.

This language of the apostle seems to have taken such hold of the Thessalonians, that their desire for the Lord’s return amounted to an error in the way of excess rather than of defect; for in his second epistle, St. Paul prays that the Lord would direct their hearts into "the patient waiting for Christ." Such, apparently, was their ardent desire for his advent, that it almost trenches upon the grace of patience. How very different is the condition of the Church now from what it was then! the Apostle having to rein in their ardour; whereas our sluggishness needs much goading. But with those who have the assurance of hope, and are living in the sense of God’s favour, the Thessalonian would be the more likely state of the two; they would be hoping for the grace which is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ;” those whose conversation is in heaven are looking from thence “for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ,” and in all holy conversation and godliness not only.
looking for, but "hastening on, the coming of the day of God."

This desire is not confined to the faithful on earth; they share it in common with the Church in heaven, for those glorified spirits, in their song before the throne, declare with joyful anticipation that they "shall reign on the earth." Then will the church militant and triumphant receive their perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul; hence the prayer to Christ is, "Oh! that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, . . . for since the beginning of the world [men] have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, [i.e. Christ,] beside thee, what He [i.e. God the Father] hath prepared for him that waiteth for Him," which St. Paul remarkably enough turns into "for them that love Him;" implying that to love Him and not to love his appearing would be impossible; as certainly we cannot love his appearing, if we do not love Him: hence it is distinctly said that the crown of righteousness "is laid up for . . . all those that love his appearing," and not only so, but apparently it is only for those, for it is "unto them that look for Him," that He will appear "unto salvation." In that day the Church will say, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is Jehovah, we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." The iteration seems to mark that the waiting was an evidence that his appearing would be to their joy.

I have now stated what I apprehend should be the expectation of the Church, and the blessed effects of that expectation upon the disposition and conduct of the believer. I will now show some of the evil consequences upon the character of those who profess to be followers of the Lord, but yet who do not live in this attitude of expectation.

In the "perilous times" of "the last days," covetousness will be a leading feature among men who have the form of
godliness while denying the power, but such men cannot be living upon the contemplation of Christ's speedy return, for nothing can be so effectual against the snare of covetousness as the expectation of Messiah's advent, for it is the thought which enables one to sit loose to the world, and which frees from all anxiety. "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand, be careful for nothing." 

Our Lord also intimates that some of his servants will be fostering a spirit of persecution, and indulging fleshly lusts, just because they say in their hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming:" upon which He urges watchfulness; for those only who watch and pray always will be accounted worthy to escape; so our Lord says again, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." And those who do watch for his advent are blessed: "Behold, I come as a thief, blessed is he that watcheth." The whole point and force would be taken away from the exhortation to watchfulness, if we admitted that there was to be a spiritual millennium intervening before the second advent; the idea intended to be conveyed seems to be the possibility, if not the probability, of Messiah's return within the period of a natural life. "The end of all things is at hand, be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer."

A similar exhortation, "Let us watch and be sober," is grounded just upon the fact of light or darkness upon this point being the distinguishing mark of the believer: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;" the "but" here is a particle of opposition by which St. Paul distinguishes the brethren from others. The son of Jonas in like manner makes wilful ignorance the characteristic of the wicked scoffers in the last days, attributing to them this inquiry, "Where is the promise of his coming?" Hence he expressly warns the beloved not to fall into this error of the wicked.

The expectation of the Lord's advent has always been
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Expectation of Christ the aspect of the true Church.

The aspect of the true Church: it was so in the apostolic days; it was so with the fathers for the first three centuries,* and it was so with the Reformers. Our Church, therefore, teaches us to say, "I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come."† We do not merely state our belief that there will be a resurrection of the dead some time or other—a thousand years hence, or even a year hence; but we declare that we are in the attitude of hope and expectation: "I look for it"—I know neither the day nor the hour.

The notion of a spiritual millennium which originated apparently by the oscillation into the opposite extreme, from the excesses of the German Anabaptists and English Fifth-Monarchy Men, has since been fostered by the expectations raised from the efforts of religious societies, till it has become the deliberate creed of many. Thus we are enabled to understand how it can be used by our Lord and St. Peter as a prophetic feature and sign of the last days. I do not mean to imply that carelessness or indifference alone, upon the subject of the Lord’s return, could be considered a prophetic sign—for that, I fear, has been the melancholy feature in most ages of the Church—but the deliberate maintenance of a doctrine which virtually says, "My Lord delayeth his coming," is a prognostic of the speedy approach of Messiah.

* "All primitive orthodox Christians expected, according to the words of the apostles, and the promises of the prophets, a new heaven and a new earth, at the second coming of the Messiah to restore the happiness which flourished before the fall of Adam," &c.—(Grabe’s Spicilegium Patrum, lib. ii. p. 230, in Duffield, p. 264.) A passage is quoted from Mr. Brooks, in chapter xxvii., showing the universal opinion of the Reformers.

† The Church says, "I look for the resurrection of the dead," &c.; but I believe no one denies the resurrection of the believer will be simultaneous with our Lord’s personal advent.
THE CHURCH’S EXPECTATION.

Now, we before observed, that a man who holds the spiritual millennium cannot be expecting the advent of the Lord: is he not, then, saying in his heart, “My Lord delayeth his coming?” And of what is such a belief the forerunner?

Shortly, then, to recapitulate this chapter. We may be confident, that an expectation—which is taught by the grace of God—which is a sign of true conversion—which is purifying in the highest degree—which shows itself in all holy conversation and godliness—which is a mark of the highest spiritual knowledge—which therefore characterises those for whom the crown is laid up,—an expectation which the saints on earth share in common with the church in heaven,—is holy in its tendency—is in accordance with the divine mind, and is a point of great practical importance. On the other hand, that ignorance upon this subject—which is wilful—which betokens a child of darkness—which encourages a covetous disposition—which fosters a persecuting spirit—which unbridles the animal desires—and which will end in sudden destruction—is to be reprobated and carefully avoided.

My second conclusion, therefore, is, that the Church ought, according to the Scripture, to be “looking for the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour,” which conclusion being inconsistent with the belief of an antecedent spiritual millennium, confirms our former inference, drawn from the character of the present dispensation.*

I have now shown, that during this present dispensation the enemies of Christ and his Church are in the ascendant; and that the Church is, or ought to be, looking for the return of the Lord. I must next inquire as to the position

* In urging this point, I have confined myself to quotations from the New Testament, with the exception of Isaiah lxiv. 1, which is applied to the second advent upon the authority of 1 Cor. ii. 9; and Isaiah xxv. 9, upon the authority of 1 Cor. xv. 54.
which Messiah himself at present holds, whilst the sons of God are in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation; I shall then examine as to whether the situation which He will hereafter enjoy, corresponds with what I have shown should be the expectation of the Church.
CHAPTER V.

CHRIST'S CO-ORDINATION.

"O God, the King of glory, who hast exalted thine only Son Jesus Christ with great triumph unto thy kingdom in heaven."—Coll. Sunday after Ascension Day.

"The Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God," saith to the churches, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and sat down with my Father in his throne." Here two thrones are mentioned: Christ's taking his seat upon the throne of God is mentioned as a past act; his joint session with his followers upon his own throne is declared to be still future. The session upon the Father's throne is the subject of the present chapter, concerning which there is abundant testimony in Scripture. "After the Lord had spoken unto them, [the eleven,] He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right-hand of God." "When He had by himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right-hand of the Majesty on high." "After He had offered one sacrifice for sins," He "sat down on the right-hand of God." According to these testimonies, therefore, our Lord is, during this dispensation, sitting at the right-hand of God, which is in accordance with his own declaration, that He is sitting upon his Father's throne. I must consider what is implied by these expressions.

Sitting upon the throne of any one, not only in common parlance, but in scriptural language, denotes reigning.
Bathsheba said to David, "My lord, thou swarest by Jehovah thy God, unto thy handmaid, Assuredly Solomon, thy son, shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne." Again, "The eyes of all Israel are upon thee, that thou shouldest tell them who shall sit upon the throne of my lord the king after him." The act of sitting upon the throne was the most marked and distinct indication of reigning. "And Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet, have anointed him king... also Solomon sitteth on the throne of the kingdom." * "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David." Indeed, so identified are the expressions, that according to inspiration they must be considered synonymous; as may be seen by comparing 1 Kings iii. 6 with 2 Chron. i. 8. "Thou hast given him a son to sit on his throne," in the one; is turned into "and hast made me to reign in his stead," in the other. And "a man upon the throne," 1 Kings ix. 5, is expounded as a ruler in 2 Chron. vii. 18. So when Christ says that He has sat down with his Father in his throne, we must conclude that He affirms his joint reign with the Father.

In like manner, God's causing Him to sit at his right-hand is generally acknowledged to involve the impartation of honour, power, and majesty, or dominion; this, I think, may be fully justified from scripture. With respect to honour, St. Paul declares that God set Christ "at his own right-hand in the heavens, far above... every name which is named not only in this world but also in that which is to come." So apparently with reference to the power which He should receive by his session at God's right-hand, Christ tells the Jews that they shall see Him "on the right-hand of power." And with respect to both power and majesty, the apostle shows that Christ's elevation to the right-hand of God raises Him far above all principa-

* David's throne is the same as the throne of his kingdom, as we shall see by comparing 1 Chron. xvii. 12 with 2 Sam. vii. 13.
lity, and power, and dominion. St. Peter, in like manner Eph. i. 21. says, "Christ is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven, angels, and authorities, and powers, being subject unto Him;" but how could "authorities and powers," aye, 1 Pet. iii. 22. "all principality and dominion," be subjected to Him if He reigned not over them? Authorities are subjected by his having authority over them; Powers, by his having power over them; and Dominions, by his having dominion over them; thus is He "the head of all principality and power." Col. ii. 10. With reference to this, Christ is said to have "sat down on Heb. i. 3. the right-hand of the Majesty on high," and to be set "on Heb. viii. 1. the right-hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," "the right-hand of Majesty" denoting the impartation of dominion; as "the right-hand of power," in a previous citation, denoted that particular character of his exaltation. And saying that He sits "at the right-hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" is the same as Christ's own affirmation that He has "sat on his Father's throne." Rev. iii. 21.

As Christ's session at God's right-hand is not mere empty pageantry, but is the investiture with actual dominion, St. Paul, in quoting from the 110th Psalm, does not hesitate to substitute one expression for the other; referring to the declaration of the Father, "Sit thou at my right-hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," he says, "For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under his feet." The manner in which the apostle refers to Psalm cx. leads us to the inference that the expressions are in their meaning identical; but if they are not identical, according to scripture verity, they must at least be synchronous; continuing until, and terminating by, the accomplishment of one particular event; for Christ will sit at God's right-hand until his enemies be made his footstool; but Christ must reign until He shall have put all enemies under his feet, hence, clearly, Christ, while sitting at God's right-hand, is reigning.

Christ, whilst sitting at God's right-hand, has not only Christ's co-ordination.
an impartation of honour, power, and dominion, but is exalted to absolute co-ordination in all these respects. The order of the proofs in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews implies as much: the apostle shows the sonship of Jesus; the worship of Him by angels; his eternal throne; his creative power; yet the climax of all is, "But to which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on my right-hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool?" So also in the epistle to the Romans, this assertion is advanced with a note of marvellous and extraordinary dignity: "Who is even at the right-hand of God." But the most convincing passage in support of Christ's absolute co-ordination is his declaration to his disciplos, "If ye loved me ye would rejoice because I said, I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I." The doubt respecting the love of the disciples is not, I apprehend, to be taken absolutely, but comparatively: "If ye loved me supremely, the contemplation of my glory would absorb the consideration of your loss of my personal presence; ye would rejoice because I said, I go unto the Father;" what follows is a reason why they should rejoice, as is evident by the particle "for"—"for my Father is greater than I." Now, his going to the Father could not alter his essential relation to Him, but it could alter his subordination; hence his disciples ought to have rejoiced because, being at that time subordinate to the Father, by going to the Father He would become co-ordinate—his Father would no longer be greater than He. Our Lord also says, that "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all should honour the Son even as they honour the Father," which appears to be the honour due to Him as co-ordinate with the Father, because it springs from the dignity which He derives from having all judgment entrusted unto Him; "All power is given unto me," says Christ, "in heaven and in earth;" God glorifying Him by withdrawing himself, in respect to visible execution, from the affairs of the world.
Christ's absolute and entire co-ordination is strongly marked, first by the apostle's assertion that God the Father is the sole exception to all being in subjection to him; and, 1 Cor. xv. 27. secondly, by our Lord's declaration that God the Holy Spirit should be dispensed by him, and therefore, in the order of working, should be subordinate to him. "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." By Christ's departure to the Father (John xvi. 5) He derived authority to send the Spirit to the Church. Hence to the question propounded when Christ ascended on high, "Who is the king of glory?" our Church responds most truly, "Thou art the king of glory, O Christ!" For we now by faith behold "Jesus crowned with glory and honour." Heb. ii. 9.

Thus I have attempted to show, that whilst the enemies of Christ and his Church are in the ascendant, He is sitting on the right hand of God, "from henceforth expecting, until his enemies be made his footstool." But this dominion which the Mediator now enjoys, is prior to the session upon his own throne, as we have already learned from Rev. iii. 21. How long He will exercise this rule, shall therefore be our next inquiry.

Before proceeding, however, may we not pause for one moment to contemplate this "great mystery of godliness," 1 Tim. iii. 16. "God... in the flesh"... "received up into glory?" Our human nature, in the person of the Son of God, exalted to absolute co-ordination with the Father. The thought is overwhelming. Yet the continued contemplation is most consoling. "Who is even at the right-hand of God," is followed by "who also maketh intercession for us."
CHAPTER VI.

THE RESIGNATION OF THE KINGDOM.

"He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end."

Those who expect the personal reign of Christ upon earth, are not unfrequently distinguished from such as look for a period of spiritual blessedness, by being designated "millennarians:" but this is neither correct nor just. It is not correct, because taking "millenarianism" as the distinctive term, we make the characteristic peculiarity to consist in a limit of time; but while between the two opinions there is a great difference in many respects, such as the order of events, the place of Messiah's abode for the thousand years, and the nature of the kingdom during that period, yet there is not a diversity with respect to the fact of time, for there are spiritual as well as personal millenniumarians; hence it is incorrect to apply the term to the one party as contradistinguished from the other.

In the next place, the designation is unjust, because those who are looking for Messiah's advent are thus at once saddled with an opinion which does not necessarily belong to the doctrine, and which, moreover, brings it into direct opposition to the creeds and standards of our Church; for

* I use the term in the subsequent parts of this book to denote those who maintain that Messiah will resign the kingdom to the Father at the end of the thousand years.
the Nicene Creed says that Christ's kingdom shall have no end; the millenarian says that it shall have an end when the thousand years shall have expired. The millenarians, with their view, are also opposed to the Athanasian Creed respecting the day of judgment; they say that "the end" mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. 24, is the end of the thousand years: thus they make a first resurrection, and a partial judgment, to take place at the beginning of the thousand years, and a second resurrection, with the general judgment, at the end of the thousand years: but the creed says, that at his "coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account," &c.

Edward the VI.th's catechism also has often been justly cited in support of Messiah's personal reign;* but it would be incorrect to quote it in support of the millennial reign, for Edward VI.th's catechism was in force when there was an article directly against the millenarians;† and these two standards could not have been in contradiction of each other; so if we would make use of the authority of the one,

* "Scholar. In the seconde parte we require that hys kingdome come, for we see not yet all thinges in subjection to Christe: we see not the stone hewed off from the mountayne wythoute worke of man, which all to brosed and brought to naught the image whiche Daniell descrueth that the onyle rocke Christe may obtayn and posseesse the dominion of the hole world, graunted him of his Father. Antichriste is not yet slayne. For this cause do we longe for and praye, that it may at length come to passe and be fylfullyd that Christe may reign with his sainctes accordinge to God's promises, that he maye lyue and be Lorde in the worlde accordyng to the decrees of the holye Gospell: not after the traditions and lawes of men: nor pleasure of worldlye tyrantyes.

"Master. God graunte hys kyngdome may come: and that speedilye."

† "Art. 41. Heretics called Millenarii. They that go to renew the fable of the heretics called Millenarii, be repugnant to Holy Scripture, and cast themselves headlong into a Jewish dotage."
we must interpret it in accordance with the language of the other.

We are therefore called upon, in our inquiries respecting Messiah's kingdom, to consider whether it be a personal reign upon earth, in opposition to the spiritual millennarians; and also whether, according to the literal millennarians, that personal reign shall be limited to a thousand years, or whether it shall be for ever and ever.

St. Paul, when discoursing upon the resurrection, declares that men will rise in different bands, of which he mentions two, one past, the other yet future: "Christ the first fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming; then the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father."

Now I apprehend that the whole of the millennial question turns upon what kingdom this is which Messiah shall resign. Those who believe that Christ shall reign upon earth for a thousand years, understand this passage to speak of three distinct periods, dividing it in the following manner:—"Christ the first fruits, i.e. at the time of his resurrection; "afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming,"—this is the second period, between which and the former, there is, we know by experience, a space of upwards of eighteen hundred years; "then the end,"—this they understand to be a third period, which they also suppose will not be till a thousand years after the second advent, justifying their conjecture by the fact, that the "afterward" in the former clause has embraced a much longer period. Thus they defer the resignation of the kingdom here spoken of, until the end of the thousand years; and consequently conceive the ceded throne will be that of David, or that which I designate the subordinate throne.

Others agree with the millennarians in the first two divisions, but understand the surrender of the kingdom to be immediately connected with the coming, making the "then"
a note of time in the following manner:—"Afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming; then, [i.e. next cometh] "the end," implying that the next great event after the advent or the revelation of the Lord in the air, will be "the end." And they make the resignation of "the kingdom" to be at the period of the second advent. There being only that space of time between the revelation of the Lord and the resignation of the kingdom which will be occupied whilst the Lord, still in the glory of the Father, is bringing all his enemies into subjection.

My first objection to the millenarian view is, that 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, will not bear the interpretation which that system requires. In order to sustain the millenarian interpretation, all the clauses should be homogeneous; there should be an identity of grammatical construction in the sentence, which therefore should run thus: "All shall be made alive, Christ [was made alive] as the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's [shall be made alive] at his coming; then [the rest of the dead] [shall be made alive at] the end." Were this the form of the sentence, I admit there would be weight in the millenarian's argument, that "then" may denote the long interval of a thousand years which they derive from the xxth chapter of Revelation. But for this meaning there is no trace of authority in the text; on the contrary, this interpretation necessitates the introduction of new matter, quite foreign to the tenor of the apostle's discourse, which is confined to the resurrection of believers, and does not touch upon the resuscitation of the wicked;* he speaks of incorruptibility and immortality, privileges peculiar to the Lord's people; and when the mortal shall have put on immortality, by the translation of the saints, then shall be

* "But every man (each, that is, Christ, and they that are Christ's,) in his own order." 1 Cor. xv. 20. Vaughan, Church's Expectation, p. 83. Mr. Brown makes this just remark: "But each in his own order,"—that is, of course, each of the two parties just mentioned,—"Christ," and "all who in Christ shall be made alive: the first-fruits and the subsequent harvest." Page 326.
brought to pass the saying, "Death is swallowed up in victory:" the resurrection of the wicked has nothing to do with the victory over sin and death.

The assertion that "the end" will be at the expiration of the millennium, is grounded upon the assumption that 1 Cor. xv. 24 synchronises with the latter part of the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse; for neither from the epistle to the Corinthians, nor from any other passage in Scripture, except this in the Revelation, do we get any intimation of a certain state of things, continuing for a portion of time after Messiah's advent, which can justify such an application of the term "the end;" therefore the millennarians must go to the twentieth of the Apocalypse for the one thousand years which they assume will be the duration of Messiah's reign. But it is quite gratuitous to assume that the Corinthians could interpret St. Paul's meaning by the revelation of St. John: indeed, without entering into any dispute as to the date of the Apocalypse,* we may say, at

* The scriptural account of the Church at Ephesus appears to me quite sufficient alone to fix the later date of the Apocalypse. We have the planting of the Church in Acts xix. at no very early date. We have next, in the account of the interview at Miletus, a prophetic record of the dangers which would arise in the Church, Acts xx. 29, 30. In the epistle subsequently written, the Church appears glowing in love; but the apostle there prepares them for the conflict, Eph. vi. 10, &c. Then, in the beginning of the Apocalypse, the Church is described as having passed through the conflict, Rev. ii. 2; and, moreover, as having declined from her first love. Rev. ii. 4.

Paley conjectures (in opposition to "all Greek manuscripts, and all ancient versions," ) that this epistle was written, not to the Ephesians, but to the Laodiceans. His principal objection to its having been addressed to Ephesus is, that the epistle contains no allusions to the apostle's history, reception, and conduct, while at Ephesus. This objection does not appear to me well founded, inasmuch as that Paul, in Eph. i. 13, "in whom, also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise," &c., appears directly to allude to the history. Acts xix. 2 & 6. "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? . . . and when Paul had laid [his] hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied."
least, that the probability must be greatly in favour of the passage in Corinthians having a sense complete in itself; and certainly the burden of proof rests with those who maintain the contrary. We need not, however, remain satisfied with showing that there is but an assumption on the one side, and the probability in favour of the other; for by examination of the context we shall be able to come to a satisfactory conviction.

I have stated that the whole of the millennarian question turns upon what kingdom it is which the Messiah will resign; this is true, because if we can decide which kingdom He will resign, we shall be able to determine what "end" is meant; that is, whether it be the end of this dispensation, or the end of the thousand years; because the end of the co-ordinate reign must be at the end of this dispensation, for we have already seen that during this age Messiah is sitting and reigning co-ordinately upon the Father's throne, where He will remain until his enemies shall be under his feet. But if the subordinate kingdom is to be surrendered, then the time of its resignation may be at the end of the thousand years. Thus we shall determine whether the "then" denote a point or an interval of time, which is the real difference between the two interpretations of 1 Cor. xv. 24.

The reign to be surrendered is that during which Christ's reign to be surrendered is that enemies are not under his feet; "for He must reign until of Ps. cx. 1. He hath put all enemies under his feet." I do not hesitate to say that the apostle refers to Psalm cx., "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" for I have already shown, in the preceding chapter, that sitting at God's right hand, is sitting on the throne of God, and is equivalent to reigning. If, then, the reign to be surrendered is that which Messiah is exercising whilst his enemies are in opposition to Him, it cannot be the millennial reign, and the "end" to which the apostle refers is
therefore the end of this dispensation, when the last of
Christ's enemies shall have been put in subjection.

The object for which Christ holds the power which is to
be resigned, is in order to abolish all rule, and authority,
and power, that God's decreed subjection of all things under
the Son of man may be accomplished. "Then the end . . .
when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority and
power; for He must reign until He hath put all enemies
under his feet . . . for He hath put all things under his
feet;" which I should paraphrase thus: "for Christ must
reign, sharing the supreme dominion with the Father, until
with that supreme power and authority Christ shall have
subjected all his enemies; for He (the Father hath decre-
tively in Psalm viii.) put all things under his feet." This
corresponds with the force of the Hebrew in Psalm cx.
"Sit thou at my right hand, until I cause to place thine
enemies thy footstool." *

* Amyraud's views are in strict accordance with this translation.
1 Cor. xv. 25. "Here," says he, "a difficulty presents itself; for this
expression, 'till he shall have put,' may be equally understood as
relating either to the Father or the Son; and to follow the thread and
tenor of the proposition of St. Paul in this place, it appears that it
ought to be referred to Christ; but in the psalm whence this passage
is extracted, it is undoubtedly spoken of the Father. 'Sit thou at my
right hand until I,' &c. To resolve this question, we must distinguish,
in the office of mediator, the charge itself, which consists in the
authority to act, and the virtue or power by which the acts themselves
are exercised: and with regard to the power, it is common to the
Father and the Son, because it is a property of their essence; so that
it is indifferent whether we say that it is the Father or that it is the
Son who acts in this respect, because their operation in this, like their
power, is common. If you look to the authority, the Son acts imme-
diately on this occasion, because it is He who has within his hands
the charge of reigning. The Father acts mediately, by Him, because
it is the Father who has given Him the charge, and the commission to
execute it.

"Now, if he who does anything immediately is properly said to act,
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Now it appears clear, that the authority which is exercised in bringing all power, and even death itself, into subjection to Christ, cannot be the power of David's son as such, but must be the arm of Omnipotence; the throne, then, that is to be surrendered, is not that of David, but the coordinate reign.

The apostle, in 1 Cor. xv. 27, evidently refers to Psalm viii., for the expression, "When he saith all things are put under him," manifestly shows that he alludes to some passage of Scripture, and that passage is in the viiith Psalm. If now we turn to the inspired comment in Heb. ii., we learn that Jesus is now "crowned with glory and honour," "but now we see not yet all things put under him,"—implying that Jesus is now reigning, but that all things are not yet in subjection; and clearly Psalm viii., which speaks of all things having been brought into subjection, relates to the dominion of the Son of man in

he who does it mediately, by another, and by means of a commission which he has given to another, may be not less properly said to act, at least according to the rules of law, 'He who does anything by another, is considered as doing it by himself.'

"I believe, nevertheless, that a distinction may be drawn between the use of this expression, at the time when God establishes his Son in the office of Mediator, and its use since Christ has been actually in the exercise of his office. In this second mode it is more suitable to say, that it is Christ who puts his enemies under his feet, because it is He who effectually executes immediately that which is designed by these words. In the other, it is more proper to say, that it is the Father who promises to the Son, that he will facilitate the administration of the kingdom which He commits to Him, by putting all his enemies under his feet, as if He said to Him, "And in this thine installation into the office which I commit to thee, fear not the enemies and the obstacles which may present themselves, for I will put all thine enemies under thy feet by furnishing thee with all the power which shall be necessary to thee for obtaining a full and glorious victory."
CHAPTER VI.

the world to come; all things being in subjection is the characteristic feature of the reign of the Son of man, the bringing of all into subjection is the work of this present dispensation.

The principal characteristic of this kingdom is, that whilst the Son holds it, he is not subject, or subordinate to the Father, for he becomes subordinate upon resigning it. "When all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him." Christ, therefore, is not subject to the Father until all things are subjected unto Him, and Christ will become subject, when all things are subjected; but Christ resigns the kingdom when He shall have put down all rule, &c. it seems, therefore, to follow of necessity, that Messiah's resignation of the kingdom, and his becoming subject, are contemporaneous; indeed, that he becomes subject by the resignation of the kingdom. But we have seen that the co-ordinate reign of Christ, namely, that in which He is not subject to the Father, is during this present dispensation, when "He sits on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," or whilst He sits upon his Father's throne; hence the throne to be resigned must be that of God the Father; and "the end" must be the end of this dispensation.

The reason why the kingdom is to be resigned, "that God may be all in all," manifestly shows the nature of the reign.

The expression, "that God may be all in all," implies that God will then exercise all rule, and authority, and power. This will be upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when God takes to himself his great power and reigns. In order to this, it would be necessary for Christ to surrender the co-ordinate throne, and it would not be necessary for Him to surrender the subordinate throne; for it is clear, that when God's anointed king sits upon the throne of
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David—upon the throne of a creature—upon that throne which He will share with all who overcome—He will not interfere with God being “all in all.” Creature rule cannot interfere with divine authority, unless the creature be in a state of rebellion; but that cannot be said of Christ.

Whilst there is sin in the world, whilst there are enemies in opposition to Christ, God cannot be “all in all.” At present there is rebellion against God’s authority, therefore all things are upheld by the word of Christ’s power, and therefore Christ is said to be “all in all;” for whilst there is sin in the world, the world must be in the hands of a mediator, otherwise essential holiness would blaze forth in its necessary opposition to moral evil; hence absolute Deity will not become the head of sustentation or of rule, until the creature is brought into a state of absolute holiness, or at least is restrained from any overt acts of sin. The kingdom, therefore, will be resigned by the Mediator, at the end of this dispensation.

We have, moreover, an exact note of time to guide us. Christ sits at God’s right hand until his enemies are made his footstool; but when all shall have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son himself be subject: but how will He become subject, but by resigning that throne on which He is not subject? He therefore sits at God’s right hand until he resigns the kingdom; “the end,” therefore, to which the apostle refers, must be when Christ leaves the right hand of God.

Christ is to reign until He hath put all enemies under his feet, but He is to sit at God’s right hand until his enemies are made his footstool; therefore the subjection of his enemies equally marks the termination of his reign and

* We must distinguish between the subjection of Christ’s enemies and the execution of the judicial sentence upon them. In that victory which I believe was typical, it was after the captains of Israel had put
session at God's right hand; "the end," therefore, when He surrenders the kingdom, must be the end of this dispensation, when He leaves the right hand of the Father.

Another note of time is, that death is the last enemy which shall be subjected before resigning the kingdom. The subjection of death, inasmuch as it is an enemy of Christ, will be immediately upon, or I should rather say by, the mutation of the living saints; death will be swallowed up in victory, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, when the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and when "we" (i.e. the living saints) "shall be changed;" for this same corruptible (i.e. the dead saints) must put on incorruptibility, and this same mortal (i.e. the living saints) must put on immortality; but when this corruptible shall have put on incorruptibility, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory." The "when" and the "then" are clearly marks of time. But we also learn that when death shall be swallowed up in victory, that then shall Messiah resign the kingdom; for He must reign until He shall have put all His enemies under His feet, the last enemy that shall be abolished is death; so Christ will surrender the kingdom at the moment of the resurrection of the dead saints, and mutation of the living ones. If, therefore, "the end," when He surrenders the kingdom, be not till the end of the thousand years, the resurrection of the dead saints, and mutation of the living ones, will not be until the end of the thousand years. This view, therefore,

their feet upon the necks of the kings, that Joshua smote them and slew them. (Jos. x. 24—26.) And in that psalm of praise which twice in the New Testament is applied to our Lord, a distinction is made between the subjection and the destruction of His enemies. (9 Sam. xxii. 41.) It must also be borne in mind, that leaving the right hand of God is not necessarily the same as leaving the heavens. (See Chapter xvi.)
is utterly destructive of the hopes of those who look for the resurrection of the saints at the beginning of the thousand years; it is equally destructive of the expectations of Christ's personal reign upon earth for a thousand years.

Shortly then to recapitulate. "The end" is when Christ shall resign the kingdom; that kingdom in which He is co-ordinate; exercising his divine power to subjugate all his enemies; the close of which will be coincident with the resurrection of the dead saints; and which He surrenders in order that God the Father may be "all in all."
CHAPTER VII.

THE FATHER'S ASSUMPTION OF POWER.

"Almighty and everlasting God . . . we beseech thee . . . that finally [we] may come to the land of everlasting life, there to reign with thee world without end."—Baptismal Service.

The examination of 1 Cor. xv. has led to the conclusion that Messiah will resign the co-ordinate throne to the Father, and leave the right hand of God, at the conclusion of this dispensation, at which time the dead saints will be raised, and the living changed. I shall confirm this view by showing from other passages that at the period of the second advent, and not at the close of the millennium, the Father will take to himself his great power and reign.

In that prayer which our Lord taught his followers, and which we so often have on our lips, we express the desire to our Father that his kingdom may come; it would be strange were we commanded to pray for that which cannot come to pass until a thousand years after this dispensation has ceased, as those who maintain that Christ will surrender the kingdom to the Father at the end of the thousand years must suppose. Surely we are not to be expecting one thing, and praying for another; Christ's kingdom is that for which we are to look, God's kingdom is that for which we are to pray. Are we not, therefore, to expect the manifestation of God's kingdom upon the appearance of Messiah? What makes it more striking is, that all look for
the following clause in the Lord's Prayer to be fulfilled when Messiah shall return. But if we expect the fulfilment of the clause, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," upon the return of our Lord, surely we are equally bound to expect the fulfilment of the preceding clause, at the same time, and not a thousand years after. The glorified spirits in heaven are looking forward to their reign upon earth; are we taught to overlook that which they desire, and to pray for that which cannot come to pass until another dispensation of a thousand years have transpired? No: when the glorified spirits shall reign with Christ upon earth, then will God's kingdom be come, as a comparison of passages will show.

By comparing Matt. xvi. 28 with Mark ix. 1, and Luke ix. 27, we learn that "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," is the same as "the kingdom of God" coming with power.

Our Lord, when instituting the supper, says to his disciples, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom;" the expression is varied by St. Luke to "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come. But St. Paul, referring to the ordinance, and marking the period of limitation for its observance, says, "Ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." It is therefore evident that when the Lord Jesus shall come, that then the kingdom of God the Father shall come.

From the comparison of these texts we see that the kingdom of God, is the kingdom of Christ's Father; from other passages we also learn that the establishing of the kingdom of God, that is, of God the Father, will be at the return of Messiah.

We are told in Luke xix. 11, that the Lord spake a parable, because the people "thought that the kingdom of
God would immediately appear;” they were expecting the kingdom of Messiah, and they did not look for some kingdom which will not be established until a thousand years after the return of Messiah. And certainly the tenor of our Lord’s parable would lead us to infer that when He shall return, having received the kingdom, that then the kingdom


When the Pharisees demanded when the kingdom of God should come, they expected the kingdom of Messiah, that kingdom which the God of heaven will set up; but our Lord implies, in what He says to his disciples, that it is the same as “the days of the Son of man.”

Luke xvi. 29—31. So when the Son of man shall come “with power and great glory,” then “the kingdom of God” shall come.

2 Thess. 1. 5 & 7. By comparing the fifth and seventh verses of 2 Thess. i., we gather that the entrance into the kingdom of God will be at the revelation of Jesus Christ. The Thessalonians were counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which they also suffered, and they are to be recompensed when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed; the recompense is the rest which they will enjoy in the kingdom of God, and into this they will enter when the Lord Jesus shall return.

Matt. xiii 41—43. Our Lord promises that at the end of this age, when the Son of man shall send forth his angels to gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, that “then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.”

Rev xii. 10. So, upon the casting out of Satan, it is said, “Now is come the kingdom of our God and the power of his Christ.” Now all these passages are in accordance with the fact, that “the kingdom of Christ and of God” are not in succession, one established a thousand years after the other, but that when the Christ, or Anointed, reigns in his own, that is, on the subordinate throne, that then the kingdom of God the Father is come.

Eph. v. 5. Conclusion.

If now the Father takes to himself his great power, and
commences to reign, at the same time that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of the Messiah, it is clear that Messiah will not have that great power to surrender at the end of the thousand years. It is also clear that if the Father takes that great power at the commencement of the thousand years, He had not taken it before that time, but to whom else could it have been entrusted until that time but to the Messiah? "The end" therefore to which the apostle must refer, is the end of this dispensation.

We are now necessarily brought to the consideration of the subordinate reign.
CHAPTER VIII

THE SUBORDINATE REIGN.

"And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end."

We saw from Rev. iii. 21, that there were two thrones on which Messiah would sit; the one co-ordinate with the Father, which we have already considered, the other subordinate, because He will share it with his fellow-men. We also saw that Christ's subordinate reign was to be subsequent to his session at the right-hand of God. I shall now endeavour to prove that Messiah will assume a kingdom, immediately upon his second advent; and, in the next place, to shew that this will be the subordinate reign; I shall then inquire into the place, the nature, and the duration of this kingdom.

The first passage which I shall notice is 2 Tim. iv. 1: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." That this appearing will be a personal, bodily appearing, I believe all allow, because it is the coming of Christ to judgment; but then his kingdom follows upon his appearing, and the judgment is carried on whilst Christ is in his kingdom.

The next passage which I shall mention is Heb. i. 6—9, in which place the apostle quotes a verse from Ps. civ. 4; but turning to the Psalm, we find that the verse cited by St. Paul is not spoken by God either of the angels, as our
version of the epistle to the Hebrews affirms, or unto the angels, as the marginal reading would indicate; I therefore understand the apostle to introduce the citation parenthetically, in acknowledgment of the dignity and duty of angels: "And unto the angels He speaks [even He] who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire." The other verses will then be understood in this manner:

"But when He shall bring again* the first-begotten into the habitable earth, he saith,

\begin{align*}
\text{"And let all the angels of God worship Him;"} \\
\text{"But unto the Son"—} \\
\text{"Thy throne O God [is] for ever and ever."}
\end{align*}

Thus there is an opposition between what is at the same time said unto the angels and unto the Son; thereby shewing that when He shall come again into the world, He will come to his throne; for the passage must be read with this connexion, "When He brings again the first-begotten into the habitable earth, he saith, 'Thy throne O God is for ever and ever.'"

Our Lord marks precisely the period when He shall sit upon his own throne, saying, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of his glory." This, I believe, all men acknowledge to be a literal personal advent: those who deny the personal reign, say that it denotes the day of judgment; and the personal millenarians generally, I be-

\* The marginal rendering of Heb. i. 6 is to be preferred, because Psalm xcvi. from which the quotation is taken, refers, not to the first advent, but to when Jesus shall come "again into the world." And that "again" cannot be understood in the sense of another quotation is evident, because the verse quoted is intended to prove a different clause from the preceding citations; those in verse 5 establish the "excellent name" of Son, but this in verse 6 proves the superiority to angels; it is not, therefore, a second quotation, but the first, which is advanced to prove that point.
lieve, suppose that it refers to the judgment of the quick at the appearing of Jesus Christ. According to either view, therefore, it must be admitted that at that period of his coming He will sit upon the throne of his glory; for, as I before observed, "when" and "then," standing in relation to each other in this manner, are tantamount to saying, that at that time, and not until that time, will the Son of man sit upon this throne. It will be "the throne of the glory of the Son of man," a glorious throne suitable to the glory of the Son of man.

As our Lord, when upon earth, without any explanation assumes this title, "Son of man," as his general designation, we may take it for granted that He supposed its meaning ought to have been known; and if so, from whence could it have been learned but from the Old Testament? Indeed, upon one occasion, Messiah directly establishes what belongs to his office as Son of man, from the use of that title in the prophets. "And [the Father] hath given Him (the Son of God, ver. 18) authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man." The Lord affirms, that because He is Son of man, that therefore He has the authority to execute judgment; but we find this authority given to the Son of man only in Dan. vii. 9, 13, 14, to which, therefore, I conceive our Lord must refer.

This prophecy of Daniel is one of exceeding importance and considerable difficulty, but the only points which bear directly upon our immediate inquiry are the succession and subordination of the kingdom here mentioned. "I beheld until the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit;" the time appears to be when Christ "shall have put down all rule and all authority and power," and therefore, "When He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." Now, as in the vision the beasts symbolize not individual kings, but kingdoms which shall arise out of the earth, so, by congruity of interpretation, I
am led to suppose that the session of "the Ancient of days" is not intended to symbolize God, but the reign of God "all in all;" to which, however, will belong some visible and manifested glory upon this earth. Ver. 13: "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days and they brought Him near before Him, and there was given Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom," &c. This verse I likewise understand to symbolise the establishment of Messiah's throne; having resigned the co-ordinate reign, He receives for himself a kingdom,* which proves the succession: the subordination is clearly marked by verse 27, **Dan. vii. 27.** for it is that which is shared with the people of God.

Psalm viii. celebrates the subjection of all things to the Son of man. The intimate relation of this passage to the 1st chapter of Genesis is evident. And I think we learn from St. Paul's comment, in Heb. ii., that David applies to the second Adam as the antitype, that which in Genesis is spoken with relation to the first Adam, as the type of Messiah. I will, therefore, first turn to Genesis in order to show in what manner Adam is spoken of as the type of Christ.

"God said, Let us make Adam in our image . . . so Gen. 1. 26. God created Adam in his image: in the image of God created He him." It appears from the passage that God addressed some one respecting the creation of Adam. If it be asked, "With whom took He counsel?" I answer, that **Isa. xi. 14.** He who proposed the creation of Adam was God the Father: but that He who actually created Adam was Christ.

That the purpose and source of all is to be attributed to the Father, is generally admitted: it is the first article of

* This interpretation appears to me to account satisfactorily for the kingdom being said to belong to the Son of man, (**Dan. vii. 14.**) but in the explanation, (verse 22,) to be possessed by the saints.
our creed, that God the Father was maker of heaven and earth: this, however, does not exclude the Son, but, on the contrary, in the order of working, the actual formation is by the Son, while the purpose is attributed to God the Father. This may be rested upon one text: "To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him."

I said, in the second place, that He who actually created Adam was Christ; this must be included in the assertion made by Paul to the Ephesians, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ;" that is, the God-man in his office-character—or "assumed relation," as Mr. Vaughan termed it—created all things. So, in Gen. ii. 2, where the completion of creation by God is recorded: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had made," President Edwards observes, that the word translated "work" most properly signifies a work done in the execution of some function, to which the workman is appointed as the messenger of another. So "wisdom," in Proverbs viii., which is generally attributed to Jesus Christ, says, "I was set up," or "I was anointed from everlasting;" and the following verses declare that the office to which He was anointed was creation. "When He appointed the foundations of the earth, then," says Wisdom, "I was by Him [as] one brought up with Him." So it is translated in the authorised version; but the learned Francis Taylor renders it, "Then was I by Him as an artificer with Him."

It would follow, from what has been advanced, that Adam was created in the image of Christ the God-man; for God who created him, created him in his [own] image. And we have seen that He who did create was the Christ. This, however, must not be understood to the exclusion of God the Father, for He said, "Let us make Adam in our image;" both, therefore, seem to be embraced in the scripture ac-
count, for it says, “So God created Adam in his image,” and then it adds, “in the image of God created He him.” Gen. I. 27.

And perhaps in the proposition of God, the same is implied, for He not only says, “Let us make man in our image,” but He adds, “after our likeness.”* But as Christ himself is “the image of God,” so Adam being created immediately in Christ’s own image, was created ultimately in the image of God. Hence man is called the image of God, and Adam is also expressly styled “the type of the coming One.” Rom. v. 14.

Adam was the type of Christ; in the constitution of his person; in his relation to Eve; and in his having dominion; which last appears principally intended in Genesis, and is exclusively noticed in the viiith Psalm, and is the subject to which my inquiry is at present confined.

“God said, Let us make man in our image . . . and let him have dominion: so God created man in his image.” In the blessing, therefore, He conferred the dominion; and Boothroyd does not hesitate to make the connexion much more intimate; for he renders it, “Let us make man . . . according to our own likeness, that they may have dominion.” And Tillock translates it, “Then OMNIPOTENCE†

* “The similitude of the Lord” is apparently a personal title of the Lord Jesus in the Old Testament, (Numb. xii. 8,) and answerable to a similar denomination of Christ in the New Testament—“The image of God.”

† El certainly denotes power, and seems, when used as a title of God, intended to convey that idea. The plural, then, Elohim, would denote powers; and when applied to Deity, may indicate all power, or Omnipotence. Thus rulers, I conceive, are called Elohim in the Old Testament, as representatives of Him, who shall govern all nations; and to this title, probably, St. Paul alludes, when he says, “The powers that be, are ordained of God;” so he argues, in another place, that a man “ought not to cover his head;” that is to have the sign of subjection to the power of another, as is the case with the woman, “Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God;” that is, he is the image of
said, We will make man in our image . . . and they shall have dominion . . . thus Omnipotence created man . . . in the image of Omnipotence created He him."

Adam, then, was a type of Christ in his power and dominion. Now that which is typified must previously exist, at least in idea; one thing cannot be made in the form, or mould, or representation of another, without the idea of the other existing in the mind of him who forms the type. But with respect to the Lord Jesus there was much more than the idea; He actually existed as the Word, and actually put forth his power as the Christ, in creation; but with respect to the constitution of his person as the God-man, his humanity having no more than a decretive subsistence, we can only consider Him in these respects as virtually set up, or in the predestinative assumption of humanity.

But in the order of the divine decrees, which have the relation of end and means among themselves, the purpose of the end precedes the purpose of the means; this is implied in Ephes. i. 11, where the apostle affirms that God works "after the counsel of his own will," in order to the accomplishment of his predestinative purpose. It would not, therefore, be the intermediate state of humiliation—for that would come under the decree of the means—but the ultimate state of glory to which the God-man was predestined, that would, according to our conceptions, be first in intention, in the Divine mind. Glorified humanity in the person of Jesus would therefore be the antitype, in the image of whom Adam was created as the type.

It is at this very point of view, so to speak, that I apprehend the psalmist is placed. He sees the Glory-man God in bearing rule. Hengstenberg will not allow that Elohim in the Old Testament ever means angels. I do not see why it should not, as well as "Powers" in the New Testament.
brought out the head of creation, and from that point he takes a retrospect of that suffering humanity, into the condition of which the Son of God descended, and from which He raised himself and will raise all united to Him.

The psalmist bursts out into an exclamation, "O Jehovah our Lord how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens." This must refer to that time when God's name, in itself essentially excellent, will be known and appreciated throughout all the earth, and when, to all appearance, there will be a higher manifestation of glory upon this planet than even in the heavens themselves. And when, instead of children as soon as they are born going astray and speaking lies, babes and sucklings will praise that strength which will have caused to cease the enemy and avenger.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; Psalm viii. 3.

the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, what is man (Enosh suffering man) that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man (Adam) that thou visitest him?" Some say that these meditations arose in the psalmist's mind at the feast of tabernacles, when dwelling in a booth which, according to the Jewish custom, was purposely so constructed that the stars should be seen. The feast of tabernacles would also be a suitable occasion, for it typified that rejoicing of universal nature which shall take place when God becomes "all in all." Be that, however, as it may, the tenor of this verse indicates a nocturnal scene, when the many distant worlds which are brought to our view, more strongly mark the comparative insignificance of this earth and its inhabitants.

These circumstances might occasion the psalm; but if, as I suppose, the royal prophet was in visionial anticipation, himself in the kingdom of Messiah, and from thence taking a retrospect, we must realize in our mind that time when there will probably be a similar result, but from opposite
causes; when there will be no night, and yet no need of
the sun; when other worlds will not reflect the light of the
sun; but the light emanating from the New Jerusalem.

I understand "man," in the 4th verse, to denote man
universally, in his lost and ruined estate. The "Son of
man" I understand to be human nature individuated in the
person of Christ Jesus, though not exclusively confined to
Him, but in the same manner as Adam, his type was an
individual, but also a federal head. Thus the dominion of
the Son of man, in Ps. viii., will be extended to his fellows,
as the dominion of the Son of man, in Dan. vii. 13, is shared
by the people of the saints of the Most High, verse 27.

"Thou hast minished Him for a little in comparison with
angels:" this necessarily implies a depression from a pre-
vious state of exaltation; the minishing was the actual in-
carnation in the likeness of sinful flesh; but from what was
He depressed? The depression could not be of the Deity
—that admits of no limitation, nor would that be a lessen-
ing of the Son of man. How, then, could there be a lower-
ing of the human nature before it had any real existence,
unless from that predestinative assumption of glorified man-
hood of which I have been speaking?

"For thou hast made Him for a little while lower than
the angels, and hast crowned Him with glory and honour." The
"a little while" was the whole period of "the days of his
flesh." The following clause denotes the co-ordinate reign
at God's right-hand, for we now by faith "behold Jesus"
... "crowned with glory and honour."

"Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of
thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet;" this is
the reign of "the Son of man," which will extend over all
that was lost in the first Adam: "All sheep and oxen, yea,
and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish
of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the
sea." This we may see for ourselves is still unfulfilled, and
the apostle confirms it: "But now we see not yet all things subjected unto Him."

That this is the subordinate reign we learn from 1 Cor. xv. 27, for the apostle quotes this viiith Psalm in proof that all things are decretively subjected to Christ; and then he adds, (ver. 28,) "And when all shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him," &c. So that He receives this dominion upon his becoming subordinate.

Thus I hope I have succeeded in showing that Messiah will sit at God's right-hand until He gives up "the kingdom," and that upon his resignation of the subordinate reign, He will sit upon a throne which is proper to Him as Son of man.

Before entering upon my next inquiry, which is respecting the nature of Messiah's kingdom, I will glance at the iind Psalm, showing how all the points I have hitherto urged are there introduced.

It is a matter of great moment, as I have already intimated on the viiith Psalm, to observe the point of time at which the prophet is supposed to be placed. In Psalm viii. the seer was supposed to have anticipated the day of glory; in this Psalm the point of time is during this dispensation, and after the ascension; the events of that time are in the present tense: "Why do the heathen?" &c., events before that time, though occurring long after the Psalm was enunciated, would be in the past: "The Lord hath said unto me," at the time of the resurrection, "Thou art my Son," &c. The events future to the session at God's right-hand are of course spoken of in the future: "I will give thee the heathen," &c.

The first three verses show the opposition to Jehovah and his Christ by both Jew and Gentile, rulers and people, during the whole of this dispensation; commencing with Herod and Pontius Pilate, and continuing until the second
advent. The first two verses are in the words of the psalmist, in the third verse he records the language of the Gentiles and the people. These verses denote the character of this present dispensation.

The fourth verse indicates Christ's present situation: "He sitting in the heavens shall laugh, Adonai shall have them in derision." This verse corresponds with Psalm cx.: "Jehovah said to Adonai, Sit thou at my right-hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" and establishes the co-ordinate reign during this dispensation, "whilest the Gentiles are raging," &c.

"Then shall He speak to them in his wrath and vex them in his sore displeasure," [saying,] "Yet am I anointed King upon my holy hill of Zion." This 5th verse marks the close of this dispensation, when Christ will cease to sit in the heavens; and when He will commence to reign in Mount Zion; the "then" of this verse is in opposition to the "now" of verse 10; "now" marking the present period of God's forbearance and long-suffering, "then" denoting the time when his wrath will be come. This verse, therefore, implies the Church's expectation.

As in the 3rd verse the psalmist records the words of the Gentiles, so in the 6th verse he relates the words which will be spoken at the time of the second advent; either by Jehovah, if we follow the Hebrew, or by Messiah, if we follow the Septuagint, which latter I prefer, because the wrath of the speaker in the 5th verse appears the same wrath as that of the Son, mentioned in the 12th verse. These, then, are the words of Messiah at the period of the second advent: "Yet (notwithstanding this opposition of Jew and Gentile) am I anointed King upon my holy hill of Zion." But whether we suppose the words to be those of the Father or of Christ, they indicate his assumption of the subordinate throne, at the time when the Gentiles shall be visited with his sore displeasure: namely, at the close of this dispensation.
THE SUBORDINATE REIGN.

In the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses Messiah himself in his own person, is introduced as the speaker, declaring the Father's decree concerning Him: "I will declare the decree Jehovah said unto me," (when He raised Him from the dead, Acts xiii. 33,) "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," &c.

The decreed subjection of the heathen, mentioned in the Rev. ii. 27. 8th and 9th verses, will be fulfilled at the second advent, as Christ has promised to those who shall overcome, in Rev. ii. 27.

In the remainder of the Psalm, David speaks in his own person, urging kings and rulers to wisdom, before it be too late: "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth," &c.; the "now," verse 10, of the day of grace, being opposed to the "then," verse 5, of the day of wrath.
CHAPTER IX.

THE NATURE OF MESSIAH'S KINGDOM.

"And He shall come again with glory . . . whose kingdom shall have no end."

In this chapter I purpose examining the account of the transfiguration, and the circumstances which led to it, at some length, hoping to show that the express object of that vision was to correct the views of the disciples, with regard to the nature of Messiah's kingdom; and if we believe that our Lord succeeded, it will follow that thenceforth the apostles understood the nature of the kingdom, though they still remained in ignorance as to the time of its appearance.

Towards understanding the connexion of this most important passage, it appears necessary to bear in mind three prominent features:

1. The confession that Jesus is the Anointed.
2. The promise of Messiah concerning Hades.
3. The opposite principles displayed in Peter's conduct.

The first is the remote cause of the transfiguration.

The second is the occasion of Peter's misunderstanding respecting Christ's death.

The third elicits the declaration of its being necessary that a (spiritual) man should renounce his (carnal) self.

The mission of the twelve, with authority over all devils, &c., seems to have raised a general belief that Jesus was connected with Messiah's kingdom; for all supposed Him...
to be one raised from the dead, though none conjectured that the lowly Nazarene could himself be "the King of glory."

The different ideas of the people were probably in consequence of their various traditions. They might have supposed Him to be John the Baptist, in consequence of their notion that martyrs were to rise first. "The King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life." Or perhaps this notion might have arisen solely with the conscience-stricken Herod.

Some might have supposed Him Elias, from the prophecy, Mal. iv. 5.

Others might have considered Him to be Jeremiah, because the Jews thought that He was that "prophet" mentioned in Deut. xviii. 15, whom the Lord would raise up, (i.e. from the dead); or "one of the old prophets;" "That is," says Gill, "one of the former prophets." The Jews (probably from Zec. vii. 7) distinguished the prophets into former and latter. In the Talmud it is asked, "Who are the former prophets?" Says R. Huna, They are David, Samuel, Solomon, &c."

Our Lord next asks, what opinion his own disciples had formed. To us it may seem strange that such an inquiry should have been necessary; but Jesus, before this, appears to have declared to but one, "and she was a Samaritan," John iv. 25, 26. that He was the Christ. Simeon learned it by special revelation; the devils who knew it were rebuked for declaring it; even the Baptist, when assured from heaven that Jesus was the Lamb of God, yet could not see that He was "the coming One." The apostles at first thought He was the Christ; yet it might not be altogether unnecessary to see whether "hope deferred" had clouded their faith upon this point.

We come now to Peter's declaration—"Thou art the Anointed, the Son of the living God:" a short confession.
but containing a summary of our faith, in the nature of God, and in the person and office of Jesus. How much Peter intended at that time to convey by these words may be doubtful.

The Anointed.

It is commonly supposed that anointing was necessary for initiation into either the prophetical, priestly, or kingly office, and that therefore the designation "Christ" applied to one of these offices as much as to another; yet for the prophetical office, it was not ordinarily the custom of the Jews to anoint. The gift of the Spirit necessary to fit for the prophetical office, was the real anointing, of which theunction was but the type—hence we find that "The prophet" is expressly distinguished from "The Christ;" nor by Peter's subsequent language does he appear to have been contemplating the priestly office; the kingly office was that which was uppermost in his mind, and was, I apprehend, the idea universally attached to "the Christ."* by the Jews. When the magi inquired for the "King of the Jews," Herod immediately demanded "where the Christ should be born?" And the Jews replied by showing whence the Ruler in Israel should come forth; so that King, Christ, and Ruler were used as synonymes. Thus Peter, when speaking of the kingly office, says, God promised David to raise up the Christ to sit upon his throne; but speaking of the prophet, he does not say "the Christ," but "Jesus." That this was Peter's meaning in his confession appears from its being allusive to the second Psalm. "Yet have I anointed my King upon the holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: Jehovah hath said unto me, Thou art my Son."

* The more full expression, "The Lord's anointed," 2 Sam. i. 14, does imply the kingly office; yet suffering our minds to be in subjection to expressions rather than to ideas, the same notion is not conveyed by "the Lord's Christ," which is exactly the same term, or "the Christ," which is virtually the same, for the Lord as the Anointer, is necessarily understood.
In the confession, "Thou art the Anointed," corresponds with "Yet have I anointed my King," as "the Son" refers to "Thou art my Son;" and the title, "living God," answers to its being the declaration of "Jehovah," the self-existent. Upon this:

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed [it] unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

By saying that flesh and blood had not revealed it, our Lord, I apprehend, implied that there was nothing in his outward appearance to denote that He was God's King. It is very similar to the answer which He made to the inquiry of John. Having recapitulated the miracles which He had wrought, as manifest signs of his being "the coming One," he adds, "And blessed is he whosoever shall not be scandalised at me." Being "without form or comeliness," He was despised and rejected of men.

"And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

That Christ personal, whom Peter confessed, is the essential foundation, as also that Peter's confession is the doctrinal foundation of the Church, is undoubted: yet in this passage the Rock seems to denote the ministerial foundation which Christ the Master-builder would use. What follows appears explanatory, the Church should not enter Hades, but should enter the kingdom of heaven. And Peter did in fact use the keys, being the first to open the door both to the Jews and to the Gentiles; in the latter instance it was very marked. The angel saying to Cornelius: "Call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter, he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do."

The gates of Hades, which Messiah promises shall not prevail against his Church, according to Grotius, "is not used to express the power of schism, sin, or Satan, but the
state of the dead, the place or receptacle of the dead, into which souls departed enter."

Jesus, however, having said that the gates of Hades should not prevail against his Church, Peter apparently understood that death would not prevail; and little did he imagine that the Christ, whom they had heard out of their law should abide for ever, would prevail over Hades by his separate soul going down to those regions: nor was that which follows likely to alter his views.

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

The former clause having declared that believers should not go into Hades, this mentions that they shall be admitted into the kingdom of heaven, or of the heavens, through the instrumentality of Peter as steward in the household.

"The kingdom of the heavens" is the same as "the kingdom of God," "the heavens" being an expression for the Deity; as "they set their mouths against the heavens," and "the Heavens do rule," which is explained by our Lord when He says, "He that shall swear by the heavens sweareth by the throne of God, and Him that sitteth thereon."

The expression, "kingdom of the heavens," originated probably with the declaration that "the God of heaven" would "set up a kingdom." This kingdom was to have two forms; the first, as seen in the vision, was that of a stone, then subsequently as a mountain, filling the whole earth; which latter will be when the stone shall have destroyed all rule, and all authority, and all power. The distinction between these two forms is observable in this discourse, as also in other parts of the New Testament. The process of severing the stone from the mountain is carrying on, I conceive, during the whole of the present dispensation, and is answerable to that which is commonly called the kingdom.
of grace, while the kingdom of the mountain corresponds with the reign of glory. Peter probably, at this time knew nothing of the former, and had very dark views of the latter.

"And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," or on the land, &c.

To bind or to loose, in the common language of the Jews, signifies to prohibit or permit, and Lightfoot remarks on this passage.

1. That it is spoken of things, not of persons.
2. That it is used in doctrine and in judgments concerning things allowed or not allowed in the law.
3. That "to bind" is the same with "to forbid," or declare forbidden.
4. And, lastly, that it here applies to the use or rejection of Mosaic rites and judgments.*

"Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was [Jesus] the Christ."

It is commonly fancied that our Lord, during the days of his flesh, while he was "a minister of the circumcision," wished to lead the Jews into the belief of his being the Christ. I think He rather sought to bring their minds to such a state as that after his resurrection they might believe Him to be the Messiah; for it was in the resurrection state that He was to fulfill all his offices; the Christ was to be raised up to sit on David's throne, &c.: had the Jews been led to discern Jesus as the Messiah, without comprehending the necessity of his death and resurrection, it would only, in the first instance, have confirmed their carnal notions of his kingdom; and, in the next place, the event of his death would have blasted their hopes and made it more difficult for them to believe the testimony of the apostles as to the

* In Acts xv. we have an example of apostolic binding and loosing; the authority, however, was not confined to Peter, on the contrary, the apostolic decision was expressed by James.
fact of his resurrection. This seems to account for the Lord taking this particular occasion of announcing his death to his disciples.

"From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day."

Our Lord having now plainly intimated to his disciples that his death was in accordance with the revealed purpose of God, their silence with regard to his Messiahship was strictly enjoined, lest, had the princes of this world known, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory: yet, though the people were not to know, chosen witnesses were to testify that He was the "man approved of God," who should suffer, and then be raised from the dead.

"And He spake that saying openly."

So our translation has it, implying an opposition between keeping secret the fact that He was the Messiah, and publicly declaring that He, a son of man, should suffer death, at the same time not giving any but the apostles to understand that He, "the Son of man," was also the Messiah. But whether the people heard this is doubtful, for it is subsequently said, that He "called the people unto Him with his disciples." Hence Campbell's translation carries the sense otherwise, and connects it with Peter's rebuke: "This he spake so plainly, that Peter, taking him aside, reproved him:" which rendering appears supported by the fact that this was the first plain intimation of his death. Following, then, the rendering of Campbell, we may infer that the apostles had some surmises of his sufferings from the hints which our Lord had given; but that now He spake so plainly that Peter could not help observing the tendency of the expression.

"Saying, Be propitious to thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee."
This, I think, is properly rendered by Gill "be propitious,"* there being, if I mistake not, a relation between this remark of Peter and our Lord’s observation respecting the ransom for the soul: "If God be propitious to me, where will you find the ransom for your soul? If God be propitious to me, how is the promise respecting Hades to be accomplished?"

Many may perhaps be surprised at Peter’s conduct; but we should bear in mind:

That Peter had just confessed Jesus to be the Messiah, for which our Lord had highly commended him. Now it clearly appeared from the law that Christ should abide for ever, and that of his kingdom there should be no end.

Again, the Lord had just promised that the gates of Hades should not prevail against his Church; this apparently was understood by Peter to imply that the followers of Messiah should not be subject to the separation of the soul from the body, instead of its referring to the place to which the separate spirits should go.

If, in connexion with these considerations, we bear in mind how very near presumptuous confidence is to a bold confession of faith; and, again, that this wily suggestion of Satan was veiled with the appearance of strong affection: considering all these, we cannot be surprised that Peter, presuming upon the knowledge which he had displayed, should now, without "knowing the mind of Jehovah," attempt to be his counsellor.

"But when He had turned about, and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan."

Peter made his suggestion privately, but the Lord rebuked him openly; either rebuking the devil directly in his instrument, or rather, as Gill suggests, "This word Satan illum."

* The word is similar to 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10; and Rom. iii. 25. See also Luke xviii. 13.
is used by the Jews to signify the vitiosity and corruption of nature," which meaning is countenanced by our Lord adding that Peter savoured of the things that be of men; and He thereby takes occasion, from the manifestation of such opposite principles in Peter, to urge the necessity of a spiritual man renouncing his carnal self.

"Thou art an offence unto me," or "my hindrance."

Peter was Christ's hindrance because he savoured not the things that be of God. Christ came to do the will of Him who sent Him; that was his delight even though it led to suffering; but by these suggestions Peter would hinder Him.

"For thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

The truth that Jesus is the Messiah, was revealed from heaven; but that ray of divine light was refracted in passing through the denser medium of Peter's fleshly mind: he saw not the glory of Messiah's kingdom through the humiliation, but brought down the nature of the kingdom to his inclinations and to present appearances. "The things that be of God,"—his glory, his will, and purposes in the sufferings of Messiah, are, to the wisdom of man, folly; hard sayings to his self-indulgence, and shame to his views of worldly glory. The carnal man "savours," or "minds," earthly things; the spiritual man should "savour," or "set his affections on," things above.

"And when He had called the people with his disciples, He said to [them] all, if any man will come after me, let him renounce himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me."

As Peter appears to have grounded his supposition that Jesus should not suffer and die, upon the fact of his being God's anointed king, the tendency of our Lord's reply must have been to correct Peter's views of the kingdom; yet at the same time the answer is so couched as not to give the
people reason to suppose that Jesus was the Messiah. If Peter wished to follow Jesus, believing him to be God's anointed king, he must not in so doing seek to gratify the old man; or if any of the people were willing to follow Jesus merely as a teacher sent from God, still the spirit in which they should follow must be the same.

I think we are here called upon not to "deny" but to "renounce" ourselves. Many understand self-denial to be using the things of this life moderately,—a truth elsewhere expressed, but I think not asserted in this passage. To "renounce" forces us to understand two principles: he, the spiritual man, must renounce himself the carnal man; and thus is introduced the double allusion to the word "soul" or "life" which follows.

The self-renunciation to which our Lord here refers may be:
Self-indulgence—"Be propitious unto thee."
Carnal wisdom—"This shall not be unto thee." As yet the cross was folly.

But chiefly self-dependence and self-righteousness, because it is mentioned by our Lord, in consequence of Peter's not seeing the necessity of Christ's death. "Renounce thyself," says Salvian, "that Christ may receive thee; thou canst not by any thy endeavours save thyself, that Christ alone can do: if thou wilt be sure of salvation, rely on Christ for it, not on thyself or any creature."

Salvian.

The second lesson which a disciple must learn, is to take up his cross daily. It is commonly said that affliction, or persecution, is the cross of Christ; it cannot, however, be affliction, for afflictions befall all men, but bearing the cross is proper and peculiar to him who will be a follower of Jesus.

Nor can persecution be intended, for if that were the cross, then must the Church be always in persecution, because taking up and bearing the cross is the disciple's daily exercise.
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We are, moreover, warranted to flee from persecutions, but "taking up" denotes an action, and not simply passive suffering. This daily crucifixion is of the self that is renounced, the old man which is corrupt, and which will remain so until sown in dishonour.

The idea conveyed by this expression, previously to the crucifixion of our Lord, must have been in accordance with what is said in scripture respecting the hanging on a tree; as also with the fact of its being the punishment of malefactors, used by those who then had the Jews in subjection.

And, to "take up" this, implies, as I have said, an act of one's own—a voluntary acknowledgment, therefore, of being under the curse, outcasts by man, and under the oppressive authority of those called benefactors. What a complete crucifixion of the natural man, the daily realization of this truth would produce! How opposed this must have been to that expectation of the dominion of the world, for which Peter, by his confession, implied that he looked. How painful to be called to follow Christ in that very thing which Peter strove to put our Lord off from suffering.

The opposition of the passage seems to fix the same sense: "taking up one's cross," is opposed to "saving one's life" or soul, or being, as I suppose, one's own saviour; and "not taking up the cross," is being ashamed of Jesus.

In the taking up of the cross there was also to be a following of Jesus. Now, in his crucifixion, there was the endurance of the curse of the law; and we should arm ourselves with the same mind. I, therefore, look at this expression as referring to the necessity of a man being brought to confess his utter inability to save himself, and to acknowledge his being exposed to the curse of the law, and, therefore, the necessity of a ransom for the soul; and, hence the need of the sufferings and death of Messiah, which, in the preceding context, Jesus had announced.
How revolting this declaration must have been to the views of Peter and the rest of the apostles! They expected an endless life, the Lord speaks of a violent death; they expected the nation to be freed from the Roman yoke, the Lord speaks of the shame and suffering of a Roman punishment; they expected the dominion of the world, the Lord calls for the renunciation even of self!

"For whosoever would save his life shall lose it, but whosoever would lose his life for my sake ["and the Gospel's," Mark viii. 35.] shall find it. For what would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or, what shall a man give for the redemption of his soul?"

"Whosoever would save his life," seems to be in opposition to a man's not "renouncing himself;" and, "whosoever would lose his life" appears answerable to "taking up his cross." I, therefore, understand it to imply, that whosoever will be his own saviour will lose his soul; but whosoever reckons himself dead indeed unto sin, and renounces the old man—which renunciation includes his having the sentence of death in himself, the crucifixion of the affections and lusts of the old man, the abandonment of all self-confidence, and the willingness to be accounted a malefactor, and to suffer death as such, for the sake of Jesus, he shall find eternal life, and salvation to his soul.

The gaining of the world, I understand to intend the dominion of the world, for which Peter, as the follower of Messiah, was looking.

I conceive that our Lord, when saying "What shall a man give for the redemption of his soul?" alludes to, and unfolds the dark saying of Psalm xlix. 7, 8, where the same word occurs in the Septuagint.

"Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed" "when he shall come in his... Luke ix. 26.
own glory,"—"when He cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."

This, I conceive, refers to being ashamed of Jesus as a ransom—ashamed of "a crucified Christ," which was to the Jews a stumbling-block. Our Lord next assigns the reason why he will be ashamed of those who have not a ransom for their souls, because, when He shall appear in his kingdom, He will come to judgment.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he recompense every man according to his work."

And whosoever has not a ransom for his soul, instead of reigning with Christ, will be condemned by Him.

Then, in order to raise the disciples' views, and to give them correct notions of the nature of his glorious and spiritual kingdom, the Lord promises—

"Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" or, "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power."

Some would refer this declaration to the destruction of Jerusalem, and suppose that the promise was fulfilled by St. John's surviving that event; but, besides the objection that this interpretation destroys all the connexion, surely there is something very forced in saying, that one individual, hearing of the destruction of Jerusalem by the heathen, could be the fulfilment of the promise, that some should see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. For some we should read one; for seeing, hearing; for the coming of the Son of man, the abolition of the Jewish economy; for the kingdom of God, the army of the unbelieving. Appearing, therefore, as contrary to the letter of the passage, as it does to the context, we may expect it to be contrary to the judgment of the best interpreters, including even the greatest opponents to the doctrine of the Messiah's kingdom.
THE NATURE OF MESSIAH'S KINGDOM.

"He comforteth them by promising to shew his kingdom, so as that they might see it with their eyes; and this He doth six days after, taking into the mountain Peter, James, and John, and there shewing them the glory of his kingdom, as much as it was possible for them in this life to see." Mayer adds, that Chrysostom’s "is the generally received interpretation, and most sound."

"That which was here promised, was fulfilled in the three disciples which were taken up into the mount, and saw his transfiguration."

"The promise that some of his apostles should see his glory, and have a taste of the glory of the elect, ere long, He performs within six days."* Ward quotes this from Aretius.

"All three of the evangelists accord in the terminus à quo, that was immediately after those words, 'There be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the Son of man come in his kingdom:' wherein, one thinks, the act comments upon the words. Peter, James, and John, were these 'some:' they tasted not of death till they saw this heavenly image of the royalty of Christ glorified."

"Christ had said that the Son of man should shortly come in his kingdom, with which promise all the three evangelists industriously connect this story; as if Christ's transfiguration were intended as a specimen and an earnest of the kingdom of Christ, and of that light and love of his which therein appears to his select and sanctified ones. Peter speaks of this as 'the power and coming of our Lord"

* There is a difference between two of the Gospels, which would be a discrepancy, did we not preserve the relation between the day of this conversation and the day of the transfiguration. Matthew says, "after six days;" Luke says, "about eight days after." This is reconciled by one account being exclusive, and the other inclusive, of both the day of the conversation and the day of the transfiguration.
Jesus," because it was an emanation of his power, and a previous notice of his coming:"

Let us proceed to consider the brilliant vision, "that by this momentary glory we may judge of the eternal." The interval of six days between the announcement and accomplishment is supposed by some to be not without a mystery: "God teacheth both by words and acts," says Hilary, "that after six ages of the world should be Christ's appearance and our transfiguration with Him." "He did worthily appear in this glory after six days, because, that after six ages from the creation the resurrection shall be, at which time He will appear in his glory."

He took with him the first three of the worthies of the son of David, who had previously beheld a display of the resurrection power, and who were afterwards to witness the agony. The sons of thunder were so taken with the scene, that they coveted the places in which they saw Moses and Elias. The effect upon Peter we must consider when examining the following context:

They went up "into a high mountain," subsequently, and probably from this occurrence, called "the holy mount," "apart by themselves," the season being night, and the place solitary, in order that no man should see the vision, as no one was to know it until after the resurrection.

"And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered," "and he was transfigured before them."

The profane poets had strange stories of the *metamorphoses* of their gods, to which some think that St. Peter alluded when he said, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables,"

"His face shone as the sun, and his raiment became white as the light, of a dazzling whiteness, glittering and like snow, of such a whiteness as no fuller on earth could imitate."

The Lord "decking himself with light, as with a garment," thus fulfilled his promise, that some should see the
kingdom of God come with power," or "the Son of man coming in his kingdom." And from this appearance of the Lord we learn what will be the condition of all the saints; for the Saviour "will change our bodies of humiliation that they may be fashioned like unto his body of glory;" Phil. iii. 21.

and, "as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" [man]; instead of an animal body of weakness and dishonour, we shall have a spiritual body of power and glory. This accords with Daniel's declaration—"They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." When the Son shall have gathered out of his kingdom all things that offend, "then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," for "they that love Jehovah Judges v. 31 shall be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might;" this is what the apostle calls "the manifestation of the sons of God."

"And behold there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory." Luke ix. 30, 31.

The Son of man did not promise that he should be seen coming to his kingdom, but "in his kingdom." He promised to shew the manner in which the Lord our God will come and all his saints with him. Now the saints will be admitted into the kingdom of glory, either by death or by sudden mutation. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." This was a mystery, a hidden truth until revealed by the apostle to the Corinthians; nevertheless I believe it was this truth which was intimated by the appearing of Moses and Elias. They were the representatives of the whole church; either of those who, having seen the land afar off, enter life through the valley of the shadow of death; or, of those, for whom the flames of the burning world will form a chariot, by which they shall "meet the Lord in the air."

1 Thess. iv. 17.
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Mark ix. 4.
Compare Luke ix. 31, and see John xiii. 1.

And they were talking with Jesus. "And spake of his departure, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem."

A strange opportunity, says Bishop Hall, "in his highest exaltation, to speak of his sufferings!" But perhaps his Exodus refers to his ascension when he entered into his glory.

Now Peter, and those that were with him, were overpowered with sleep; but when they awoke, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him; and as they [i.e. the two men] were removing from Jesus, Peter said to him, Master, it is good for us to stay here; let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias;" "for he wist not what to say, for they were sore afraid."

The evangelist seems to intimate that this proposal of Peter was not according to reason. The feast of tabernacles was probably now at hand, and Peter's proposition might refer to the tradition of the Jews, that Messiah would appear at the feast of tabernacles.* St. John says "The Word...tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory;" which corresponds remarkably with the evangelist's declaration, "They [John, and the other two] behold his glory;" perhaps, therefore, Jesus having tabernacled among us, is not to be extended to the whole time that he was in his "earthly tabernacle;" at any rate, John probably had special reference

John vii. 2, 3.

"Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand, his brethren, therefore, said unto him, Depart hence and go into Judea." Implying, that if he was the Christ, the time of his manifestation approached. Jesus replied that his time was not yet come, that is, the time for his open manifestation as the glorious Messiah had not arrived. But, as he was to fulfil the whole law, having, of necessity, to appear before the Lord at the feast, he went up, not, however, "openly, but as it were in secret."

If the feast of Tabernacles was the type of that which shall be, when the tabernacle of God is with men, it is probable that (as with Passover and Pentecost) the antitype will have its accomplishment "according to the season" of the type.

John vii. 2, 3, 10.
Deut. xvi. 16.
Rom. v. 6.
to his tabernacle of glory, or to that visional anticipation of the period when "the tabernacle of God shall be with men." In this I am confirmed by comparing John i. 14 and Exodus xxiv. 15, 16, "A cloud covered the mount, and the glory of Jehovah (a title of Christ, Isa. iii. 8; xl. 5; Exek. x. 4, with Heb. i. 3,) tabernacled upon Mount Sinai," &c. with what follows in this passage.

"While he yet spake, behold a bright cloud overshadowed them."

The bright and glorious cloud is styled by Peter "the excellent glory," from which the voice of the Father came; this symbol always betokened the presence of Jehovah. And when the true tabernacle of God shall be with men, then again "Jehovah will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all, the Glory shall be for a defence, which shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the day-time from the heat, and for a place of refuge and for a covert from storm and rain." Why should Peter think of imitating the ceremonies of the feast of tabernacles, which was but a type of the glorious defence?

"And [the disciples] feared when those men entered the cloud."

It was death to any one in mortal flesh to enter into the Divine presence; the disciples were conscious that this was "the excellent glory;" and no wonder that they felt a holy awe when they saw Moses, who had before exceedingly feared and quaked at the sight of the burning mount, now going into the very presence of "God the judge of all." What an elevating view does this give of the exalted state of Christ's co-heirs in the kingdom! "Blessed are the pure in heart, Matt. v. 8, for they shall see God." "He that sitteth upon the throne Rev. xii. 15. shall tabernacle over them."

"And behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him."
Peter had, just a week before, confessed that Jesus was the Son of God. Why, then, this testimony from the Father? By God thus declaring his approval of him, Christ received from the Father "honour and glory." Now, we must bear in mind, that the original cause of this vision was our Lord’s announcement of the sufferings which he was to endure, and the offence which Peter took at that declaration. We find a similar expression in Isaiah xiii. 21, "Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake: he will magnify the law and make it honourable." It was by Christ being "made sin for us" that the law was magnified, and it is that with which Jehovah was so well pleased; "therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life." I understand a similar connexion here; the Lord had, for the first time, distinctly declared his sufferings, and the apostles were offended; but, in this vision, which was to correct their views, God declares himself well pleased, and cautions the disciples not to cavil, but to hear.

"And when the disciples heard [it] they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them and said 'Arise, and be not afraid.'"

Their fear, I apprehend, was at hearing the voice of God; a terror which has been felt ever since the fall; much more must this have been the case when the voice implied a reproof of the hesitation with which Christ’s annunciations had been received. But the sweet declaration which they are called to hear from the lips of a mediator is, "Arise, be not afraid."

"And, as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying—'Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead.' And they kept [it] close, and told no man in those days any of those things which they had seen."

The promise concerning the Christ was, that he should be raised from the dead, to sit upon David’s throne. There
was the same promise respecting the Prophet whom they
were to hear as the founder of a new mode of worship.
This vision was granted beforehand, in order to give the
apostles correct views of the kingdom, and to fit them for
preaching it, which involved the necessity of their having
right conceptions of the Prophet whom God had promised;
and probably the words from "the excellent glory" referred
specially to this. "Him shall ye hear," says Moses; "Hear
Deut. xviii. 15. ye him," says God; that is as "raised up," or in the resur-
rection-glory. Both these points are advanced by Peter in
his first and second addresses to the Jews; for the right
Acts ii. and iii. time of urging them was after the resurrection.

I have thus gone through the whole account of the trans-
action, tracing the connexion, even at the hazard of appear-
ing prolix, because I think that the most satisfactory manner
of shewing the correctness of the interpretation is to exhibit
a consistency of view and to point out the mutual depen-
dence of the parts.

One important use which I intend to draw from the
history is, that the apostles, by means of this vision learned
the nature of the Messiah's kingdom.

Bishop Hall observes that the disciples "were at a fault
for the manner of Christ's kingdom," when they put the
question to our Lord in Acts i. 6. This has often been
repeated; but it appears to me a mere assumption, for which
there is no warrant in the text, and, I believe, was adopted
solely with the intention of getting rid of a doctrine which
would otherwise be necessarily implied. This surely is a
dangerous principle of interpretation, and is, if I mistake
not, precisely the manner in which some Socinians interpret
the noted exclamation of Thomas, in order to get rid of the
John xx. 28. doctrine of Messiah's Deity: but, of the two, I think this
interpretation of Acts is more unreasonable; for, not only is
it like the other, in defiance of our Lord's tacit approval, but
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is also of the express application which Peter subsequently made of the knowledge which he acquired at the time of the transfiguration, and which he therefore was in possession of, when the Lord was interrogated with respect to his kingdom.

The apostle, addressing those who, together with himself, had "obtained precious faith" in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ—who were, therefore, members of Christ's kingdom of grace—exhorts to the exercise of various Christian virtues; "for so," says he, "an entrance shall be ministered into you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" which kingdom, therefore, must be that of glory. He then backs his urgent exhortation by enforcing the reality of these things: "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty"—that is, of the kingly glory of Christ.

The reference to the transfiguration is evident. In the apostle's language there is a fulness, which seems to embrace the different expressions of all the evangelists. Matthew calls the transfiguration, "The Son of man coming in his kingdom;" Peter speaks of the "everlasting kingdom of our Lord;" Luke says they should "see the kingdom of God;" Peter says again, they "were eye-witnesses of his majesty." But the language of Peter's son in the faith corresponds most remarkably with that of the apostle. Mark says they should "see the kingdom of God come with power;" Peter, from being an eye-witness, was able to make "known the power and coming of the Lord;" here "majesty" and "kingdom" correspond, while "power and coming" is equivalent to "coming with power." Peter, moreover, explicitly refers to this transaction, together with an express note of time, "When there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'"
Twice were these words uttered; once "out of the heavens,"* 2 Pet. i. 17. once "out of the cloud;" once when Jesus came up "from the water," once when he was "in the mount;" Peter says he refers to that time "when they were with him in the holy mount," and when the voice came from "the excellent glory." The time then when Peter acquired knowledge respecting the nature of Messiah's kingdom, was when with Christ on the mount of transfiguration.

But, how did he get his information? Was it by the revelation of the Holy Spirit? No! he learned by being an eye-witness; and the force of the exhortation turns upon the certainty of the knowledge he had so acquired, that it was not a cunningly devised fable, because he was an eye-witness. Hence it follows, that from the time when he was an eye-witness of this majesty, he had such correct ideas respecting the power and coming of Jesus, as to be able, from his own knowledge, at that time, and by those means acquired, to impart to others the knowledge respecting "the power and coming of the Lord." And, it follows, that by reading the account of the transfiguration, we may also learn the nature of Messiah's kingdom.

* "The heaven." 2 Pet. i. 18, out of which the voice came, is not, I presume, the same as "the heavens," Matt. iii. 16, 17, but is the aerial heaven, Luke xiii. 19, Rev. xix. 17, Luke iv. 25, Acts xiv. 17.
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THE BLESSING OF ABRAHAM.

"The land of everlasting life."

Baptismal Service.

A short consideration of some of the promises of God will, I think, show that they could only be fulfilled by the incarnate Jehovah dwelling upon the earth. The points which I purpose taking up, are—

1. The promises to Abraham concerning the land.
2. The promises to David respecting his throne.
3. God’s purpose to dwell and reign upon earth.

The promises to Abraham were either concerning the seed, or to him and his seed conjointly with him. These latter, of course, presuppose the former. I propose considering the promise to Abraham and his seed, which, it will be observed, constantly relates to the inheritance of the land: “And Jehovah appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land.” This is repeated in the following chapter: “All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed, for ever;” that is, he and his seed should together enjoy it for ever.

Abraham appeared to know that the promise of permanent possession of the land was wrapped up in the promise of the seed. When he refused to accept anything from the king of Sodom, lest it should be said the Gentile monarch had enriched him who had the promises, the Lord immediately
encouraged him with, "Fear not, I am thy shield and exceeding great reward." Abram's responsive interrogation shows that he hung the promises of the land upon the promise of the seed. "Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless? behold, thou hast given me no seed," referring to the previous promise: "All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever."

The Lord, upon this occasion, confirms the same promise by a covenant; "Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." This is again reiterated, with the additional promise of being God to Abram's seed, both of which are confirmed by the covenant of circumcision, "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee . . . all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession: and I will be their God . . . thou shalt keep my covenant therefore." To this Stephen alludes, saying, "He gave him the covenant of circumcision, and so," or, "and thus Abraham begat Isaac;" that is, in this covenant of circumcision he begat Isaac, through whose line the promise to the seed was limited—that promise which "He promised, that He would give the land to Abraham and his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."

The possession of the land was therefore the great promise to Abram and his seed: hence it is called by way of eminence "the blessing of Abraham." "God Almighty . . . give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land of thy sojourning, which God gave unto Abraham." Now no one can doubt that the land which Abraham saw—the land in which the patriarchs sojourned—was the very land of Canaan; therefore the identical literal land of Canaan must have been the inheritance promised to Abraham.
But it may be objected that the promise was fulfilled in the possession of the land by the Israelites under Joshua, because the possession of the promise was undoubtedly proposed to those who came out of Egypt by the hand of Moses; and it is equally clear that the next generation did enter into the very Canaan of which the generation of the wilderness fell short. The wording of the promise moreover shews that Abraham was to enjoy it only during his lifetime, and that then his seed were to enjoy it after him.

I admit that the inheritance of the promised land was a contingency proposed to the faith of those who heard the report of the spies, and that in consequence of unbelief they did not enter therein. Still I maintain that the entrance into the land of Canaan by the next generation was not the inheritance of the promises; on the contrary, they are still to be enjoyed by Abraham and his seed. And as regards the second objection, I do not understand the language to imply that Abraham was first to enjoy the land, and that then his seed were to enjoy it in succession after him, but that Abraham and his seed which should come after him, his posterity, should together inherit the promises.

In sustaining my position I will attempt to shew: That even in the original promises, we can trace a distinction between the temporary occupation of Canaan and the permanent inheritance of the promised land—That the character of this occupation was, or ought to have been, a sojourning, in opposition to the rest which yet remaineth—next, That it is distinctly stated in subsequent parts of Scripture, that the promises are yet unappropriated—I will then show that the very objection here advanced is proposed and refuted in the epistle addressed to the Hebrews themselves—and, lastly, That the promises therefore made to the fathers are yet to be fulfilled to the Church, whether composed of Jews or Gentiles.
That a distinction was preserved between the promised occupation and promised inheritance of Canaan seems probable, from the mention of both. Speaking of the occupation by the seed he says, "In the fourth generation they shall come up hither again;" but in speaking of the inheritance it is added, "In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." So, therefore, when the time arrived for Israel's deliverance out of Egypt, the fulfilment of the promise to the patriarchs, in their own individual persons, is kept alive; which promise the occupation of the land by their seed did not neutralize. "I have also established my covenant with them [the patriarchs] to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers." This passage also shows the character of the occupation by the patriarchs; they were strangers and pilgrims in the land which God had covenanted to give them. So, in like manner, when the Lord gave the Israelites directions respecting the occupation of the land, he declares that they are to occupy as strangers and sojourners. "The land shall not be sold for ever, for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me."

"The land is mine," saith the Lord; hence the prophets call it "the Lord's land." And we find, from the patriarch David, that he and all the prophets viewed it as the Lord's, and that they were sojourners with him. "I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were." This pilgrim spirit, manifested by the patriarchs in the land, is a preliminary frame of mind equally necessary to be cultivated by those out of the land who are looking for the rest and the inheritance. Thus Peter addresses the "elect sojourners of the dispersion," exhorting them to "pass the time of their sojourning in fear."
The reason why, hitherto, the land was not to be considered as the rest of the saints, is assigned by the prophet, "This is not [your] rest; because it is polluted."

It follows from what has been advanced, that the promises have not yet been appropriated by the patriarchs or their descendants. Hence the apostle, when arguing upon their own acknowledged principles, with the Hebrews then in the land, urges the example of Abraham, who sojourned in the land of promise, together with Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him of the same promise, who were therefore "strangers and pilgrims on the earth," or "land," that land of promise. And they died in faith, not having received the promises: therefore if they ever are to have the promises fulfilled to them, it must be in the resurrection.

One passage from the prophets will suffice to show that the promise to the patriarchs was not supposed to have been made good to them at any time before the advent of Christ: "Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old." The fulfilment, then, was to be some time future to the prophecy of Micah.

When the advent of Christ drew near, Zecharias prophesied of the horn of salvation, which would "perform the mercy to the fathers;"* not as our translation would imply, that the mercy promised to the fathers was to be fulfilled to the children, but accomplished to the patriarchs themselves, in their own person; and that he would also grant unto them, the children, deliverance from all their enemies.†

If Abraham has not yet enjoyed the promises, his seed has not yet inherited the promises after him. But, as I have already observed, I must not be understood to suppose the

* Literally "to exercise mercy towards our fathers."—Doddridge.
† These blessings refer to the second advent. The difficulty of this and similar passages in the prophets, will afterwards be considered.
tenor of the promise to have been, that Abraham was first to enjoy the land, and that then his posterity was to enjoy it in succession. For upon that supposition how could the promise of inheriting the land have been wrapped up in, and dependent upon, the promise respecting the seed? Abraham and his posterity—his seed after him—shall together enjoy the land.

The argument in Heb. iii. and iv. seems intended to meet the very objection which I stated at the commencement; this makes it probable that the view of the promises which I have given is the same as that taken by the apostle, inasmuch as that in each case the argument appears to be open to the same objection.

By the manner in which St. Paul handles his argument, not only does he remove the present difficulty, but I conceive that he unfolds a general doctrine with regard to lapsed promises, which is important towards the interpreting of some other dark passages of Scripture.

I apprehend we may maintain the following propositions: Propositions.

1. The very land of Canaan which the spies examined is that very land of promise which was proposed to the generation of the wilderness.

2. That the promise of entering into Canaan was not appropriated by the generation of the wilderness: "They could not enter in because of unbelief." "A promise being left of entering into his rest," &c.

3. That the very same promise of entering into Canaan which was proffered to the children of the wilderness, is now offered unto us; and that the land of Canaan is not a type of the heavenly inheritance, as many without warrant conclude, but is the very place itself of the heavenly inheritance: "Some must enter therein; and they to whom it was first preached entered not in, because of unbelief." "We, believing, enter into the (or 'his') rest." If some must enter therein," "and they to whom it was first
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4. Not appropriated by Joshua.

4. That Joshua leading the next generation into the land of Canaan did not appropriate the promise of the rest of Canaan. To be in the place of rest is one ingredient, but not the sole and entire appropriation of the promise. "For if Joshua had given them rest, then would he not after have spoken of another day."

5. Not by any before David.

5. That the promise had never been appropriated before the time of David is evident, because the Holy Spirit proposed the original promise again, by the mouth of David many years after Joshua, "Saying in David..." after so long a time," namely, five hundred years after they were in the land, "To-day, if ye will hear his voice," &c.

6. David prophetically proposed it

6. That David did not promise it to the Church of his generation, but prophetically to us, because during this present dispensation is the day of hearing the promise. "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith to-day, if ye will hear his voice."... "Exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day."

7. Proposed under the Gospel.

7. That not until the gospel dispensation was the rest of Canaan again proposed to the Church. "They to whom it was first preached entered not in... he again determines a certain day," i.e. of hearing, "Saying in David to-day," &c.

8. On the ground of the ascension.

8. The promise is reiterated upon the new covenant ground of Jesus having entered into his rest from the work of redemption. "There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God, for He that hath entered into his rest, He also hath ceased from his own works as God [did] from his."

The point of importance in the present argument is, that Canaan was the place originally promised to Abraham and his seed; and that this promise has not yet been fulfilled either to Abraham or his seed. Hence the apostle, when
drawing to a close in the same epistle, and when urging upon the Hebrews the example of the fathers—which he cites from every period of the Church before the first advent, concludes, "And these all having obtained a good report through faith, carried not off the promises, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The promises, therefore, are still unappropriated.
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THE BLESSING OF ABRAHAM—(continued.)

"The Land of everlasting life."

Baptismal Service.

I have now to show that the promises made to Abraham have yet to be fulfilled to the Church of God, whether composed of Jews or Gentiles.

I attempted to point out, in the last chapter, that the promises respecting the land tendered to the generation of the wilderness, were not again proposed to the people of God until after the resurrection of Christ. Of this I think there was an intimation by the Lord immediately upon the sin of the people in receiving the report of the false spies. In answer to the intercession of Moses, Jehovah says, "I have pardoned according to thy word; but as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of Jehovah." The connexion shows that this forebodes evil to the nation of the Jews. Now the earth being filled with the glory of the Lord was not in itself an evil; but the evil consisted in the manner in which this should be brought to pass, which was by the rejection of the Jews as a nation; and instead of their national election, an individual election out of all nations being taken for the name of the Lord: or to show forth his glory. Thus it was the casting off of the Jews which occasioned the riches of the Gentiles. So that like the matter of the golden calf, though the nation was not at
that time disinherited, nevertheless, in the day when he visited, he visited their sin upon them.

I purpose establishing my present point by commenting on a passage in the epistle to the Galatians.

In the 3rd chapter and 13th and 14th verses, the apostle Gal. iii. 13, &c. states, that by the abolition of the law, Christ enabled the Gentiles to participate in "The blessing of Abraham," although the blessing was originally limited and confined to the seed of Abraham; and that Christ also thus conferred upon the Church the promise of the Spirit. The proof of the former is taken up from the 15th verse to the end of the chapter; the latter point is handled in the following chapter. I will now examine the passage relating to "the blessing of Abraham."

"Brethren, I speak according to the manner of men; no Gal. iii. 15. one annulleth or farther encumbereth a ratified covenant, even of a man."

The argument is from the less to the greater: if even among men, no one would be so unjust as farther to encumber a covenant once ratified, far less can we suppose it of God. Whatever, then, was the original contract with Abraham, of that the Church has now the full benefit.

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. Ver. 16, 17. He saith not, 'and to seeds,' as of many; but as of one, 'and to thy seed,' which is Christ. And this I say, a covenant previously ratified by God unto Christ, a law delivered four hundred and thirty years after, cannot nullify so as to invalidate the promise."

The promises here mentioned are not concerning the seed, but to the seed conjointly with Abraham; and were the promises concerning "the inheritance," for the apostle adds, "If the inheritance be of law, it is no more of promise, but to Abraham God conferred it through a promise."

The subject, therefore, is the inheritance promised to Abraham and his seed; the inheritance of the land of Canaan, designated in a way of eminence, alike by the zealous
apostle, and the contemplative patriarch, "The blessing of Abraham."

The following considerations will enable us to decide with some confidence, as to which of the promises the apostle here specially alludes.

They were ratified by a covenant; the reference, therefore, must be either to Genesis xv. 18, or to Genesis xvii. 9, 10.

But (1) the allusion cannot be to Genesis xvii., because there the seed is not spoken of in the singular number, but in the plural: "I will be their God;" but the apostle's argument in part depends upon the promise being confined to one, "and to thy seed."

(2.) The apostle could not have referred to the covenant of Gen. xvii., for that was ratified by circumcision; but the whole scope of the epistle to the Galatians is against the necessity, or even the propriety, of circumcision; had, therefore, the reference been to the covenant of Gen. xvii., with which the rite of circumcision was necessarily connected, St. Paul's argument would have tended to show that circumcision was still the condition.

Lastly, the apostle is speaking of a covenant ratified by God unto or upon Christ 430 years before the giving of the law; this could not have been the covenant of circumcision, for into that Christ entered, not before the giving of the law, but after his birth in the flesh.

St. Paul, in saying that the covenant was ratified unto or upon Christ, seems to refer to the mysterious transaction in Genesis xv.

The mode of covenanting was by the Berith or covenant victim being divided down the chine, and the contracting parties passing between the moieties of the slain animal, the divided victim being intended to intimate the desert of the covenant-breaker, that he should be cut asunder, having his portion with the hypocrites. Jeremiah distinctly refers to the mode of covenanting, our Lord is supposed to al-
lude to the mystical import; it is upon the manner alone, however, that I insist.

It will be observed, that in the symbolical representation of the covenant, in Genesis xv., the smoking furnace and lamp of fire must denote the principals, for it is these that pass between the parts of the divided animals; but as I have before observed respecting symbolical representations of the Deity, it is not the person, but the office which is sustained by the person, that is symbolized. Here I conceive the smoking furnace denotes the furnace of affliction sustained by the man Jehovah's fellow, while the lamp of fire denotes the Shekinah, the divine glory, sustaining the requirements of essential holiness. Thus I understand the assurance to Abraham was God's covenant with Christ; hence the apostle, in verse 19, speaks of the Lord as "the seed to whom the promise was made."

St. Paul, in mentioning the 430 years, doubtless refers to Exodus xii. 40, 41: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel [and of their fathers in the land of Canaan and] in the land of Egypt was 430 years, and it came to pass at the end of the 430 years, even the self-same day, it came to pass that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." This language must allude to some notable transaction on some particular day from which the 430 years were current, and it appears most probable that "the self-same day" to which Moses so emphatically alludes, is the day in which the Lord announced to Abraham, that the affliction should come on his seed.*

* I am happy to find that Mr. Browne takes the same view, (p. 308, § 288). He also informs us that the Rabbim assign this covenant to the night of the 15th of Nisan, (note, p. 231,) which shows that they supposed it was the self-same day as the deliverance from Egypt.

The difference between the 430 years mentioned by Moses and confirmed by St. Paul, and the 400 years announced to Abraham and repeated by Stephen, may be in consequence of the longer period
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The particular time of day seems also to point to the Paschal release, and through that release, to the greater which it typified. "And when the sun was going down . . . to a horror of great darkness," &c., compared with Deut. xvi. 6, "Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover at even at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou comest forth out of Egypt."

When I say that the apostle referred to those promises to Abraham and his seed repeated in Gen. xv. 7, 18, respecting the inheritance of the land, I of course do not exclude those promises to the same effect previously given. The reference in Gen. xv. 7 to Gen. xii. being so express, and the substance of the promise being the same, of course the one covenant ratified them both.

I would also observe, the language of this passage implies that the fulfilment of the law was apparently to be rewarded by the inheritance. And this is in agreement with the lan-

being reckoned from the announcement to Abraham (Gen. xv.,) and the shorter period which referred, not to Abraham but to his seed, being dated from some time after the seed was born, probably from the weaning of Isaac when the mocking by Ishmael began. (Gen. xxi. 9, Gal. iv. 29.) This event, as far as one can judge, was five or six and twenty years after the announcement in Gen. xv., and therefore might very well be called in round numbers 400 years.

Gill observes, that in those times when men married and begat children and lived to a more advanced age, children might not be weaned so early as now. The Jewish writers vary considerably as to Isaac's age when he was weaned. Philo says he was seven years of age; if he is correct, the two periods harmonise perfectly. We assume that the Exodus was precisely 430 years from the vision; the last date mentioned before the vision was (Gen. xii. 4)) when Abram was 75, and Abram was 100 when Isaac was born. (Gen. xxi. 5.) If Isaac was seven when weaned, the vision (Gen. xv.) was two years after, (Gen. xii.) and there were 400 years from the mocking of Ishmael to the Exodus. Some Hebrews, according to Jerome, say Isaac was only five years old; the period might still be precisely 400 years, if Gen. xv. was shortly after Gen. xii.
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guage of Moses. "Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto Deut. iv. 1.
the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you for
to do, that ye may live and go in and possess the land which
Jehovah, God of your fathers, giveth you." Upon every
view, then, the land of Canaan is the subject in question.

"For if the inheritance be of a law, it is no more of a
promise; but to Abraham God conferred it through a pro-
mise." "Wherefore, then, the law? It was added because
of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the
promise was made."

Law and promise are as diametrically opposed as grace
and works; and as God gave the inheritance to Abraham
by promise, it is clear that its attainment could not after-
wards be encumbered by a law of any kind. But then this
objection naturally presents itself: "If law and promise are
such opposites, what was the object of the law?"

There is an opinion very general, that the whole object of
the law, moral, ceremonial, and civil, was to bring in every
soul guilty before God; that idea, I believe, scripture at-
taches, not to the law as a whole, but to the "ten words,"
or "the ministration of death in the letter, engraven in
stones"—that is, to the ten commandments. The law,
taken as a whole, although imperfect, was yet a means of
grace, a staying of judgment, as it were, until the time of
complete redemption. In this sense I understand it here:
the law was added because of transgression, the one part,
namely, the ten words keeping alive a sense of sin, and
driving to the other part the ceremonial justification which
pointed to Christ.

From this we may infer, that the inheritance of the land
must be enjoyed by those who are in a state of sinlessness;
for it is implied, sin cannot pass unnoticed: the law was
added because of transgressions; there must be an acknow-
ledgment of the forbearance of God—a remembrance of sins
—until the seed should come, who would put away sin by
the sacrifice of himself.
"[It was] disposed through angels in the hands of a mediator: but the mediator is not of one, but God is one. The law is then against the promises of God."

I understand these verses to start a second objection. A mediator implies, that there are two parties, and that grounds of mediation are opened between them. Now God is one of the parties; the Israelites of course are the other party. The law of God, then, opening terms of mediation and acceptance, is against the promises of God, which confer the inheritance absolutely to the exclusion of all terms. The apostle replies:

"By no means: for if there had been a law able to quicken, verily justification would have been by law; but the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to the believing."

To suppose that justification was to be attained by the law was to mistake its object, and its powers. The law concluded all under sin, the ministration of condemnation, keeping alive a knowledge of sin, while the hope in the promise was kept alive in the typical justification of the ceremonial law. In this way, the law, instead of being against the promises of God, actually ministered to their acceptance.

"But before the faith came, we were kept (in custody) under law, shut up together unto the faith, to be subsequently revealed."

"The Faith" here appears to be Christ the object of faith, and the end of the law, which confirms what we have already observed, that until the coming of Christ, the promise made to Abraham could not be fulfilled.

"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith; but the faith having come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster."

"Faith" is here again used for Christ the object of faith. The apostle here draws the conclusion already stated, that
so far from the law being opposed to the promises of the inheritance, it actually ministered to them.

"For ye are all sons of God, through the faith in Christ Gal. iii. 25—26. Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is not male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

These verses unfold that mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known; namely, how the Gentiles could inherit those promises hitherto limited to Abraham and his seed; this is effected by the Gentiles becoming one, in and with Christ Jesus, that seed to whom the promises were made.

"But if ye [be] Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, Gal. iii. 29. and heirs according to promise."

This is the conclusion: the Church, by being one with Christ, has the right of appropriating the promises made to the seed of Abraham. The Church, then, composed whether of Jew or Gentile, is heir to the land of Canaan, promised to Abraham, and "according to promise;" that is, without any hindrance from the law.

These points, then, seem to have been established: the Conclusion.

promises to the patriarchs were of the very land of Canaan: these promises have never been fulfilled, either to them, or to their posterity; nor was there a capability of realizing the promises, from the time that the generation of the wilderness rejected them, until after the first advent of Christ, when they were again proposed.

I shall next consider the promises respecting the throne of David.
CHAPTER XII.

THE THRONE OF DAVID.

"Oh, Son of David! have mercy upon us."

"For this cause do we longe for and praye that it may at length come to pass and be fulfilled, that Christ may reign with his saintes according to God's promise."—Edward VIth's Catechism.

I purpose continuing the plan I have hitherto pursued of confining myself to the New Testament evidence, for this obvious reason: many think, from the prophecies being principally in figurative language, that all the promises there found respecting the reign of the Son of David should also be figuratively understood.

I therefore purpose at once examining the promise to the Virgin, (Luke i. 82,) and then the first chapters of Acts, taking up as they may occur in the text, the points already treated respecting the reign of the Son of man, namely, the succession, subordination, place, and nature of the kingdom.

Whether the kingdom of the Son of man be identical with that of the Son of David is not essential to my present inquiry: it appears to me, that the reign of the Son of man extends over all that was under the dominion of the first Adam, which will therefore extend even to the irresponsible creation; but that the throne of David is limited to "the Lord's land."

By comparison of passages, we learn a truth which is indeed universally assumed; that these reigns center in the same individual Jesus, and commence simultaneously; for
in a former chapter we learned that "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," is the same as "the kingdom of God coming with power." But as Jesus, when He shall return to this earth, will "inherit the throne of glory" proper to Him as "Son of man," so the Lord has also promised to confer upon Him his hereditary throne, as the descendant of David: "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of his Father David." Again, it appears by comparing 2 Sam. vii. 16 with 1 Chron. xvi. 14, that the kingdom of God, and the reign of Messiah upon David's throne, are alike.

But we have already seen that the kingdom of God coming with power, and the Son of man coming in his kingdom, are one: hence they are all identical in the period of commencement, and center in the same individual Jesus.

I shall now consider the promise to the Virgin just mentioned: "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of his Father David." To sit upon the throne of any one, in its fullest sense, perhaps embraces the idea, not only of reigning over the particular geographical division, as it might be said that Ahasuerus of the seed of the Medes, was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; but it would also include being the legitimate descendant: for which reason it could not be said that Solomon sat upon the throne of Saul, it being another dynasty. And thirdly, reigning over the same people is included: for example, when the Israelites were removed from their land, and the other nations brought up by Asnapper, then it ceased to be the throne of Israel. In this passage, however, as if to prevent the possibility of any mistake, these points are all expressed:

1. The Throne, "of David."
2. The Dynasty, "his Father David."
3. The People, "He shall reign over the house of Jacob;" i.e. the twelve tribes.

Now we know what in plain language is conveyed by the
expression, "the throne of David." It will be acknowledged that David sat upon the throne of David; but when he died, and passed into another state, he ceased to sit upon the throne of David: and Solomon sat upon the throne of David: and when Solomon passed into another state, he ceased to sit on David's throne.

The Virgin saw no impediment to the fulfilment of this promise excepting the physical consideration; it was necessary that a man should be born upon earth, in order to sit upon David's throne.

This promise having been given to Mary, it must be made good. But Christ did not sit upon David's throne in the days of his flesh, for then He would have continued to sit there; because He is to reign "for ever," and just before the ascension of the Lord, the apostles looked forward to the restoration of the kingdom as an event still future. Nor is Christ sitting on the throne of David whilst He is in heaven; for He is sitting on the throne of God; and we must not confound the throne of God with the throne of a creature. The promise, then, remains yet to be fulfilled: which I shall further attempt to establish from the first chapter of Acts.

Our Lord, for forty days after his passion, discoursed with his apostles "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." This did not hinder them from asking Him before his departure whether He would at that time restore the kingdom again to Israel. We must, then, conclude that our Lord's discourses for those forty days respecting the kingdom, were not inconsistent with the views involved in this question. But, on the contrary, the "therefore" shows that the question of the disciples sprang from their previous conversations with Christ about his kingdom; "being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; when they, therefore, were come together, they asked of Him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this
time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" for we have already seen that the kingdom of God and Christ's reign over the tribes of Israel are identical.

Be it observed, moreover, that the apostles did not seek knowledge as to the fact that the kingdom should exist, nor as to the nature of that kingdom;—we have already seen that they had by the transfiguration been informed upon this subject—they simply inquired as to the time when it should be; hence, as we have seen that they knew about what they were talking, their question takes for granted and establishes two points:

1. That the kingdom was to be restored to Israel.
2. That up to that time the kingdom had not been restored.

The restoration of the kingdom to Israel is synonymous with re-establishing "the throne of David," which was to be not only by the power of the Lord, but in the person of Jesus; for when the Lord shall give unto Him the throne of his father David, then will He reign over the house of Jacob, that is, over the twelve tribes of Israel. Luke 1. 32, 33.

Our Lord, in his answer, denying explicit information respecting the time when the kingdom shall be restored, implicitly but clearly confirms the fact of its restoration.

The apostles shortly before had asked Him, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" He answered, "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." So referring to the information already given, he says to this effect: "Though the kingdom will not be established when you receive the promise of the Father, yet you shall then be qualified to proclaim the glad tidings of the kingdom, witnessing unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."* Hence, upon the outpouring

* As the apostles did not learn, until after this, that the call ex-
of the Spirit at Pentecost, St. Peter declares the commencement of the dispensation of the last days, which will continue until the great and notable day of the Lord come."

Many seem to suppose that St. Peter quotes the prophecy of Joel ii. 28—32 as if it were completely fulfilled and exhausted on the day of Pentecost, so as to be no longer applicable to any future period, but I think they mistake the intent of the quotation. The Holy Ghost had been poured out, and some visible effects of his miraculous power had ensued. Upon this St. Peter urges the promise that in the last days there should be an effusion of the Spirit, mentioning the miraculous effects there detailed; but it is remarkable that the identical gift of languages, which marks the ushering in of the dispensation of the Spirit, is one of the very few gifts of the Spirit not mentioned in the prediction; hence the accomplishment of Joel could not terminate in the gift of languages. The application of the prophecy, indeed, refers not to the detail of the effects, but to the fact of the presence of the Spirit in the Church; very little of the detail in Joel having been accomplished on the day of Pentecost. The turning of the sun into darkness and the moon into blood, prior to the coming of "the great and notable day of the Lord," is as yet wholly unfulfilled. And surely none would limit that sweet promise of the Spirit: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" for from this very passage St. Paul argues the riches of God towards all who call upon Him during the whole of this dispensation.*

* Some students of prophecy appear to me to have rightly applied, but to have drawn wrong deductions from this passage in Joel. They saw that it applied to the whole of this dispensation, and therefore...
The apostle proceeds to show that this gift of the Spirit flows from the risen Lord:

"Jesus, the Nazarene, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know; Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."

The miracles of Christ, and the fact of his crucifixion, were undeniable. But the next proposition was the great point to be proved:

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death; because it was not possible that He should be holden of it."

I do not understand the apostle in this verse to assign as a reason why God raised Him up, that it was not possible He should be holden of death; this would be no argument with a Jew not willing to be convinced. Had it not been possible, physically considered, for death to hold Him, it had been unnecessary for God to exert his power in raising Him up. But it was not possible, in accordance they inferred that the gift of languages ought to be in the Church at all times; whereas, if I mistake not, the cessation of the gift of languages is intimated in 1 Cor. xiii. 8—10: "Love never faileth; but whether [there be] prophecies, they shall be abolished; whether languages, they shall cease; whether knowledge, it shall be abolished: for partially we know and partially we prophesy; but when the perfect [state] shall have come, the partial shall be abolished." Here it is predicated concerning two out of the three gifts, that they shall be abolished at the introduction of the perfect state, they therefore will continue throughout all this dispensation; but respecting the other gift, namely, that of languages, we are not told that it shall be abolished by the introduction of the perfect state, but that it "shall cease;" and upon its cessation we have no authority for its revival. The proper question, then, simply is, Did the gift of languages ever cease in the Church? and that all must admit.
with the truth of God, that He should be holden of death, because the psalmist when under inspiration had predicted otherwise:

"For David speaketh concerning Him . . . 'My flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.'"

This is St. Peter's next assertion: that David by the spirit of prophecy did speak in Psalm xvi. concerning the resurrection of Jesus. Several propositions are involved in this assertion:

1. God had promised to David that the Messiah should descend from him. (ver. 30.)
2. That the Messiah should be raised up (i.e. from the dead) to sit upon his throne. (ver. 30.)
3. That Psalm xvi. did speak concerning the resurrection of some one from the dead, without his seeing corruption. (ver. 31 with 27.)
4. That the individual was not David himself. (ver. 29.)
5. That this individual should be the Christ. (ver. 30.)
6. That Jesus was raised up; i.e. from the dead. (ver. 32.)

It will be seen that all the points advanced by the apostle are supported by Psalm xvi., excepting the matter of identity, the evidence concerning which is partly negative and partly positive; that David had not been raised up, was a matter of general notoriety; hence David could not have been speaking of himself.

"Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him, with an oath, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ."

"The fruit of his loins according to the flesh," is explained by a similar expression in Rom. i. 3: "Jesus
Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;" that is, according to human descent. The oath of God is admitted to be that mentioned in 2 Sam. vii. 12, 13, upon the interpretation of which I need not enter, the point of importance in our present inquiry being the promise that God "would raise up the Christ to sit upon his throne," it is here introduced to justify and strengthen that which David said in Psalm xvi. concerning one to be raised from the dead; for so St. Peter applies it, "He seeing this before," that is, David previously to writing the psalm, understanding God's promise to refer to the resurrection, he therefore in that psalm "spake of the resurrection of the Christ."

The matter of identity, namely, that it was Jesus who was the one raised up, rests upon the testimony of the apostles; it is not, however, brought forward as a naked fact, but is advanced in order to account for the phenomenon of the gift of languages, with which Peter and the others were endowed: thus the two facts, the one which they had perceived, the other which had been predicted; the gift of tongues, and the resurrection of Christ, are connected and made mutually illustrative; the display of miraculous power in fulfilling the promise of the gift of languages, establishing the fulfilment of another supernatural promise that the Christ should be raised from the dead; his resurrection, on the other hand, being the only fact which could account for the gift of languages: thus the power of God establishes the truth of God, and the truth accounts for the visible display of power.

"Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye see and hear."

The apostle appears in this verse to advance two more propositions:—

1. That Jesus is at the right hand of God exalted:
2. That Jesus has received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost; from which he deduces that Jesus has shed forth that which they saw and heard. The whole proof is taken from the first verse of Psalm cx., which records that He who, according to Psalm xvi., should ascend into the presence of God, was in the relation of Lord to David; and secondly, that this Lord of David should sit at God’s right hand. But in order to bear the weight of the apostle’s conclusion, this last proposition must take for granted two more important truths:

1. That this Lord of David is the Christ.

2. That the session at God’s right hand involves the fact of all power and authority having been transferred by the Father to the Messiah.

That the Jews acknowledged David’s Lord to be the Christ, is evident by Jesus silencing them by this very question,—“How, then, does David in spirit call Him [the Christ] Lord?”

The co-ordination of Christ I have handled in the former part of this treatise; I will content myself at present with referring to Luke xxii. 69, 70, in proof that the Jews thought the exaltation of humanity to the right hand of God amounted to the investiture of the creature with the attributes of Deity; this, therefore, was blasphemy in their estimation, and for this Jesus died.

Recapitulation. Shortly then to recapitulate. According to the prophet Joel, the outpouring of the Spirit had been promised; in accordance with God’s oath, in 2 Sam. vii., as applied by David in Psalm xvi., the Christ was to be raised from the dead; and, lastly, from Psalm cx., it is deduced that the Christ was to sit at God’s right hand, as Lord. All of this was fulfilled in the person of Jesus, who was raised from the dead, as the apostle testified. From these premises he concludes that Jesus is “both” the “Lord” mentioned in Psalm cx., who should sit on God’s throne, and the
"Christ" whom God had promised should sit upon David's throne.

I have concluded my attempt to analyse the argument as it would present itself to a Jew: we Gentiles do not always see the connexion of such passages; partly, perhaps, because the mode of argumentation is different from that with which the minds of all in the west are more or less imbued, and partly because a Gentile Christian would more readily concede the very points which a Jew would find most difficulty in admitting; and, on the other hand, a Hebrew would take for granted positions which Christians have perhaps never considered.

The inferences which I shall draw from this passage are:

1. That the throne of David is the throne of the Anointed or Christ.

2. That the reign of Christ upon the throne of David was to be after his resurrection: this accounts for the apostles, when Jesus had risen, asking, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"

3. The reign of Christ upon the throne of David was to be after the dispensation of the Spirit. Christ did not sit on David's throne, when He ascended into heaven; for then He sat on God the Father's throne, not as David's son, but as David's Lord, when even the Holy Spirit himself was subordinate to, and dispensed by Him.

The descent of the Spirit marked the commencement of the dispensation of the last days, during which "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" the

* One point more appears necessary to make the argument complete: that is, the time in which the outpouring of the Spirit should take place. St. Peter fixes it to "the last days," Acts ii. 17, an expression always applied by the Jews to the times of the Messiah; but the present Hebrew text does not appear to support this, though, according to Bloomfield, the words are equivalent.
close of the dispensation will be defined by the coming of "the great and dreadful day of the Lord;" after which will follow the reign of Christ upon the throne of David.
CHAPTER XIII.

"THE TIMES OF REFRESHING."

"The end of the world, holy Scripture calleth the fulfyllynge and performance of the kingdome and mistery of Christ, and the renewing of all things."—Edward VIth's Catechism.

The discourse in Acts iii. must be taken in connexion with what St. Peter had before urged; the former address in the second chapter was at "the third hour," this was "at Acts ii. 15. the same [time]," "at the ninth hour," that is, the one dis-

Acta. III. 1. course was in the morning, and the other in the afternoon of the same day. The probability of this is increased, from the doctrine of the resurrection which grieved the Sadducees so greatly, as to cause the imprisonment of the apostles, Acta. IV. 2. having been much more fully discussed in the first discourse than in the second; also from Peter saying, ver. 20, "Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you, whom the heavens must receive," &c., for here I apprehend he must refer to his previous sermon, in which he had fully proved that Jesus was received into heaven. I shall therefore con-

Acta. III. 33, 34. sider this discourse in connexion with what we have already learned from the preceding.

"In the name of Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, rise up and

Acta. III. 6. walk."

Thus did Peter address the cripple, and immediately the lame man leaped as an hart; so that in this, as in the
former discourse, the groundwork was a miraculous fact, evident to the senses of the multitude.

"The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his son Jesus."

The manner in which Peter opens his appeal must be noticed. He speaks of the Deity under that title which involves the doctrine of the resurrection, and the certainty of all the promises being made good to Israel. Our Lord, about a month before, had silenced the Sadducees by pointing out this very relation between God and the patriarchs: "I am the God of Abraham, &c. . . . God is not God of the dead, but of the living, for all live," or "are alive unto Him." St. Paul uses a similar argument, and as he was writing to a church partly composed of Gentiles, he is a little more explicit; I will therefore first notice the passage in the epistle to the Romans.

"Abraham is the father of us all . . . before . . . God who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were." Abraham is the father of us all before Him, on whom his quickening from the dead depends, and in the eyes of Him to whom the future is present; therefore he speaks in the past tense of a relation still future, "I have made thee a father of many nations;" that is, Abraham was father of many nations, not actually at that time, but virtually, and in the sight of God, to whom the future is absolutely present, and whose power in accomplishing his purposes cannot be frustrated.

Thus the Lord proves the resurrection from the relation of God to Abraham, which exists in God's purpose, but will not actually be in full force until Abraham is in a state to enjoy all which that relation implies. This relation of God to Abraham was not when Abraham was on earth; nor is it now, as Abraham is not in a state of perfect being; nor will it be until the resurrection, for "God is not God of the dead, but of the living." But God nevertheless does speak
in the present tense, "I am the God of Abraham," &c., for Luke xx. 38. all are alive to Him; that is, all the patriarchs are alive in the sight and fore-ordination of God.

This title, then, involved, of necessity, the fact of the resurrection, and the fulfilment of all the promises, for which the twelve tribes were looking, to believers when in the resurrection state.*

The position advanced by St. Peter is, that God has Acts iii. 13. glorified his Son; this the apostle establishes by enunciating several other points respecting Jesus.

1. That the Jews delivered Jesus.
2. That they denied Him in the presence of Pilate.
3. In denying Jesus, they denied "the Holy One."
4. They denied "the Just One."
5. They killed "the Prince of Life."
6. God raised Him from the dead: hence the power exercised by the apostle in working the cure.

That the Jews did deliver Jesus, that they did deny Him, and occasion his death, was notorious. The points requiring proof were, that Jesus is the Holy One, the Just One, and the Prince of Life; that God had raised him from the dead; that he therefore is God's Son; and that, moreover, God has glorified Him.

Having in his previous discourse established the right of "The Holy One." applying Psalm xvi. to Jesus, Peter now, doubtless, from thence applies to Him the title of "the Holy One," which designation, I apprehend, relates especially to the priestly office of Messiah, for Aaron the high priest, as the type, was called the saint or holy one of Jehovah, and the imagery Psalm cvi. 16. in Psalm xvi. appears to allude to the high priest going

* Compare Acts xxvi. 6—8, which implies that all the fathers and the Jews looked to the promises as referring to a resurrection state: "And now I stand arraigned for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers... why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"
into the most holy place: "Thou wilt show me the path of life," the path from the grave to his "presence," where there is "fulness of joy," typified by the presence or "faces" of Jehovah in the most holy place. "At thy right hand are pleasures for evermore;" this may refer to the Melchisedec priesthood, "Sit thou at my right hand . . . thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."

"The Just One."

The next title, that of "the Just One," refers, I apprehend, to the kingly office of Christ; they "denied Him in presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let Him go;"

Peter refers to when "Pilate sought to release him;" the connexion is remarkable:—Pilate urges upon Jesus that the power of life and death is no longer vested in the Jewish rulers, but in him, as representative of the kingly power of Caesar. Our Lord replies, that the regal authority even of Caesar did not properly reach him—it was a usurpation of his right as king of the Jews; this, however, was given from above, because of the sins of the nation; nevertheless his betrayer, knowing him to be king of the Jews, the greater was his condemnation.

This implied assumption of his kingly authority, both Pilate and the Jews understood, for he thenceforth sought to release him; but the Jews opposed his acquittal upon the very ground that Jesus made himself king, and king in such a sense as to interfere with the regal authority of Caesar, therefore if Pilate released him he would not be Caesar's friend; hence, according to their conceptions, the regal dignity which Jesus assumed, interfered with the authority of Caesar.

But Pilate—"determined to let him go"—brought Jesus forth and said unto the Jews, "Behold your king;" they, however, denied him: yet again he said, "Shall I crucify your king?" but they again denied him, saying, "We have no king but Caesar."

Now surely Peter charges the Jews with denying Jesus in
the very character in which they intended to deny him; namely, as "king of the Jews," and king of the Jews in such a sense as would interfere with the regal power of Caesar. Nor were the rulers at Jerusalem peculiar in thus understanding the claims of Jesus; the Jews at Thessalonica drew precisely the same inference from the preaching of Paul, "These all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, Acts xvii. 7, saying that there is another king [one] Jesus."

Nor were the Jews wrong in their inference; St. Paul, in his second epistle to Timothy, very strikingly shows how conscious he was that the kingship of Jesus was rightly understood to be in direct opposition to the authority of Caesar: "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things; remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel: wherein I suffer trouble as an evil doer [even] unto bonds." What mystery is there in these words, which Paul calls Timothy to consider, but to which he, a prisoner, did not think it prudent to give explicit utterance? Is it not the truth involved in the promise to David that one of his seed should be the Christ and raised up (from the dead) to sit upon his throne? This was the truth for which Paul suffered bonds, because in this he spake against Caesar.

The incompatibility of the existence of merely human or earthly rule, with the plenary exercise of God's sovereignty over the house of Jacob, is brought out more prominently, by a similar event in the early history of the Jewish monarchy; in requesting a human king, they rejected the regal authority of Jehovah.

1 Sam. viii. 7.

But it may be objected, if we are correct in our conjectures respecting the reign of Messiah, why did the Jews reject him? Is it not notorious that they expected a Messiah to relieve them from the Roman yoke? Was their loyalty sincere when they said we have no other king but
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Caesar? Is it not clear that they wanted a Messiah to set up a temporal power, and they objected to Jesus because He claimed merely a spiritual kingdom?

This objection embraces the real difference between the views of those who call themselves spiritualists, and the opposite opinion, which by implication they designate carnal. I conceive the Jews did not object to the claims of Jesus, but to his character; and therefore to the mode in which he asserted his claims. One who said of himself that he was meek and lowly of heart, and who required his followers to be poor in spirit, was, according to their estimation, utterly unsuitable to deliver the nation from the Roman thraldom. They wanted, as in the case of Saul, a king to go out before them and fight their battles. "If we let this man go," he will not be able to maintain his claim to the Messiahship, "and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation." "We will not have this man to reign over us." They would lean on an arm of flesh rather than trust to the verity of Jehovah.

The next clause appears to be antithetical; they desired a destroyer of life, and rejected him to whom the fathers had given to have life in himself. The xvth Psalm, which Peter had already proved to relate to the Lord Jesus, would, in the eyes of a Jew, justify his being styled "the Prince of Life." "Thou wilt shew me the path of life," "shew" being understood in the sense in which it is used by the Lord in a similar connexion. "The Father loveth the Son and sheweth Him all things that himself doeth . . . for as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will."

The apostle then asserts his having been a witness of the resurrection of Jesus, which fact confirms all the former declarations; the miracle putting the seal of authenticity to his testimony. All these predicates together fully bear out the proposition that Jesus is God's Son; for respecting
that descendant of David, who should be raised from the
dead to sit on his throne, God had promised, "I will be
his Father, and he shall be my Son."

Here then we have these points; God is styled God of
the patriarchs, which involves their resurrection, and the
accomplishment of all the promises to them, through the
Holy One and the Just One promised to David, who had
been raised up, which declares his sonship to God; and
who has been glorified, which the miraculous power im-
ported to the apostles evinced. We must next consider the
manner in which these points are applied.

Peter upon one occasion classifies the subjects of pro-
phecy under two principal heads, namely, "the sufferings of
Christ, and the glories ensuing." In the passage before us
he tells the Jews that the one part had had an accom-
plishment—"those things which God before had shewed by the
mouth of all his prophets, that the Christ should suffer, he
hath so fulfilled." The prophecies concerning the ensuing
1 Pet. i. 11. Prophecies concerning Christ divided into the sufferings and ensuing glories.
2 Sam. viii. 14, with Acts ii. 30.
Heb. i. 5, also Psalm ii. 7, with Acts xiii. 33.
future glories are apparently again subdivided into those which
concern—

1. The "times of refreshing" and "the times of the resti-
tution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth
of all his holy prophets since the world began."

2. "These days" which "all the prophets from Samuel,
and those which follow after, as many as have spoken, have
likewise foretold." The word "likewise" indicates a time
different from "the restitution of all things," and different
from the period when "Christ should suffer." "These
days," therefore, must be the days in which the apostle was
speaking, and which will continue whilst "the heavens
receive" the Messiah. The order, therefore, is, first, the
sufferings of Christ which were past when the apostle spoke;
next, "these days," which had commenced when the apostle
was speaking, and will continue whilst Christ is in the
heavens; and, lastly, the times of refreshing or of restitution,
which will then arrive. This last state is the only one which I am called upon to notice.

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord."

The Christ having suffered, Peter announces, that, upon the supposition of Israel having turned to the Lord, another state of things would have ensued, called "the times of refreshing . . . from the presence of the Lord." Now, bearing in mind the state in which the church then was,—the Spirit visibly, powerfully, miraculously present, and all the believers of one heart and one soul—this must give us a very elevated view of a state so much beyond this as to be called "times of refreshing." For, clearly the expression is not suitable to denote simply the extension of the church, it intimates altogether a different state of things.

The prophet of the captivity promised to Israel, in the name of the Lord, saying, "I will make them, and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his season; there shall be showers of blessings." Then shall "the Plant of renown" be raised up for Israel; he, whom their sweet Psalmist also declared should "come down as rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth." This language poetically describes "a time of refreshing," nature starting, as it were, into new life.

These "times of refreshing" being spoken of as contingent upon the repentance of Israel, I apprehend that the Israelites will be principally interested in them, though the blessing will overflow to the Gentiles, as the apostle of the Gentiles intimates.

These "times of refreshing" are to "come from the presence of the Lord," his presence diffusing blessedness upon those who have repented and turned to him, as "everlasting destruction" will come "from the presence of the
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Lord" "on them that know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," a "cloud and darkness" to some, but light and salvation to others. These "times of refreshing" appear preliminary to the actual descent* of Messiah upon this earth, as the following words intimate:—

"And he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached Acts iii. 30.
unto you."

Jesus Christ was "preached before" in the second chapter, but how? Not as having a spiritual reign for ever in heaven, not as returning to this earth in the moment of nature's final groan, but as the Christ, who, it was promised to David, should be raised up to sit upon David's throne.

Now, when the inspired apostle says there shall be times of refreshing, and Jesus Christ shall come, and shall sit upon David's throne, the question is, what sense the expressions chosen by infinite wisdom would convey to those addressed? Were we to say that the Jews, in consequence of their carnal notions of Messiah's kingdom, had misunderstood these truths, we might be charging God foolishly, for they did not, as in the case of Messiah's sufferings, perversely refuse to receive the literal import of the words; but, on the contrary, the plain meaning of the words is that which they did take, and which I contend they ought to have adopted. But, I ask, would the multitude have less material notions

* The author of the Retrospect distinguishes between the Revelation, the Presence, and the Appearing, of Jesus Christ. I have been led to consider the revelation and the presence as parts of the coming. Mr. Gillson points out, very properly, that there is much to be accomplished between the resurrection of the saints, and their peaceable establishment with Christ in His kingdom. The order of events would be an inquiry of much nicety: it will be seen that I suppose the destruction of the wicked and the times of refreshing will be whilst the Lord is present, but before his descent to the earth with his saints, His throne must be established on the earth; and when the saints shall descend Rev. xx. the wicked shall have been consumed, for they will be as ashes under the soles of their feet. Mal. iv. 3.
than the apostles, whom Jesus had been so long teaching? They came to the matter-of-fact idea of a kingdom restored to Israel, and therefore, in some respects at least, similar to the kingdom which Israel formerly enjoyed. What shall I say? Did they understand the throne of David to be a kind of aetherial negation? or, did they expect yet to see Jerusalem "the city of the Great King?"

But this coming of Jesus Christ, which is spoken of as having been contingent upon the conversion of Israel, may, by some, be supposed not a literal personal coming, but a coming in spirit, the following words however do, to my mind, carry conviction:

"Whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things."

In whatever sense the heavens receive Jesus, in that same sense will he come again, in the times of refreshing; indeed there seems a complete parallelism between the two expressions. Until "the times of refreshing" Jesus will not be sent, which is tantamount to the heavens receiving Jesus "until the times of the restitution of all things." And, as Jesus will be sent upon the times of refreshing, coming from the presence of the Lord, the times of refreshing and times of restitution are equally connected with the coming of the Lord; the times of refreshing, therefore, which were promised upon the conversion of the Jews, were to be when the heavens would no longer retain the personal bodily presence of Jesus.

The restitution of all things is to be about the same time as the subjugation of Christ's enemies, because the one limits his session on the throne of God, and the other denotes the period of his leaving the heavens. They are in fact the same truth stated positively and negatively, for, as all things were very good as they came from the hands of their Creator, when all shall be restored, there shall be no enemies of Christ unsubdued.
But where is this restitution to be? Surely in the very field which has been deteriorated by sin: heaven has nothing to be restored—hell is performing the office for which it was prepared—but as the earth has been deteriorated, so the earth shall be renewed.

These considerations would rather lead to the conclusion that "the restitution of all things" is not to be limited to the Jews. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that Peter had in his mind what our Lord had told him should take place previous to the advent of Messiah—"Elias truly cometh first and restoreth all things." With respect to the "all things," the restitution of which is proper to the ministry of Elias, so far I should suppose the Jews to be primarily, if not exclusively interested. And there are other restorations promised, in language limited to Israel:—"The Lord shall comfort Zion, He will comfort all her waste places, and He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord."

But there are other passages which do not limit the restitution of all things to Israel: thus the viiiith Psalm takes up the language originally referring to the first Adam, and applies it to his antitype, and we may be sure the dominion will be as extensive as that originally conferred upon our first parent. In short, "the restitution of all things" implies that all things will be brought back to their original condition. Eden, it is true, was then in a different state from the rest of the earth over which Adam was given dominion; he was to dress and keep the garden, but he had to subdue and replenish the earth. Jerusalem shall be as Eden; the rest of the earth may perhaps be brought to a state still capable of improvement.
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GOD'S PURPOSE TO DWELL UPON EARTH.

"Grant, O Lord, that . . . we may steadfastly look up to heaven, and, by faith, behold the glory which shall be revealed."

Collect for St. Stephen's Day.

IMMEDIATELY after the deluge the prophecy of Noah was uttered; which, according to the Jews, bears a different interpretation from that commonly given by us Gentiles. The prediction was occasioned by the misconduct of Ham, and the correct behaviour of his two brothers; upon which a curse was pronounced upon Canaan and a blessing upon Shem and Japheth, the words of which are generally understood to announce, that Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and are interpreted as indicative of the extensive colonization of the Europeans in the east. But instead of being a blessing upon the two brothers, this would rather be a prediction of the superiority of one over the other; for, although by saying that God was the God of Shem, there is all blessing pronounced by implication, yet there is no distinct mention of any blessing. I, therefore, understand verse 27 to run in this manner: "God shall dwell in the tents of Shem;* and Canaan shall be a servant to them."

* The Chaldee paraphrase says, "God's shekinah shall inhabit the tabernacle of Shem." So Bishop Newton observes, "God shall enlarge (not persuade) Japheth, and shall (i. e. God shall) dwell in the tents of Shem." "This," says he, "seems to have the authority of the original."
This prediction thus understood is reiterated, both in typical and prophetic language, down to the close of Revelation. Rev. xxi. 3. I will first examine the types, inquiring primarily into what was prefigured, and next into when and where it shall be accomplished.

Apparently there were two distinct symbols denoting the abiding presence of the Divine Majesty: the pillar of the cloud, and the thick cloud in which the glory dwelt between the Cherubim. Either of these is sometimes called a cloud, but their distinction may be observed; for instance, the "thick cloud" in which Jehovah declared He would appear, Ex. xix. 9. is not the cloudy pillar, but "the thick darkness where God was," when He descended to the mount; the same cloud, Ex. xx. 21. probably, as that which covered the mount, when the glory of Jehovah tabernacled upon Mount Sinai; that which Ex. xxiv. 16. covered the mercy seat, and in which he said God would Lev. xvi. 2. appear.

This cloud seems to have denoted that manifestation 1 Kings viii. 10,11. which is designated "The Glory of Jehovah;" as, for example, when the temple was dedicated "the cloud filled the house," which was the Glory of Jehovah. Once, however, before the tabernacle was built "the Glory of Jehovah" Ex. xvi. 10. is said to have appeared in the cloud.

There appears to have been considerable difference with The cloudy pillar. respect to the circumstances attached to these two symbols; the cloudy pillar was visible to all, during the whole of their migrations in the wilderness, but the appearance of the glory was only upon a special occasion, or to a favoured individual. Yet, both appear to have denoted the abiding presence of the Divine Majesty. Respecting the cloudy pillar it is said "Jehovah went before them in a pillar of a cloud;" Jehovah fought for Israel by the pillar going behind Ex. xiii. 21. them, and by Jehovah looking through the cloud and troubling the Egyptians. Language which plainly denotes a personal presence, and effects flowing from it; and, in one
instance, the cloudy pillar descended and talked with Moses, which is mentioned as one of the highest privileges of the Decalogue.

The thick cloud. But, if the cloudy pillar denoted the Divine Majesty, the other symbol, to which generally much more awe was attached, must evidently do so likewise. The Glory of Jehovah tabernacled upon the mount, and gave directions to Moses about building a sanctuary, in order that he might dwell among the children of Israel; then, undoubtedly, there was a real manifestation of the presence of Jehovah. We must, therefore, suppose that there was a real abiding in the sanctuary; in accordance with which God said that he would meet and commune with Moses. Again, the shew-bread was before him, the names of Israel were borne before him, fire proceeded from him, and Aaron was not to enter the most holy, except upon a certain day, and in a particular manner, lest he should die, because Jehovah said that he would appear in the cloud on the mercy-seat. In fine, the tabernacle was called the tabernacle of meeting, just because God would there meet with his people.

These expressions then clearly appear to denote the manifestation of the Divine Majesty; and it being admitted as a universal law, that whatever the symbols denoted is more glorious in the antitype, we must consider that the highest manifestation of the Divine presence is indicated.

The place to which we must look for the antitype is our next inquiry. The wilderness state seems to have typified the condition of the whole church during this dispensation; not only those militant, whose temptations and trials, St. Paul says, were so prefigured, but also the invisible state where the spirits of the just are now tabernacled; for the earthly tabernacle, according to the same apostle, was a pattern and subindication of heavenly things, whilst the holiest of all denoted heaven itself.

The cloudy pillar was not in the tabernacle, but was the
guide of those who were marching through the wilderness; we must then, during this dispensation, look to the church on earth for the antitype to the cloudy pillar; but, as the abiding place of the cloud of glory, was the holiest of all, we must, during this dispensation, look to heaven itself for the substance of that symbol.

The initiation into the Mosaic rites through the cloud and sea seems from 1 Cor. x. 2. to correspond with the entrance into the kingdom of heaven, by being born of water and the Spirit. Again, He, whom the Israelites disobeyed, went in the cloudy pillar, but they rebelled and vexed God’s Holy Spirit. Jehovah in the cloudy pillar, therefore, corresponds with the Spirit of Jehovah who now guides the church.

Now, we must not lose sight of our privileges; in the present dispensation there is not merely a spiritual presence but a personal presence of the Spirit in the church, an indwelling in believers beyond what formerly was, and which more than compensates for the loss of the personal presence of the blessed Lord himself.

Nor will it be difficult to fix upon the antitype to the cloud of glory, for the Most Holy indicated heaven itself, where Christ has entered to appear openly in the presence of God for us; and it will not be denied that Christ is actually and literally in the presence of the Divine Majesty.

We have then learned what was indicated by the cloudy pillar, and the cloud of glory; the latter especially denoting the highest possible manifestation of the Divine presence, which, with respect to the God-man, we should call personal and bodily, and, with respect to the Father, we can only describe it to be such as is now displayed in heaven itself, denoting what scripture styles “the presence of God.”

We have also learned where, during this dispensation, the persons dwell, who were symbolized by the cloudy pillar and the cloud of glory. But a state of rest for the church was also intimated, and we must now enter into the inquiry as to where the place of rest shall be.
CHAPTER XIV.

When God said to the children of Israel, "And I will set my tabernacle among you, and my soul shall not abhor you, and I will walk among you, and will be your God and ye shall be my people;" this could not have been understood of the tabernacle just erected, for the greater blessing here promised depended upon God's earthly tabernacle being reverenced; therefore the glorious presence must have been intended. And when God said that he would set his tabernacle among the Israelites, we cannot understand it of the saints tabernacling in heaven, for this would be to reverse the gracious language of the Lord; moreover, the promises which accompany it clearly denote a state upon earth: "Your threshing shall reach unto the sowing time, and ye shall eat your bread to the full and dwell in your land safely." What could have been expected, but that the prophecy would be fulfilled to Israel, according to the triumphant song of Moses, "Thou shalt bring them" (the people thou hast purchased) "in and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, [in] the place, O Jehovah, [which] thou hast made for thee to dwell in, [in] the sanctuary, Adonai, [which] thy hands have established: Jehovah shall reign for ever and ever." There is, then, a place upon earth which Jehovah has made in order for himself to dwell in; one not made with human hands, but by the hands of God himself, and apparently the place in which Jehovah will reign for ever; for this seems the connexion—"the sanctuary, Adonai, [which] thy hands have established, [in which] Jehovah shall reign for ever and ever." Now, as in the earthly sanctuary there was a seeing, face to face, and a direct speaking by Jehovah to his servant, so will there again be a seeing "eye to eye," and "face to face;" we must expect, in short, a manifestation of Jehovah upon earth, as full as the creature is capable of receiving.

The Glory in the temple.
1 Kings vi. 13.

Ex. xvi. 17, 18.

Ex. xxxiii. 9—11.
Num. vii. 20, 24.
14.

Isa. liii. 8, Ezek. xx. 35.

When he, whose reign typified the glories of Messiah's kingdom, built a house for the Lord "to abide in for ever,"
and when the Glory of Jehovah had filled the house of the Lord, Solomon asks, "But will God indeed dwell on the earth?" implying that something was expected upon the earth more glorious than the manifestation of the Divine presence which they then had. This expectation was kept up by the prophets, both before and after the destruction of the temple; so Joel says, "Fear not, O Lord! be glad and rejoice: for Jehovah will do great things for you;" which he crowns by saying, "And ye shall know, that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am Jehovah your God, and none else." This he repeats: "So shall ye know, that I am Jehovah your God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain;" and he concludes by saying, "Judah shall abide (margin) for ever; and Jerusalem from generation to generation; for I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed: for Jehovah dwelleth in Zion:" which I thus understand, "Judah," the people, "shall abide for ever;" "for I will cleanse their blood which I have not cleansed;" "and Jerusalem," the place, "shall abide from generation to generation;" "for Jehovah dwelleth in Zion;" the dwelling of Jehovah in Zion is the cause of its abiding. The same is said in Psalm xlvi. 5, "God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved." And Isaiah, speaking of the cleansing of Jerusalem from her blood, adds, in allusion to the type, "And Jehovah will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all, the Glory shall be a defence." This, as I have already noticed, is "the excellent Glory" which was over the Lord when he shewed forth his "power and coming." There seems a similar promise in Zec. ii. 5, "I, saith Jehovah, will be unto her (Jerusalem) a wall of fire round about, and will be the Glory in the midst of her."

The expression with respect to the removal of the ark is very remarkable: "When the ark set forward . . . Moses Num. x. 35, 36. said, 'Rise up, Jehovah, and let thine enmists be scattered;"
and let them that hate thee flee before thee." This language is applied, in the lxviiiith Psalm, to the ascension of Christ; but when the ark rested, [Moses] said, "Return, O Jehovah, unto the many thousands of Israel." This is worthy of notice; for, when the ark set forward, it could not be said to leave Israel; the language seems to be more adapted to the antitype than to the type; and, as the former clause is, in the Psalms, applied to the ascension of Christ,

Ps. cxxxii. 8, 12, 14.

so this latter is to his return: "Arise, O Jehovah, into thy rest; thou and the ark of thy strength . . . for Jehovah hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation; this is my rest for ever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it."

Jer. iii. 16, 17.

Jeremiah expressly marks the distinction between the ark of the covenant, as a type, and the future much more glorious antitype: "In those days they shall say no more, 'the ark of the covenant of Jehovah,' neither shall it come to mind; neither shall it be magnified; (margin) at that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of Jehovah." The circumstances of this prophecy are also remarkable; it was addressed to Israel, who were already removed from the land and was given shortly before those judgments commenced on Judah, which ended in their captivity. It was not fulfilled after the return from Babylon, for they then had not even the symbols of "the Glory;" nor has it been accomplished during this dispensation of the Spirit; for the peculiar feature of this dispensation is, that there is no pre-eminence given to Jerusalem. Worship is not confined to Zion, but can be offered everywhere alike. Lastly, as by the other member of the comparison, "the" literal "ark of the covenant" is clearly intended, so must we receive literally the explicit declaration, that Jerusalem shall be the "Throne of the Lord."

John iv. 21.

These passages warrant our receiving similar language in the prophets in their literal acceptation. The song of triumph, Isaiah xii., concludes with "Cry out and shout

Isa. xii. 6.
thou inhabitant of Zion, for great is the Holy one of Israel in the midst of thee." This appears parallel with the close of the prophecy in chap. xxiv.: "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed; when Jehovah of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem and before his ancients gloriously." Hence Jerusalem is called "the city of the Great King," a designation which it had not lost when the sceptre had departed from Judah; its right to the title, we must, therefore, conclude still remains, and must refer to that time, yet future, when "the kingdom shall be Obadiah, ver. 21. the Lord's;" when Jehovah will reign in Mount Zion from henceforth even for ever."

Now, as the Israelites, in seeking a human being for their king, rejected Jehovah that "he should not reign over them," we are led to conclude that when it is declared Jehovah shall again reign over Israel, it must be understood in opposition to any merely human king—that, therefore, there will be, as before, a direct interference in the affairs of the nation by the suspension of second causes with, moreover, a manifestation of the presence of God, and a local habitation for his name.

Now, all these promises, namely, the donation of the land to Abraham's seed, and yet Jehovah's possessing it for him—Lev. xxv. 23. self—David's seed—sitting upon his throne, and yet Jehovah himself reigning in Zion, in contradistinction to any merely human king—can only be realized in the person of Jehovah, and by his being "made of the seed of David according to the flesh," and thus becoming "the son of David, the son of Abraham." Hence we find, that he who shall sit upon Matt. 1. 1. David's throne is "the mighty God," or "God the mighty man," David's righteous branch, and yet Jehovah our Isa. xi. 5, 6. Righteousness: thus, when Jehovah shall be king of Israel, a poor one raised from the dust, will inherit the throne of 1 Sam. ii. 8. Glory.
CHAPTER XV.

DURATION OF CHRIST'S REIGN.

"Whose kingdom shall have no end."

It is universally believed by Christians, that our Lord will return to this earth, with his visible bodily presence, some time or other. The fact of his advent, and the manner of his coming, are indeed most explicitly declared: "This same Jesus, who hath been taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner* as ye have seen Him go into heaven." Perhaps this intimation may also include the place, for, from the Mount of Olives, He ascended, and apparently to the Mount of Olives will He return: "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives,"—that day in which "Jehovah shall be King over all the earth."

The end of Messiah's advent is also acknowledged to be for judgment: God "hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world by a man whom He hath ordained:" but the theatre of Messiah's judgment will also be the place of his reign; this we learn from the same text which we have already considered: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, . . . then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations."

Now "whatsoever is not read [in Holy Scripture], nor

* "The going is to be the model of the coming."—Vaughan.
may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith.” As, oth Article. therefore, all acknowledge that Jesus will return to this earth, it rests with those who say that He will again leave it to prove their assertion. This leads me to consider the duration of Messiah’s reign.

As we have seen that this earth will be the place of Christ’s kingdom, my first inquiry must be as to the continuance of the planet itself; for if that be limited, it would of course put a period to the reign upon the earth.

In Ecclesiastes, the abiding nature of the earth is contrasted with the fleeting of the generations upon it: “[One] generation passeth away, and [another] generation cometh; but the earth abideth for ever.” Again, the stable manner in which the temple was built is compared to the durability of the earth, in the following language: “He built his sanctuary like high [palaces], like the earth, which He hath established for ever.” Again, the eternal immutability of the earth is brought forward as an instance of the mighty power of God, “[who] laid the foundations of the earth [that] it should not be removed for ever.” So the Lord confirms the unchangeableness of his purposes of love and mercy to Israel, by comparing it with his immutable ordinances respecting the durability of the heavens and earth. “Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves roar, the Lord of hosts is his name; If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, [then] the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever.” Again, “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.” If this argument were drawn out syllogistically, it would be as follows: Israel shall remain as long as the earth endures; the earth
shall endure for ever; therefore Israel shall endure for ever. Hence, if the argument for the perpetuity of Israel be good for anything, it must pre-suppose and establish the eternity of the earth.

The last instance which I shall quote assumes, as a matter of course, that the earth shall abide for ever, assigning it as a reason why Israel should be saved with an everlasting salvation: "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end; for thus saith the Lord that created the heavens, God himself that formed the earth and made it; He hath established it, He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited: I am Jehovah, and there is none else."

But is it not said that the heavens and earth shall perish? Yes, but the following verse explains the manner thereof, for it is added, "and they shall be changed." As far, then, as the earth is concerned, there is no necessary limit to the perpetuity of Messiah's reign.

I now proceed to the direct proof in support of the eternal duration of Christ's reign upon earth. From Psalm xlv., as applied in the Hebrews, we learn that one of the great marks of Christ's superiority, is the eternity of his throne: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever:" this we have already seen is the subordinate throne. Again, we are told that "his throne shall be as the days of heaven," that "his throne shall endure as the sun," that it is "everlasting."

But some one using the arguments of the universalist may say, that there is no positive expression for eternity in Scripture. To this I reply, that the duration of Messiah's kingdom is not only mentioned positively, but is also accompanied with expressions of a negative form: "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it... from henceforth, even for ever;" to which the
angel Gabriel appears to allude, saying, "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." So the kingdom which the saints shall receive when sitting upon his throne "cannot be moved," for "his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." If Christ's kingdom, which Daniel says shall be "for ever," were only to endure for a thousand years, it would not exist half so long as those transient dynasties, to which its perpetuity is opposed by the prophet. This can never be: no, Christ's kingdom is as durable as his glory; limit the one, and you restrict the other; for they alike shall be "for ever and ever."

Now, how can these two passages of Scripture be met? The only method which I have heard millennarians attempt, is, by saying that at the end of the thousand years, Christ would resign David's throne, and that the reign of God as "All in all" denotes the kingdom of the undivided Trinity, in which Christ will reign for ever. In that case Christ would not resign the kingdom to the Father, any more than He would resign it to himself or to the Holy Spirit; but the Scripture says expressly that He is to deliver the kingdom to the Father. Moreover Christ would not become subject by resigning the kingdom, but exactly the reverse; by resigning the kingdom He would cease to be subject and become co-ordinate, which is directly contrary to Scripture. Again, Jesus would not reign for ever on the throne of David any more than the Father or the Holy Spirit. All these difficulties seem to flow from the supposition that the reign of God "All in all" denotes the kingdom of the undivided Trinity.

I will conclude this chapter with reference to a passage embracing all the points which I have been urging. Upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet, voices in heaven say, "The kingdoms of this world are become [the kingdom]
of our Lord and of his Christ." The kingdoms of this world do, then, at a fixed moment become the kingdom of Messiah; we are, therefore, to expect, not a gradual amelioration, but a sudden transition.

According to the same text, the establishment of the kingdom of the Father upon earth will be coincident with the commencement of the reign of Messiah; these kingdoms, therefore, are not in succession. This, according to the view which I have advocated, harmonizes perfectly; for Messiah resigns the kingdom to the Father when He ascends his own throne as the Lord's anointed. The kingdoms of the world, at the same time, become the kingdoms of Jehovah supremely, and of the Messiah subordinately.

Scarlett, it is true, gives another turn to Rev. xi. 15: "The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdom of our Lord, even Messiah himself." And I must admit that the expression "our Lord" is not in any other part of the New Testament applied to the Father, but quite the reverse; for it is said in contradistinction to the Father, that to us "There is one Lord Jesus Christ." According to this rendering, the clause would only support the eternity of Messiah's reign; for it continues, "And He," that is, Messiah himself, "shall reign to the ages of the ages." It amounts, however, to the same thing, for in the seventeenth verse, the twenty-four elders say, "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art and wast and art to come, because thou hast taken to thee thy great power and hast reigned." From which we learn that upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the Father takes his power, which, therefore, He did not previously exercise, having delegated all power, both in heaven and in earth, to the Son; this establishes the doctrine of Christ's present co-ordination and future subordination.

We also learn from this passage, that at the period at
which God takes to himself his power, the time commences for judging the dead, and rewarding the prophets and saints, and those that fear God's name, both small and great; and lastly, for destroying the destroyers of the earth, or the living wicked. Here, then, in the order of narration, the judgment of the dead precedes the rewarding of any class of God's servants; nor can we understand the rewarding of the prophets and saints as exegetical of judging the dead, the two being in direct opposition, for Christ's people come not into judgment, but have passed from death unto life.

The way in which Mede, and I suppose others, would avoid the inevitable conclusion from the passage is by asserting that the seventh trumpet continues during the whole of the thousand years, and that therefore the four living creatures give thanks for what shall happen under the seventh trumpet, though it would be a thousand years after the second advent of Christ. But this is an unavailing subterfuge, for at the same time that the kingdoms become the kingdom of God, they also become the kingdom of Christ: so that if we defer the kingdom of God we equally postpone the reign of Messiah. The point which I maintain is, that when Christ enters into his proper kingdom, that then the Father takes to himself his great power and reigns; but the common millenarian view makes these two kingdoms to be in succession; first, Christ's kingdom during the millennium, and subsequently, his resignation of that kingdom to the Father.

Again, in chapter x. 7, it is said, that "in the days of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished. "The mystery of God" may be understood of a mystery hid in God, or of the mystery concerning God, which latter I believe correct, for I see no warrant for any mystery hid in God being called "the mystery of God"; but the expression understood as "the mystery of God" subjectively appears directly supported by
Col. ii. 2, and is, in fact, just that which is related in Rev. xi.; which, in one word, is the manifestation of the eternal relations which are to subsist between God and Christ, and the development of God's counsels with regard both to the Church and the Jews.

Thus answerable to the two dispensations, there are, according to Scripture, two reigns in which Messiah participates; one with the Father, the other with the brethren; one supreme in power, but limited in continuance; the other circumscribed in authority, but unceasing in duration: the co-ordinate rule is during this dispensation; the subordinate kingdom shall be established at the second advent of Christ to judge the world; its commencement, therefore, will be contemporaneous with the resurrection from the dead: and concerning this period of glory, all the prophets, since the world began, have written.

The present, then, is the age of expectation; the next will be the dispensation of consummation. Now, the creatures are expecting—the Church is expecting—Christ is expecting; but when the seventh trumpet shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished; the mystery of God's transactions, the mystery in God's relations: the mystery of God's transactions. in Israel's restoration, the Church's transformation, and iniquity's prostration.

Again, the mystery of the assumed* relations in Deity—

* This is Mr. Vaughan's term. If admissible, I should prefer to use "ordinate," with reference to the previous chapters on co-ordination.

Seeing that the humanity of our Lord will never be either annihilated or deified, it clearly appears to me that the complex person "Christ" must ever be in an assumed relation towards the Father, for the essential relation which the one nature bears, is opposite to that essential relation which the other sustains. Co-ordination must be an assumed relation with respect to the humanity, subordination may be compatible with co-essentiality, but to the extent which I apprehend Scripture contemplates, subordination will be an assumed relation by the Word.—See the chapter on Millenarianism.
styled in Colossians, "the mystery both of the Father and of Christ," will be "finished,"—not terminated, but consummated. That relation between the Father and Christ will be developed, which will continue, thenceforth, to all eternity. The man, now not subject to Deity, yet sinless—without blasphemy, dwelling in light inaccessible, which no man can approach—will then become subordinate, by being exalted in glory of his own,—resigning the kingdom, He assumes his throne. All creation being gathered together in Him, Christ ceases to be "all in all!"

Ephes. i. 10. 
1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

I here close the outline of the doctrine respecting Messiah’s kingdom. The chapters which follow are intended either to meet objections and difficulties which may be supposed to attach to the doctrine in general, or to the particular view which I advocate; as also to point out objections to some points in detail from which I differ.
CHAPTER XVI.

MANIFESTATION OF THE FATHER'S GLORY.

"Mercifully grant that we which know thee now by faith, may after this life have the fruition of thy glorious Godhead."—Collect for Epiphany.

The opinion that Messiah will sit for ever upon the throne of David may startle some, perhaps, even of those who do await his second advent, to reign for a limited period upon this earth. This arises probably from its being supposed to involve a local separation, to all eternity, from the manifestation of the Father's glory.

Were this supposition well founded, considerable repugnance to the view might justly be felt. Nay, the idea involved in the millennial hypothesis of Christ's leaving God's presence, "where there is fulness of joy," even for the limited period of a thousand years, may be somewhat repulsive; but the view which I advocate avoids even this objection. In explaining myself I shall, however, be obliged to enter into some detail, which I have hitherto purposely avoided.

It is certainly said in Scripture that Christ shall sit upon the throne of David for ever; I therefore believe that He will reign for ever upon this earth. An aërial throne would not be the throne of David; it might be an angelic rule; but in my opinion it would be as great a misnomer to call it the throne of David, as to call Christ's present reign upon
the throne of God the fulfilment of the promise to David. In addition, however, to the plain language of Scripture, some arguments in support of the assertion that the throne of David will actually be on this earth might be urged.

We are told that Gog and Magog, at the close of the thousand years, will encompass the camp of the saints as well as the beloved city; therefore, wherever the camp of the saints will be, there also will be the beloved city.

The term "saints" appears primarily, and properly, to belong to the sanctified from amongst the Jews, which accounts for the distinction which we sometimes find made between saints and faithful brethren, these latter being the called from amongst the Gentiles; the brethren, therefore, are said to be "fellow-citizens with the saints." So Eph. ii. 19. the mystery of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church is "made known unto the saints." The Philipp-ians, who are addressed only as "the saints," are called "the circumcision," in opposition to the unbelieving Jews.* The collection which is made for the saints, is to be taken to Jerusalem; and therefore Paul goes to Jerusalem to minister to the saints, and the Gentiles were their debtors, Rom. xv. 25, 27. having partaken of their spiritual things. There appears, therefore, sufficient warrant for supposing that in the prophecy of St. John, the converted Jews are designated "saints."

The term "camp" in like manner seems especially to refer to the Jewish Church: "Let us go forth without the camp," says the apostle, when urging the Hebrews to leave the pale of the Jewish ordinances, when God was casting off his people; and respecting the future when they will again

* Lydia, the first convert, was probably a Jewess, as she resorted to the place where prayer was wont to be made on "the Sabbath-day." (Acts xvi. 13.) The jailor, however, in all likelihood, was not a Jew. (Acts xvi. 34.)
be in favour, it is promised in the prophets that Jerusalem shall be “a tabernacle which shall not be taken down.” The camp of the saints I therefore understand to be the national conversion of Israel.

What, then, is the beloved city from which it is contradistinguished, with which, however, “the camp of the saints,” is connected, for Gog encompasses both together?

Scripture appears to speak of no beloved city but one; namely, “the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem;” “the city of God, New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven;” “the city which hath foundations,” for which Abraham looked; “the Zion” which Jehovah hath desired for his habitation, in which He will rest for ever. This can be nothing else than the Bride, or those gathered during the suffering dispensation, built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets.

Now the camp of the saints, the national conversion of Israel, will be upon this earth when attacked by Gog; then how will the nations of the earth attack the city, if it be not upon the earth also? How could the kings of the earth “bring their glory and honour into it,” were it not upon earth? Jerusalem, in plain language, is called “the city of the great king,” which therefore attaches a character of sacredness to it; but a city in the air could not have been intended by our Lord, or understood by his hearers.

Yet I do not believe that there will be a local separation from “the presence of God,” because there appears abundant ground for considering that the manifestation of the glory of the Father will be on this planet also.

When considering the account of the transfiguration as foreshowing the glory of Messiah’s kingdom, we learned that there was a display of “the excellent glory” whence the voice of the Father proceeded; for this was a prefiguration of the glory not only of the Messiah, but of “the Son
of man coming in the glory of his Father." The Jews thereafter "shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven;" there will then be a manifestation of the glory of the Father's power at the second advent; as also appears intimated in Daniel, where the Ancient of Days gives the kingdom to the Son of man. Thus the Lamb is different from the sitter upon the throne, who will dwell among, or rather "upon" those who come out of great tribulation, the expression vividly alluding to the shekinah as the type.

It is also very observable how God's promise of dwelling with his people is constantly connected with being God to his people; for example, "I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God;" apparently, indeed, these promises are identified—"My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people." One also is used as illustrative of the other, "God himself shall be with them, their God." The knowledge of the presence of God with, and of this, his relation to his people, is connected, "And ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, and none else." The two promises therefore appear inseparable; nay, more, they probably are synonymous, for being God to any one implies the highest manifestation of Jehovah in love, of which the creature is capable; and that must be realised by the creature being in the presence of God where there is "fulness of joy."

Now it is the Father, and not the Son, who reveals himself in the relation of God to his people, for it is by their being one with Christ that the Church is elevated to that relationship. Jesus saith, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." Therefore the apostle says, "To us there is one God the Father," in contradistinction to our blessed Saviour, who is in the peculiar relation of "Lord." And we must not change the
promise of God's being with his people, into one of their
being with God; for it is upon the descent of the Bride
from heaven that there is the note of wonder; not "Beh-
hold the tabernacle of men is with God," but "Behold!
the tabernacle of God is with men."

Moreover, as God will not be actually in the relation of
God to Abraham, and to those who will be blessed with
faithful Abraham, until after the resurrection: so neither
can the dwelling of God among his people, inseparable from
that promise, take place until the same period.

This leads me to mention a view which I believe to be
probable. We know that the tabernacle was a pattern and
sub-indication of heavenly things, and one part of the
tabernacle appears to have typified the state of things in
heaven itself, where Christ has entered, "to appear in the
presence of God for us." But this heavenly scene is to
descend to this planet, when the earth shall have under-
gone the necessary purification by fire; for it is declared
that the tabernacle of God shall be with men. However,
that which shall descend does not appear to be the antitype
to the whole of the typical tabernacle, but only to one part,
namely, the most Holy, where Christ has entered within the
veil, and into which all who are called during this dispen-
sation have liberty of access. Thus the New Jerusalem,
which shall descend, is a cube; so was the most holy—it is
described as composed of gold and precious stones; so was
the most holy lined with gold and garnished with precious
stones—but above all, there will be the Shekinah, the pre-
sence of the glory of God, and therefore it is that the city
is called "The Holy (Place) of the tabernacles of the Most
High."

But if the most Holy corresponds with the heavenly
Jerusalem where God dwells, what did the Holy place
signify? This, I conceive, answers to the "Camp of the
saints," or the national conversion of Israel; for God has
promised, "I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore; my tabernacle shall be with them." Ezek. xxxvii. 26. Now from this it appears that God's sanctuary and his tabernacle are not precisely the same, the one term being, apparently, more comprehensive than the other, the sanctuary answering to the Most Holy Place. If, then, God's glory is in the New Jerusalem, as the Most Holy, and yet his sanctuary is in the midst of Israel, the Church of Israel will apparently have the relation to the mystical bride, that the Holy Place had to the Most Holy.

But perhaps the expression, "The camp of the saints," leads us to look for the type in the tabernacle of the wilderness, rather than in the Holy Place of the temple. Possibly the national conversion of Israel will not, in the first instance, be altogether in the same permanent state as the Beloved City; for which reason Jerusalem may be called a tabernacle, though, considered as a whole, it is "a tabernacle which shall not be taken down." Then, when things are in this state, will be fulfilled the 1xxvith Psalm, which speaks of God's tabernacle being in Salem, (the nether city,) and his dwelling-place being in Zion, (the upper city,) or the Jerusalem which is [now] above, the mother of us all. This accounts also for the peculiar phraseology in Gal. iv. 26. Isaiah xxx. 18, 19, "All they that wait for Him . . . shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem," Zion being the heavenly city which shall descend to the locality of Jerusalem.

But in addition to the Holy and Most Holy places, there was the court of the Gentiles, which may correspond with "The nations of the saved," who walk in the light of the New Jerusalem, and who will go up yearly to Jerusalem "to worship the king the Lord of Hosts." Zec. xiv. 16.

Thus the whole condition of "the world to come" was typified by the tabernacle of Moses; and perhaps this is intimated in the Mosaic worship being styled the rudiments or elements of the world; surely it was not the rudiments of the old
world, though it may be so of the new; and to this perhaps the expression of the "worldly sanctuary" refers. The Church having now entered, by anticipation, into the new creation, the Mosaical ordinances are but weak and beggarly.

This also may be the reason why, in the prophets, the laying of the foundation of the new heavens and earth, and the establishing of Zion, are connected, if not identified:

"To plant* the heavens, and to found the earth; and to say to Zion, thou art my people."

Now I do not advance all this as certain, but merely as probable; yet not from idle curiosity, but to meet objections which I have heard urged against different parts of the general view advanced in this book. For example: How can it be affirmed that there will be no more death, until after Gog and Magog shall be destroyed; and though we do expect a period of great blessedness as compared with the present, yet during that time "sinners being a hundred years old shall be accursed."

I answer, that we must discriminate between the different states and conditions of men, that there will be on earth, during the first thousand years of Messiah's reign. I do not say that there will be no liability to death among any of the conditions of men upon earth during the period commonly called the millennium, but that death, as an enemy of Christ, will be put under his feet. Those who attain the world to come, by the resurrection, among them there will be no death; death shall have no more dominion over them; when Christ's saints shall be raised, then death shall be swallowed up in victory. To this class Rev. xxi. 4

* "The heavens, conceived of as a tent, —a metaphor not unusual with the sacred writers. It signifies to plant, in the sense of fixing or driving into the ground the pins or pegs to which the cords of a tent are fastened." — Henderson.
refers: There will be no more curse in the New Jerusalem, "but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it;" Rev. xxii. 5. and as there will be no curse, so there can be no death among Christ's people.

Yet death may still exist in subjection to Christ, by sinners being cut off from the national conversion of Israel; to such a possible occurrence Isaiah lxv. 20 seems to refer: Isaiah lxv. 20. "There shall be no more thence," or "from thence," i.e. Jerusalem, (ver. 19,) "an infant of days, nor an old man who hath not filled his days;" this clearly appears to denote a blessed condition and a state of great longevity: the following words, I apprehend, are not intended to give a contrary idea, but to amplify what had been said, "For the child shall die a hundred years old, but the sinner (being) a hundred years old, shall be accursed." I understand them to imply that, suppose such a rare occurrence as one of Israel dying at a hundred years of age, as to his years he would be regarded as a child, but as to his condition he would be accursed. This would be in accordance with the nature of a theocracy, so at least it was under the Mosaic economy. To this state of things I alluded when I said the national conversion of Israel appeared not in the first instance to be in the same permanent condition as the Bride. It refers to the same time as Jeremiah xxxi. 29, 30, "In those days" when Israel shall be under the new covenant, "they shall say no more the fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children's teeth are set on edge; but every one shall die for his own iniquity."

According to this view, the verse in Isaiah is consistent with the following context: "For as the days of the tree [are] the days of my people."* So that those who are God's people—God's elect ones of the national conversion of Israel,

* According to the Septuagint, "the tree" is "the tree of life," but the parallelism seems decidedly against this view:
or their descendants—will not die, only the sinners will be accursed, "every one shall die for his own iniquity;" longevity is the promised boon, if not forfeited by personal transgression.

That there will be these two different states of man upon earth, besides the condition of the nations, appears highly probable, from our comparing the Lord's answer to the Sadducees with Isaiah lix. 21, and lxv. 28, those who attain the age to come, and the resurrection from the dead, do not marry, but are similar to the angels; but the nation of Israel will have seed, and seed's seed.

I have now only to throw out a few conjectures with regard to the nations or Gentiles who will not previously have heard of the fame of Jehovah, or seen his glory, but who will be joined to the Lord after the glorious appearing of Jesus Christ.

An election of individuals out of all nations characterizes the present dispensation, as contra-distinguished both from the former, which consisted in an elect nation—whilst God winked at the ignorance of the Gentiles—and from the future dispensation, when apparently God will not only deal with Israel as a nation, but with the Gentiles also as nations. "Many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day;" "The nations of them which are saved shall

"And they shall build houses and inhabit [them];
And they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them.
They shall not build and another inhabit;
They shall not plant and another eat:
For as the days of the tree [shall be] the days of my people;
And mine elect shall wear out the works of their hands."

Here the first, third, and sixth lines correspond: so also do the second, fourth, and fifth. They shall not build and another inhabit, for they themselves shall occupy until they wear out the works of their hands; they shall not plant, and another eat the fruit, for their own life shall be as long as that of the tree which they shall plant.
walk in the light of” the New Jerusalem, and at the end of the thousand years “nations” will be deceived.

But what is the nature of a national standing? When nations as nations shall be joined to the Lord, will those nations ever be permitted to apostatize from the Lord? With regard to the people of the Jews—the only example we as yet have had of national election—God has shown himself as unchangeable, as He is to elect individuals gathered during this dispensation. The decision of this question would assist us in our inquiry respecting the nations which shall be deceived at the close of the thousand years.

It is clear that they belong neither to the camp of the saints, nor to the beloved city; they will not be of the national conversion of Israel, nor of the Church gathered out of the nations during the suffering dispensation. But as to who they shall be, whether the descendants of the sixth part of the people who will come up against Israel in the latter days, which their name may seem to indicate—or whether they will be the degenerate descendants of some of those nations which shall have been joined to the Lord—or what their actual condition shall be, whether while restrained from overt acts of sin, they will only yield feigned obedience—or whether sin will be latent but yet unknown, even to themselves, until elicited by Satanic solicitations, I feel it will be wiser to conjecture cautiously than to pronounce confidently. The former supposition seems to have some countenance from Scripture; but it is revealed that the devil shall deceive them at the end of the thousand years, the legitimate inference is that before that time they will not be under the deceptive power of Satan, which seems more suitable to the latter conjecture.

The depth of thought and grandeur of expression which characterize Mr. Vaughan are discernible in what he says on this subject: “In this day, evil is to be restrained by all outward
means, though not counteracted by the alone effective resister, an internal God; that inward energizing being restricted to the twofold Israel already defined. The Adam of "the nations," therefore, is a moral creature left to the exercise of his own inherent powers in an element every way favourable to their wise and lawful use. Man, uninspired man, bearing the yoke of the holy rulers, his benedicters and beatifiers... shall not tempt man; neither shall any other substance which is outside of his own, tempt him. . . . Vestiges of antecedent judgment remaining on all sides of him, peculiar monuments making proclamation in appointed places; . . . the kingdoms of the world shall have become as one garden of Eden, with more than Eden's knowledge, and with a guarantee for its continuance which Eden never had, . . . the Devil, the bringer out of all evil, though not its root and first cause, in the Adam, . . . prohibited from further acts of aggression. . . . The essence of this ameliorated state, then, as respects the earth and the Adam upon it, is, 'Man taught God by all outward means without the intrusion of temptation.'"

It may be objected, that to suppose millennial blessedness disturbed by the re-entrance of sin; and man so blinded and hardened as to rush against the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler, is astounding! True, it may be astounding, it certainly is wonderful. It is wonderful that sin should have originated in heaven, and that the angels in the presence of God should not have kept their first estate. It is wonderful that all the sinning angels were not cast into hell, but that one should be permitted to mar God's good creation and to deface his image in the soul of man. It is wonderful that one man's sin should have plunged millions into misery for thousands of years. These are all wonderful, and all more or less analogous to the fact here revealed.

We may not now see the reason why God will be pleased to permit this fresh display of sin. It may be necessary
towards the manifestation of the unchangeable one, to shew forth the inseparable mutability of the creature when exposed to temptation, though, in other respects, under the most favourable circumstance; it may be conducive to the display of God's wisdom and mercy in dealing with man in his federal head, by shewing how, after all the fearful consequences of sin have been made known; after the stupendous measures necessary for the recovery of man have been brought out into action; that man, placed in all the favourable circumstances of our first parent, with the knowledge of good and evil in addition, will yet, when standing on his own responsibility, act as Adam did, and fall as Adam fell. But, as to what shall be in the future eternal world, we may well say with the apostle,

"How unsearchable are his judgments, how untraceable Rom. xi. 33, 34. his paths! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or, who hath been his counsellor?"

Again, it has been objected that "the wicked one" will not be destroyed until the appearing of Jesus, for he is to be put down or destroyed by the brightness of Christ's 2 Thess. ii. 8. coming; but it is also said that the last enemy that shall be put down or destroyed is death; which will be done by the mortal saints putting on immortality, which, therefore, must be after the destruction of "the wicked one," and after Christ has left heaven. How, then, can it be said, as I have insisted, that Christ is not to leave the right hand of the Father until all his enemies shall be made subject?

I answer, that leaving heaven, and leaving the right hand of the Father, are not the same. Christ might leave the right hand of God before leaving heaven, or he might leave heaven before leaving the right hand of God; which I believe will be the case, for it is said that the Son of man shall be seen sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven; He, therefore, when revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance upon them that know not
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God, will still be at God's right hand, supreme in power. This agrees with the declaration of Daniel, that it will be the stone and not the mountain which will destroy the image; which I understand to denote that this act of judgment will be by Christ during this dispensation, when the number of the elect shall be complete, but before He has resigned the co-ordinate reign.

Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13.

The same seems intimated in the viith of Daniel. The coming of the kingdom is in the glory of the Father; and the kingdom of the Son of man is subsequently established. Again, respecting "those who sleep in Jesus," it does not simply say "will He bring with Him," which, according to the tenor of the passage, we might expect, but "will God bring with him." God himself will come, and Christ at the right hand of God; thus all the world will see the glory and feel the effects of Christ's co-ordinate reign; the wicked by his being revealed in flaming fire, at the right hand of power, for their destruction; the righteous by their being caught up to meet him in the air. Then will He "resign the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all," "to the glory of God the Father."


Another difficulty, from a different class of objectors has been as follows:—The Son will not surrender the kingdom until all his enemies shall be subjected; but, this cannot be whilst Satan is still loosed and deceiving the nations: the kingdom, therefore, cannot be surrendered until the close of the thousand years.

The question, properly, is not, whether Satan will then be in subjection, but whether he shall have been in subjection. When Satan shall be bound and shut up in prison, he will be in subjection; his being subsequently loosed, to perform a work in the mysterious economy of God, cannot set aside the fact that he will be in subjection for the thousand years.
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The Lord sold the Israelites into the hand of Jabin, and Judges iv. they were mightily oppressed: it cannot be said that they were not then in subjection, because Barak subsequently delivered them. Zedekiah's rebellion against the king of Babylon does not prove that he was not previously in subjection, but exactly the reverse: and, to take an example, which perhaps approaches more nearly to a type, Solomon's reign commenced with all his enemies being "under the soles of his feet;" but at the close there were wars and rebellions. So Satan, not even breaking out by his own power, but being loosed at the end of the thousand years to perform a work, as God's instrument, this only proves that he shall have been Christ's footstool for the previous thousand years.
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AN OBJECTION TO THE VIEWS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH EXAMINED.

"Beseeching thee, that it may please thee of thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom."—Burial Service.

CHAPTER XVII.

Our Lord, by his warnings, both to the believing and the unfaithful members of the church, evidently intended that we should be in daily, and even, it would seem, in hourly expectation of his advent. "Of that day and that hour knoweth no one. . . . Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." The Lord of that [evil] servant shall come in a day when he looked not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of. "Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." And when we meet in the apostolic writings such expressions as these: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," . . . "we shall be changed;" "we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep;" . . . "we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together (i.e. with the sleeping saints), in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air;" must we not infer that they believed in, at least, the possibility of Messiah's immediate advent.† Even

† It is known to every reader of Scripture, that the fourth Epistle to the Thessalonians speaks of the coming of Christ in terms which
when St. Paul reproves the Thessalonians for neglecting their daily callings, upon the supposition that "the day of Christ was at hand," yet there his language implies the expectation that the greater part of those addressed would be alive at the period of Christ's advent—"We beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering together unto him." Are we not, then, led irresistibly to the conclusion, that the apostles and primitive church were brought to this practical state of expectancy, "waiting for the revelation of Jesus Christ?"

The sneer of the infidel historian gives unexceptionable testimony to this fact, and at the same time insinuates the objection, which I propose to consider. He says, "In the primitive church the influence of truth was very powerfully strengthened by an opinion, which, however it may deserve respect for its usefulness and antiquity, has not been found agreeable to experience. It was universally believed, that the end of the world and the kingdom of heaven were at hand;" which stated in plain language amounts to this: "Christ was either himself deceived, or else he, for politic ends, deluded his followers." This blasphemous suggestion springs, like other errors, from ignorance of the scriptures and the power of God.

The expectation of the Christians was not unfounded, even though it be still unfulfilled; there was a possibility of Christ's advent, nay, I should say, that the coming was, in one sense, nearer then than it was five hundred years afterwards; for the return of our Lord does not depend upon a certain number of years being run out, but is revealed as an event which shall come to pass contingently. If it indicate an expectation of his speedy appearance . . . . (iv. 15—17, v. 4.) Whatever other construction these texts may bear, the idea they leave upon the mind of an ordinary reader is that of the author of the Epistle looking for the day of judgment to take place in his own time, or near to it.—Paley, Horae Paulinae, Ch. ix. No. 1.
depended solely upon time, the apostle would assert a palpable truism; "for now [is] our salvation nearer than when we believed."

Before, however, entering upon the proof, I would simply state that I am not speaking of contingency "as the middle point between necessity and impossibility of being," according to which there would be an equal possibility of the advent taking place or not taking place; I am only speaking of the mode in which it is decreed that the second advent shall take place.

An event coming to pass contingently, is not synonymous with its coming to pass casually; nor does this view interfere with the doctrine of God's foreknowledge. The moderate divines admit that "God doth necessarily and certainly foreknow all that will be done," even though the events fall out contingently; they, however, resolve it, not into the immutability of God's decree, but into the prerogative of his Deity, whereas others, who I rather incline to follow, say with the schoolmen, "That God's will is so efficacious as to cause all things to come to pass after such a manner as they do come to pass; to wit, necessary things necessarily, and contingent things contingently." They are necessary with respect to the first cause, and contingent in relation to second causes. To illustrate the matter in hand, the service of the king of Babylon was to expire at a given period, and was not contingent upon the state of the Jews; but not so the second advent of Messiah—that is spoken of as contingent upon the state of the church; which I think illustrates our Lord's answer to the apostles, "Times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power;" surely "all times are in his hand;" but when there is a "set time" of mercy God may be said to have put it out of his own power, for "God is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent: hath He said and shall He not do? or hath He spoken and shall He not make good?" But, with regard
to the period of Christ's second coming, it is, so to speak, still in God's power, for it has been predicted, not as to transpire at a particular season, but as dependent upon a certain state and condition of things: hence we must watch the signs of the times.

The parable of the marriage-feast exemplifies this point: the call in verse 4 appears evidently to be the call to the Jews, which was made subsequent to the crucifixion of Messiah: "Tell them which were bidden, Behold I have prepared my dinner, my oxen and fatlings [are] sacrificed, and all things are ready; come unto the marriage." Here the marriage feast is contingent upon the Jews obeying the Gospel call; which appears precisely parallel with St. Peter's appeal to them. Speaking of the crucifixion, he says, "Those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that the Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." "The fatlings are sacrificed, and all things are ready." St. Peter continues, "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when (or 'in order that') [the] times of refreshing may come from [the] presence of the Lord, and He shall send Jesus Christ." We here, then, learn that the times of refreshing and the second advent of Christ were contingent upon the repentance and conversion of the Jews; but we know that "they made light of it," "they which were bidden were not worthy." So the apostle takes up the very word of the parable, "seeing that ye . . . . judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." This answers to the command in the parable to go into "the bye-ways," and bid to the marriage as many as they should find.

The fall of the Jews was the occasion of salvation being preached unto the Gentiles: the feast is now, therefore, contingent upon there being guests from among the Gentiles. Hence, St. Peter implies that the coming of the day of God may be hastened by the holy conversation and godliness of
the brethren: "What manner of persons ought you to be, in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for, and accelerating the coming of the day of God." And there is a remarkable minuteness in the language of scripture, which seems to mark this delay, if I may so speak, in the economy of God; the Jews were invited to the dinner, but now the invitation is to the marriage-supper of the Lamb. We see then the scriptural propriety of that prayer in our burial service, which makes the coming of Christ's kingdom contingent upon the number of God's elect being made up.

The unjust judge.

Luke xvii. 29, 32.

So this word is sometimes rendered in our translation, e.g. Num. xxxv. 12, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27.

Matt. xxiv. 23, 24. sake the days of trouble will be shortened—who alone in
those days will not be deceived, and in answer to whose prayers the Lord the avenger will speedily come.*

From this view of the parable we are brought to conclude **Conclusion.** that the advent of Messiah now depends upon an elect remnant being brought to that effective belief in the doctrine of the kingdom, and desire for the advent, which will stir them up to pray fervently and incessantly, "Thy kingdom come." And that which will elicit these agonizing cries will be the persecution of the last days.

* Do Post-millennarians expect such a universal apostacy at the end of their millennium, as this parable implies will be the case when Messiah appears?
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SCRIPTURE DIFFICULTIES.

"Beseaching thee . . . shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom."

Nothing, perhaps, more clearly shows us how little we have the mind of the Spirit, than the difficulty which attends the applicability of the quotations from the Old Testament in the New. If we knew the sense of the prophets, and understood the reasonings of the apostles, these passages, instead of being amongst the most difficult, ought to be the most luminous parts of scripture; for we are in possession of an infallible comment upon an inspired text.

I purpose, in the present chapter, to examine how the view which I have given, respecting the contingency of Christ's advent, bears upon the quotations by the apostles, relative to the times of the Gentiles; for if Christ's coming to reign was contingent upon the nation of the Jews accepting or rejecting him, it stands to reason that there would be an inconsistency in there being any distinct and explicit revelations respecting the Gentile dispensation which has intervened; and the evidence adduced from the quotations out of the Old Testament would be inferential, and by implication, rather than in the nature of direct proof. More especially is this opinion strengthened by the manner in which the apostle of the Gentiles speaks of the revelation given to him, concerning the mystery of the dispensation towards the Gentiles, as being "in other ages not made
known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets, by the Spirit."

The passage first in order, and probably in importance, which I shall take as an example, is the reasoning of St. James in the apostolic council, relative to the admission of the Gentiles into the church; for there the peculiar character of this present dispensation is directly discussed.

The question proposed was, whether the Gentiles could be admitted without circumcision; for during the former dispensation no stranger could enjoy the full privileges of the covenant, unless he were circumcised; but if circumcised, he was bound to keep the whole law; these were called "proselytes of the covenant," that is, of the covenant of circumcision; others, called in scripture "strangers within their gates," and styled by the Jews "proselytes of the gate," were bound, as the Hebrew doctors said, to observe the seven precepts of Noah, of which the four stated in Acts xv. were the principal, and of which we can discover some mention as early as the days of Noah. Abstinence from blood, which Lev. xvii. 10, 13. was God's covenant with all flesh upon the earth, (this also Gen. ix. 4, 15. includes "things strangled," because the blood was not poured out); also from idolatry, from which we learn in the Ezek. xiv. 7. prophets, the strangers in Israel were bound to abstain; and "fornication," the law against which was "from the Mark x. 6. beginning."

It does not appear extraordinary that Jewish converts, all "zealous for the law," should have questioned respecting the footing upon which the Gentiles should be admitted; and the decision was not so simple as some Gentiles would now be led to suppose.

The apostle of the circumcision commences by stating the fact that the Holy Ghost had been given to the Gentiles as Gentiles, and that, that purification of the heart, that inward work of God, which the external purifications of the ceremonial
law only typified, had been conferred upon them. He, therefore, asked why they should put that yoke of the ceremonial law upon the Gentiles, when they believed that even the Jews themselves would be saved by grace through faith, even as the Gentiles. St. James subsequently declares that this statement of Simeon Peter, respecting the election from among the Gentiles "of a people for his name," is consonant with the words of the prophets; and therefore, his sentence was, that they should not trouble the converted Gentiles with the yoke of the ceremonial law,—that is, that these Gentiles need not become proselytes of the covenant. But it was fair so far to meet the Jewish prejudices, as that the Gentiles should be admitted as proselytes of the gate; "for," says he, "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day:" these ordinances had been so long warranted by Divine authority, that it was but reasonable to deal gently with those who were zealous for the law.

It is desirable to notice one other point before we come to consider the quotation. The things mentioned as necessary to be observed are not all of one kind, one being moral, and the rest ceremonial; if, therefore, we say that they were only bound for a time, in order to meet the prejudices of the Jewish converts, do we not release from a moral obligation, when the prejudices of the Jewish converts no longer make that binding necessary? And, if we do not say that they were bound only for a time, we make things permanent which are elsewhere declared to be indifferent. I conceive that though the restraint of all was laid on together, without any distinction, the necessity for the continuance of the "burden" would either vanish or be confirmed, as the prejudices of the two different parties were cleared up: the supposition of the Gentiles, that fornication was only a thing indifferent, would be removed, as well as the scruples of the Jews, in the other extreme concerning things ceremo-
nial. If this be the argument, the point to be proved from Amos is, that a time had been contemplated in the Divine mind during which Gentiles, as Gentiles, should be admitted into the church.

The prophet declares the Lord's intentions of destroying the sinful kingdom from off the face of the earth, or rather "the land;" not, however, by annihilation, but by dissipation, according to the mitigation promised; "and yet, for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them: for I [am] Jehovah their God." This, then, I understand to be the prophecy of the dispersion.

"The herdman" then predicts the excision of all the sinners among God's people, which say, "the evil shall not overtake us, nor prevent us." "This probably refers to the time when the restoration of Israel draws nigh—that period of trouble, just prior to the last deliverance of all the Jews, whose names are written in the book, when all left in Zion will be holy—that refined and purified portion which alone will be left; who will call upon his name, and of whom God will say, "It is my people." Zec. xiii. 9.

From the following verse in Amos, the quotation is taken: "In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." The tabernacle of David is mentioned by the evangelical prophet in a manner which fixes its meaning, . . . "The oppressors are consumed out of the land, and in mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth." This "he" refers apparently to "the Lamb," the ruler of the land, who will go "to the mount of the daughter of Zion; and he shall sit upon it [the throne] in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgment, and hastening righteousness." This reign of the Lamb upon the throne of David will be after the tabernacle of David shall have
been built up, which, according to Amos, will be "in that day;" an expression which seems, by way of eminence, to denote the day of the Lord, even sometimes when there has been no direct mention of it in the immediately preceding context, (as, for example, Isa. ii. 17, Matt. vii. 22,) it may be so used here, but I think the period is fixed by the time of the excision mentioned in the preceding verse. The expression is altered by the inspired apostle into "after this." Amos, when predicting the event, fixed its accomplishment to the time previously described, but in the use St. James was going to make of it, much depended upon the order of the events, and upon its being after the time in which he spake; so he says "after this," after this state of things upon which we have now entered; for it was evident that the tabernacle of David was not yet built up.

The following verse, as it is in the Acts, differs considerably from what we now have in the Hebrew text; but the words upon which, I think, the proof turns, are the same: "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord who doeth all these things." After this dispensation, will be the great dispensation of glory, when "the remnant shall return;" and I think that this very remnant of the Jews may here be meant, they being sometimes in scripture called "men" in distinction from the Gentiles; our Lord, for example, says, "Beware of the men . . . . they will scourge you in their synagogues," . . . which shall be "for a testimony against them and the Gentiles." The Jews justified this distinction from Ezekiel, "and ye, my flock of my pasture, are men." The Hebrew text might be more flattering to the national vanity of the Jews, for it seems to imply that they would have the dominion over the remnant of Edom, as well as all the Gentiles upon whom God's name was called. We need not, however, be detained with this inquiry, for the proof required by the apostle, depends upon
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the following clause,—"the Gentiles upon whom God's name is called;" if then, at that time, some of the Gentiles upon whom God's name is called, shall seek after the Lord, it is evident that before that time God's name will be called upon some of the Gentiles, and therefore, that God will have visited "the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." He then concludes by breaking out into admiration of how God's foreknowledge is in accordance with the contingency of events, and how he works all things after the counsel of his will, through men, who are still left to their own free will and responsibility: "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world." Here, then, are all the points for which I have been contending: the calling of the Gentiles, although provided for from the beginning of the world, was only brought to light after the Jews, as a nation, had rejected Christ, and the proof drawn from the prophets is by inference and implication.

This passage also appears to me very important, in giving us the order and character of the dispensations. The feature of this dispensation is God's visiting the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. The next will witness the re-establishment of the house of David.

This view of Christ's second coming also elucidates the manner in which the prophecies relating to the two advents of Messiah are grouped. The pious and profoundly learned Joseph Mede, as he was styled, says, that "The old prophets, for the most part, speak of the coming of Christ indefinitely, and in general, without that distinction of first and second coming which the gospel out of Daniel hath more clearly taught us. And so, consequently, they spake of the things to be at Christ's coming indefinitely and altogether; which we, who are now more fully informed, by the revelation of the Gospel, of a twofold coming, must apply each of them to its proper time—those things which befit the state of his first coming, unto it, and such as befit the
state of his second coming unto the second; and what befits both alike may be applied unto both." Now, although this statement be in substance according to truth, yet I never felt that it could be satisfactorily urged, either to the conviction of a Jew who denied Jesus to be the Christ, or of a Christian who did not believe in his personal reign upon earth: but what I have already observed respecting the quotations relative to the times of the Gentiles, equally holds good with those concerning the two advents of Christ. If there was a possibility of an entrance into the inheritance immediately after the ascension of Christ, it clearly would have been unsuitable that those prophecies, given to support the hopes of the faithful in the glories of Messiah's reign, should mention that intervening time of darkness and trouble, whose future existence was only contingent upon the unbelief of the nation. I need only mention Isa. lxii. compared with Luke iv. 16—19, and Zech. ix. 9 to the end, with John xii. 14, 15, to illustrate how closely the two advents are connected and foreshortened by the prophetic eye, when gazing into the long perspective of futurity. But now that we stand between the two advents, in the very times of the Gentiles, occasioned by the unbelief of the Jews, we can distinctly discriminate and separate the events of each advent under their proper head.

The last observation of Mede requires a more express inquiry. He says, that "such predictions of things as befit the state of both advents alike may be applied unto both." Whether or not this be applicable to more than one case, I do not know; but I apprehend that it is true to a certain extent, with respect to those events which are to prepare the way of the Lord, or, in plain words, the ministry which is to urge men to that state of mind upon which Christ's coming is contingent. I will therefore examine that which is said respecting the coming of Elias; for the prophecy of Malachi is one of the passages which Mede expressly ob-
serves must refer to the second, as well as to the first, coming of Christ.

After the transfiguration, which I considered at some length in the former part of this work, it is said, "As they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, 'Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead,' . . . and they took notice of that expression, debating among themselves what the rising from the dead should mean." After all that our Lord had said, the disciples could not understand literally the saying concerning his sufferings. "And his disciples asked Him, saying, 'Why then say the scribes, that Elias must first come?'" Gill quotes some passages from the Jewish writings, to show that this was the belief of the scribes; for instance, "Before the coming of the Son of David, Elias will come to bring the good news of it." And they say that even Messiah "shall not know himself, nor have any power, till Elias comes and anoints Him, and makes Him known to all."

The appearance of Elias would remind the disciples of this saying of the scribes; and probably they could neither understand his departing without proclaiming Messiah, nor why the vision should be kept secret now that Elias had come; nor, perhaps, why they, and not Elias, were hereafter to proclaim it; and, after that which our Lord had said of John, and what the Baptist had testified concerning Jesus, why it should now be kept secret at all. With doubts and reasonings, probably, of this nature, they, in order to get more information, put the question, "Why, then, say the scribes that Elias must first come?"

Before considering our Lord's answer, it will be well to examine those prophecies upon which the scribes had probably formed their opinions; as also to inquire concerning the portion of those predictions which John the Baptist had already fulfilled.
The first is, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, 'Prepare ye the way of Jehovah; make straight in the desert a highway for our God.'" This passage appears to refer directly to John; for St. Matthew, accounting for why the Baptist preached, "Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is at hand," says, "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, 'The voice,'" &c.; and John, when denying that he was Elias, affirmed that he was "the voice" predicted by Isaiah. In like manner, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way for my presence;" this is applied by our Lord to John absolutely; while at the same time He says, that whether John be Elias or not, is a contingency: a passage which I purpose examining presently.

There is, lastly, an explicit promise, that Elijah the prophet shall come; and the time of his advent is also as expressly mentioned to be "before the great and dreadful day of the Lord:" the same expression as that which is used by Joel, with reference to the time when "the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood." The angel appears to allude to this prophecy of Malachi, when speaking of the Baptist; but then it is with the express and distinct limitation: "He shall go before Him [the Lord] in the spirit and power of Elias."

Answerably to all these promises, John "baptized with a baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him who should come after him; that is, on Christ Jesus." The apostle of the Gentiles does not here refer to John's testimony concerning the individual: "Behold the Lamb of God!" for those whom Paul addressed were prepared for Christ by the ministry of the Baptist, but had not been baptized in the name of the Lord, it relates generally to the character of John's initiatory dispensation. This our Lord unfolded to the people when "He began to say unto the multitudes concerning John,
‘What went ye out into the wilderness to see? . . . a prophet?’ ‘Yes, they did; “for all held John as a prophet,” but he was “much more than a prophet.”’ The dignity of John was exceedingly great: he was “the prophet of the Highest;” for he was to go before the face of the Lord to prepare his way. Comparing this with our Lord’s application to him of the prophecy of Malachi, we learn that he was in a manner the angel of Adoni’s presence: and so our Lord adds, “For I say unto you, among those that are born of woman, there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist.” What, then, is to be understood by the following clause? “But He that is the lesser in the kingdom of God is greater than he.” The word is not “least” but “lesser,” denoting one individual. Chrysostom therefore thought it denoted Messiah himself, and Augustine inclined to the same opinion; yet I think it forced to say, that Christ is, in any sense, less than John, for his suffering himself to be baptized by his forerunner could scarcely be so interpreted.

2. The being “born among women” appears to be in opposition to being “in the kingdom of God,” or “of the heavens.”

3. John’s greatness consisted in his official dignity. There is “not a greater prophet than John;” but he is “much more than a prophet,” because he is Messiah’s forerunner.

4. From its being said that John was more than a prophet, I think we may infer that “He that is less” is a prophet; and that He, in his prophetical capacity, is inferior to John, as the forerunner of Messiah.

5. The crowning point of dignity appears to depend upon the reception by the people. “And if ye will receive”—Matt. xl. 14. What were they to receive? “It,” says our version, which must be, “If you will receive the following assertion.” I, however, think it ought rather to be, “If ye will
receive him," for the reception or rejection of the assertion cannot alter the truth of the fact; but the rejection or reception of John would make all the difference as to the effect; that is, whether or not he would in the spirit of Elias, prepare a people for the advent of the Lord in glory.

6. The Jews, we have already seen, expected the kingdom of the heavens to be in the resurrection.

From all these considerations, I am led to conclude, that he, who, as born among women was less than John, and yet who, in his official capacity in the kingdom of the heavens, is greater than the Baptist, must be Elias. John, as forerunner of Messiah, was greatest among men in the flesh, but he was only the forerunner of Christ in humiliation, but there will be an Elias the forerunner of Jesus when coming in glory.

I understand Matt. xi. 12 to intimate, that the kingdom of heaven was incipient and inchoate from the time of John to that of Messiah; but that it required a most energetic faith to enter the kingdom before the time of its full development by the pentecostal effusion.

"For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John." It is quite true, as one of the old writers expresses it, that the prophets foretold Christ, but that John said, "Behold" Him. But I think that there may be something more in this declaration. The prophecies all pointed to the particular crisis of John's ministry; then there was a hiatus, and whether those prophecies respecting the events which should usher in the reign of glory would then be in sequence, depended upon the result of John's ministry.

Our Lord seems to mark the solemn importance of what follows, by saying, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear; if ye will receive [him], he himself is Elias who is about to come." Whether John was or was not the Elias predicted depended upon his reception or rejection by the people. And if we turn to Isa. xi. and Mal. iii., which we saw ex-
pressly related to John, the prediction in either case is embedded in promises relative to Messiah's advent in glory, and which, for my own part, I could not understand, but upon the supposition of Christ's advent in glory being contingent upon his being received by the Jewish nation; and, therefore, the rejection of Israel, and that kind of hypothetical dispensation, the intervening call of the Gentiles, could not properly be mentioned.*

Lastly, I must notice Christ's answer to the question of the disciples respecting Elias. Assuming, then, that John did come in the spirit and power of Elias, to prepare the people for the Lord; and that the nation, through the hard-ness of their rulers' hearts, did nevertheless reject Messiah; that still the Lord does intend, by the ministry of one called Elias, to bring them to himself before the great and dreadful day of Jehovah;—if such be the case, how would our Lord be expected to answer his disciples? Would He not state the fact that Elias shall still come and accomplish the work appointed for him to do; and that an Elias had come, mentioning also what kind of reception he had met with from the rulers? And such does appear to be the reply of our Lord: "Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things." The following clause in our translation of Mark does not appear very distinct; I am disposed to understand it thus: "But how is it written of the Son of man that He must suffer many things and be set at naught?" As if He had said, "It is true that Elias shall hereafter come before my appearance in glory; but before the hearts of the disobedient are turned to the wisdom of the just, the Son of man must suffer many things, and be set at naught;

* It may be objected, "If the Jews had received Christ, would He have suffered?" What James says, when pursuing a similar line of argument, is, I conceive, a sufficient answer: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." (Acts xv. 8.) God brings to pass contingencies, as certainly as necessary things.
to that I referred when enjoining silence respecting the transfiguration until after my resurrection."

Our Lord then mentions about John, and the reception with which he met: "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already; and they acknowledged him not, but have done unto him whatever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that He spake unto them of John the Baptist." I am not aware that it was written concerning John, that he should suffer. So some make, "as it is written of him," to relate not to the suffering but to the coming of John. But might Mark be understood in this manner? "they have done unto him [i.e. the Baptist] whatever they listed," in like manner "as it is written of Him [i.e. the Son of man, referring to verse 12,] that he must suffer;" in which manner the argument agrees with Matthew. Our Lord wishing to impress upon them the fact of his literal death, shows that, as John had suffered literally, so "likewise should the Son of man suffer of them."

From these statements I am led to believe that the second assertion of our Lord is not meant to neutralize or qualify the first, but that they are two distinct propositions.

1. That Elias, the restorer of all things, shall come.*

* This was the belief of Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Euthymius, Tertullian, Hilary, Anselm, Hugo, Lyra, Thomas Aquinas (from Gill). Meyer says, "As Chrysostom and Hieronymus, so all the rest of the fathers, did constantly hold that Elias should come in the body, before the day of judgment, to convert the Jews and oppose Anti-Christ.

"A belief in the re-appearing of Elijah 'before the great and dreadful day of the Lord' (Mal. iv. 5) has always been so strong among the Jews, that it is a custom unto the present day, when a devout Jew mentions a city or country, for him to add, 'May it stand until Elijah,'—that is, until the coming of Elijah."—*Voice of Israel*, vol. i. p. 89.
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2. That Elias, the sufferer, has come; each corresponding, as Jesus seems to intimate, one with his advent in humiliation, the other with his coming in glory. Our Lord, after John had been beheaded, said to Peter, in the future tense, "Elias truly shall first come and restore all things;" so that apostle, when subsequently addressing the Jews, mentions the time of the restitution or restoring of all things, as being immediately connected with Messiah's second advent. Acts III. 21.

Understanding Christ's declaration in the way for which I contend, it will exactly harmonize with St. Peter's; but if we refer it to the past, then will the apostle's enunciation appear in opposition; for evidently, if the time for restoring all things be not till the second coming of Christ, John the Baptist could not have restored all things at the time of the first advent.
CHAPTER XIX.

2 PETER CHAPTER III. EXAMINED.

"I look for... the life of the world to come."

I PROPOSE now to consider two passages of Scripture, both of which present some difficulties, and which are in a great measure dependent upon each other: 2 Pet. iii. and Rev. xx.

The expressions in the third chapter of the second epistle of Peter, appear to describe such a universal and entire destruction, that not only do those who deny the kingdom of Christ on earth, but many of those also, who think He will reign upon earth for a thousand years, refer this conflagration to the annihilation of the world; conceiving it to be inconsistent with the prophecies which foretell the conversion of the nations during the millennium, that this destruction should be prior to those events.

Neither the matter of detail as to "how these things shall be," nor how apparently opposing prophecies shall be reconciled, can fairly, I think, be urged as objections: they may properly be classed among the "things which are hard to be understood." I conceive, therefore, that the legitimate subjects of inquiry are:

1. When shall the destruction, predicted by Peter, take place?

2. Whether there be any prophetic intimation of such a condition upon earth, subsequent to that destruction, as would correspond with the reign of blessedness?
Reverting to the commencement of the epistle, we find St. Peter urging the brethren to anxious carefulness in the exercise of the various graces of the Spirit: "For so," says 2 Pet. 1. 11. he, "an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." So exceedingly precious a promise, as the entrance into Christ's kingdom, being held out to the faithful, the apostle uses all means to keep the necessity of practical virtues and holiness in their remembrance. Hence he strengthens his exhortations by showing the certainty of the glorious kingdom which he had described: "For we did not follow cunningly-devised fables when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty." Peter was an eye-witness of that transient glory which will be displayed permanently, when our Lord shall come again with power into his everlasting kingdom.

The faithful were also to heed the written word of prophecy respecting this coming of Christ in glory, (which word is further assured to them by the oral testimony of Peter, with regard to what he saw,) for prophecy in the Church is as "a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn." The Jews say that the temple was so situated with regard to the rising sun, that upon the day of atonement, its first ray darted into the holy place. As the year of Jubilee commenced upon the day of atonement, St. Peter may have had this idea in his mind; for as the holy place received no light but from the seven-branched candlestick, so the Church is enlightened with respect to the future, by the seven-fold illuminations of the Holy Spirit in the written word, which must be her guide, until the dawn of that of vengeance, which shall usher in the year of God's redeemed.

The next clause is rather obscure: some would join the words "in your hearts" to the following verse: "In
your hearts knowing this first that no prophecy," &c.; but
we have the very same expression, chap. iii. 3, "Knowing
this first," without "in your hearts." And the promise in
Rev. ii. 28, "I will give him the morning star," seems to
imply some inward work. Yet as Peter is writing to those
who had obtained faith, alike precious with that of the
apostle himself; the day-spring from on high had visited
them; the day-star of grace had arisen in their hearts: still
the day-star must denote Christ, for He is so styled "by
prophetic description, and evangelical ascription." How,
then, is the day-star of glory to arise in the hearts of those
who have been visited by the day-star of grace? The dawning
of the day is prior to the actual rising of the sun; and
I suppose this figure to imply that, by a sort of refraction of
faith, we shall see the Sun of Righteousness before He ac-
tually appears to the world; but till this greater light arise
to rule the day, we do well to observe the lesser lights of
prophets and apostles. When the day breaks, and the
shadows flee away, we shall be able with the prophet to say,
"In thy light shall we see light."

The following verse seems to mark why prophecy is so
sure a guide: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy is of
private solution; for prophecy came not at any time by the
will of man, but holy men of God spake, impelled by the
Holy Spirit."

In the second chapter, St. Peter warns against false
teachers, who will introduce doctrines opposed to those
which he had been inculcating; thus will they "bring upon
themselves swift destruction." I do not examine into the
nature of the heresies, the present inquiry being solely as to
the time when these false teachers will arise in the Church.
I suppose all will say that it must be before the day of
glory; for the apostle could not be cautioning those to
whom he wrote, as to what could not occur for a thousand
years after the Church had entered into her rest. In that
case, moreover, how could it be said that the judgment of these heresiarchs lingered not—slumbered not—and would come swiftly?

From God's former dealings of vengeance, the apostle illustrates how this judgment, upon the ungodly professors of Christ, shall be universal, whilst his sincere followers shall be delivered. If the sinning angels were not spared; if the old world was destroyed, whilst Noah, with seven others, was saved; if the cities of the plain were consumed, whilst Lot was delivered,—then may we draw the comforting assurance, that "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." Hence it appears that the apostle must be speaking of the judgment prepared for the false teachers who will be alive in the last day; or, as it is here called, "the day of judgment." To these same Enoch prophesied, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all who have spoken against him." The same two examples of God's judicial proceedings towards men, are mentioned by our Lord as foreshadowing the manner of his second advent.

The apostle then mentions his having written this, as also his former epistle, in order to rouse the Church to mindfulness of the prophets, and of the commands of the apostles: but the particular subject of prophetic announcement and apostolic injunction, concerning which they were to be heedful, was Christ's coming in glory; and this third chapter is directly to warn against the scoffers of the last days, who will sceptically inquire, "Where is the promise of his coming?" They are taunting believers with their hopes in that promise; it cannot then be supposed that "the last days" of which he speaks can be deferred to any time beyond that preceding Messiah's second advent: this is confirmed by the 14th verse, where he again exhorts to
diligence, "that they may be found of Him in peace." Surely this must be when He shall come again, and not a thousand years after we shall have been sitting with Him upon his throne.

The assertion of the scoffers is, that the coming of the Lord does not draw nigh; and their reason is because of no change taking place in the appearance of the world. Now Peter does not meet the argument by saying that the Lord will come without a change, and that the change is to be a thousand years after; but he shows that their assertion simply rests upon the evidence of their senses with regard to present appearances, in defiance of the declarations of God's word respecting what were the dealings of Jehovah formerly, and what will be his actings hereafter; implying, moreover, an analogy between the former and future destructions; and that those who refuse the testimony concerning the one, will equally reject the prediction respecting the other. "All things," say they, "continue as from the beginning of the creation." Now it would be quite beside the argument, to talk of a change which would take place, not at the time of his coming, but a thousand years after his advent; a thousand years after the fathers, who had fallen asleep, had been raised: and a thousand years after the tongues of the scoffers had changed from taunting into wailing. The event which would fix their doom would be the practical point to be urged, both for the comfort and support of the saints, who were enduring their bitter mockings, and for the warning of the scoffers. Thus St. Peter explicitly says, that the heavens and earth are reserved unto fire against the judgment and perdition of the ungodly," the same judgment of the quick wicked which St. Paul also tells us will take place at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Then, it would seem, according to the tenor of the argument, that in saying "One day is with the Lord as a thou-
sand years, and a thousand years as one day," he is not speaking of the day of the Lord, but accounting for why Christ does not immediately appear. Moses seems to use the expression with reference to the time between the destruction, and the return to life, of the children of men, and I think that St. Peter uses it in the same sense, for he immediately adds: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise," . . . "but the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night;" that is, notwithstanding the long-suffering of God, that day will come unawares, and find the scoffers unprepared. Surely, then, the dissolution of the heavens cannot be deferred for a thousand years after the day has arrived; how would that bear upon its coming as a thief?

The practical conclusion follows: "[Seeing] then [that] all these things shall be dissolved, what manner [of persons] ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" To suppose that the destruction to which the apostle refers shall take place after the saints shall have been reigning with Christ for a thousand years, and yet that the consideration of it should be urged as their great incentive to holiness during this age, appears to be what St. Peter calls a "wresting" rather than an interpreting of Scripture. We conclude, then, that the destruction by fire, of which St. Peter speaks, is the perdition of the ungodly, which will take place at the time of the Lord's advent.

My next inquiry is, whether a state and condition of things upon this earth, subsequent to this destruction, be predicted.

We must recall to mind, that the subject of the epistle is the admission of believers into the everlasting kingdom of Christ, at the period of his second advent; this hope is that subject-matter of prophecy which they will do well to heed, and it is for believing the promise of his coming, that the Church is described as having to bear the taunts of the
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 scoffers; "for since the fathers fell asleep," say they, "all things continue as from the beginning of the creation."

The allusion made to the fathers, is probably because of the promises made to them respecting the inheritance of the land, which have not yet been accomplished; for in reply Peter says, "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise," that promise to the fathers which involves a change in the heavens and earth upon the advent of Messiah. The delay is because God is long-suffering "to usward," says the apostle, when writing to the "elect sojourners of the dispersion." He is waiting for the repentance of some, not willing that any of them should perish. But seeing that

2 Pet. iii. 9, 10. "all these things shall be dissolved, what manner [of persons]," says he, "ought ye to be in [all] holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting (accelerating) the coming of the day of God," &c. But why should the believer be strivng to accelerate the day of God? Is it simply because of the dissolution of the elements which will then take place? No, but because of the "promise," that promise which cannot be fulfilled until the dissolution: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth;" this, therefore, is the reason why he should be hastening on the day of God: "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things be diligent." And again, "Seeing [that] ye know [these things] before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked," who scoff at the idea of the advent, "fall from your own stedfastness."

The establishment of the new heavens and new earth, upon the passing away of the old, is that for which Peter, and those who had the promises, are looking.

The apostle implies that the destruction to be anticipated is analogous to that which was occasioned by the flood. The earth, however, was not annihilated by the deluge, the form of its surface only was changed; so the "new earth"
which is promised, is not, I conceive, "new" as to its matter and identity, but new as to its form and condition—"new" by its regeneration, as man becomes a new creature by his regeneration; "new" somewhat in the sense in which John speaks of love being "a new commandment,"—it is old for 1 John ii. 7, 8.

its matter and substance, new for the manner and circumstance of urging it; namely, after the example of Christ. The fashion of this world shall pass away; the things that may be shaken shall be removed, in order that the things which cannot be shaken may remain, to constitute the Hebrew ii. 27, 28.

immoveable kingdom of the saints.

We conclude, therefore, from St. Peter, that there are 2 Peter iii.

promises with respect to this earth, which will yet remain to be fulfilled after the dissolution mentioned in the same passage.
CHAPTER XX.

EXAMINATION OF 2 PETER CHAPTER III. CONTINUED.

"I look for . . . the life of the world to come."

In the preceding chapter I came to the conclusion, in agreement with all post-millennialists, but upon which premillennialists are divided, that the destruction predicted by Peter will be at the second advent.

I also came to another conclusion, maintained by all premillennialists who agree in the former conclusion, by some few post-millennialists also, that a state of blessedness is to be expected upon this earth, after the dissolution described by Peter.

I will now notice the difficulty which this view of the passage in hand forces upon our consideration. St Peter seems to declare that the conflagration will be universal. If, then, it happens at the time of the Lord's advent, how can there be nations upon the earth subsequent to that event? Nations not deceived, but deceivable—not in a state of sin, yet not in a condition of perfection, because liable to apostatize?

It must be acknowledged that the language of St. Peter is very comprehensive, and any attempt to dilute its force would be highly objectionable; yet I think that the structure of the first part of the chapter has generally been misunderstood. "The world," in verse 6, is supposed to correspond with "the heavens and the earth" in verse 7; it is
therefore inferred that the destruction of "the heavens and the earth" by fire, will be co-extensive with the former destruction of the world by the deluge; but I cannot assent to this interpretation. In speaking of the former constitution of the heavens and the earth, St. Peter apparently alludes to "the word of God" in Gen. i. 6, 7, 8, not the efficient word which called the heavens and earth into existence, but the inspired word which records their constitution, for it is the "same word" which informs us with regard to the day of judgment. This word states that there was a firmament in the midst of the waters, which "God called heaven;" so there were waters above the firmament, as well as below the firmament; and thus not only the earth, but the heaven also, consisted out of the water and in the water, by means of which constitution of things, when the windows of heaven were opened, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up, the world were destroyed by the flood. "The world," I say, were destroyed, supposing, not the material of the world, but the people of the world, to be here intended, for I think we are bound to understand it in the same sense as those similar expressions of the apostle in the preceding context, viz. "the old world," and "the world of the ungodly." Turning, moreover, to Gen. vi. 13, margin, and vii. 4, 23, we find that what St. Peter calls the perishing of the world, was the destruction of every living thing from off the face of the earth. Now "the world," in 2 Pet. iii. 6, not being the material of the world, but the people of the world, it is clear that it cannot correspond with "the heavens and the earth" in verse 7; in fact, "the world" bears the same relation to the former destruction, that "the ungodly" (verse 7) does to the future one. The world were destroyed by water, and the ungodly shall be by fire; in this case "the heavens and the earth," in verse 7, are in exact correspondence with "the
heavens” and “the earth” in verse 5: thus there is a perfect antithesis—

“The heavens were of old, and the earth,” &c.

“Whereby the world then perished,”

“The heavens and the earth which are now,”

“Are kept against the perdition of the ungodly.”

The three reasons stated above, namely: the structure of the passage; the meaning of the same word “world” in the preceding context; and the fact, as recorded in Genesis, all confirm me in believing this to be the correct view.

According to this interpretation, St. Peter’s argument does not by any means require a universal destruction; it appears to be the reply to those who say, “All things continue as (they were) from the beginning of the creation;” but they are ignorant that by the former constitution of things the overwhelming of the ungodly world was provided for; so also revelation now declares that means are in store for the destruction of the ungodly by fire. Here, then, the extent of the destruction is not at all affected by the comparison; the argument indeed might be from the greater to the less: how can a future destruction of ungodly ones be denied, when Scripture declares to us a former destruction of a whole ungodly world?

Again, there does appear to be an express limitation in the language. The heavens and the earth are kept [reserved] in store for the judgment and perdition, not of the world, but of “the ungodly.” Had judgment to the same extent been intended, we might have expected a term equally extensive.

That the manner in which this destruction of the ungodly alone will be accomplished, is mysterious, the apostle seems to intimate in the preceding chapter; for “if God spared not the old world, but saved Noah with seven others,” and turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, yet
delivered Lot, then may we draw the conclusion: "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."

2 Pet. ii. 9.

In the third place, we must notice that for the account of the future destruction, St Peter refers us to the former Scriptures; "The heavens and the earth which are now, by (or according to) the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of the ungodly." The passages which refer to the destruction by fire at the future coming of the Lord, may be classed under the following heads:

1. Such as only mention that the wicked shall be destroyed by fire: Psalm xcvii. 1—5 may be given as an example, "A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about; his lightnings enlightened the world: the earth saw and trembled; the hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth." Mr. Cox, in his valuable work, also refers to the following passages: Psalm xi. 6; xxi. 9, 10; xxxvii. 20; xlvi. 9; lxviii. 1, 2; lxxxiii. 13—15, and Isaiah ix. 4, 5.

2. Such passages as speak of the wicked being gathered into a particular place, in order to their being destroyed. These strongly imply that the fire will not be universal; under this head I should class such as the following:

Ps. xcvii. 3—5.

"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 mine indignation, [even] all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy." Joel, chap. iii. 2, 11—16, speaks of the gathering of the nations, and the second chapter and 30th verse implies that the judgment will be partly by "fire and pillars of smoke." Zec. xiv. 2 speaks of the gathering of Zec. xiv. 2, 3.
the nations, and the following verse speaks of the Lord going forth to fight, and plenty of passages declare that He will be revealed in flaming fire, such as 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. Zec. xii. 3 speaks of the gathering of the nations, and the 6th verse implies that their destruction shall be as by fire. So Isaiah xxix. 5—7 informs us that the multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel shall be visited with the flame of a devouring fire. We may add from the New Testament Matt. xiii. 30, 40—42, 50.

3. Passages which give a geographical limit to the conflagration: (1.) Isaiah xxxi. 9 may be mentioned, which speaks of the Lord’s fire being in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem. Dan. vii. 9—11 is a remarkable instance of limitation, and would fall under this or the second head, according to whether we understand “the body of the fourth beast” to be the corporate body, or a geographical division; I suppose the former. Ezek. xxxix. 6, 7, seems also to belong to both this and the former head: “I will send a fire upon Magog, and among them that dwell carelessly in the isles.”

(2.) But there is another class of texts which by inference fall under this head. If we suppose that fire is to perform the work of purification, those passages which describe a blessedness peculiar to the holy land, would lead us to infer that the purifying process is to be limited to that locality. Isaiah li. 8, and Ezek. xxxvi. 35, speak of the wilderness of Zion being made like Eden. The effects of fire upon Idumea, however, are described as quite the reverse. Comp. Isa. xxxiv. 9, and Ezek. xxxvi. 5, 7, 8.

4. Passages which appear to be universal in language, which are, however, evidently limited in effects: as Psalm xlvi. 6, 8, 9, 10, “The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved: He uttered his voice, the earth melted.” This might be supposed to intimate universality, yet we see in the subsequent verses that the chariot will be burned with
fire, but that God will be exalted among the heathen. Isaiah xxiv. 6 speaks of the inhabitants of the earth being burned, this implies universality, yet the next clause marks a limitation, "and few men left." This passage is the more in point, because the prophet in the 18th verse, like the apostle in the passage we are considering, appears to allude to the destruction by the deluge. But Isaiah lxvi. 16, 19 is still more to the purpose, for St. Peter, when speaking respecting the promise of the new heavens and the new earth, refers to the context, which, therefore, we may very fairly suppose to be a clue for interpreting the apostle's meaning. In this passage we are told that "by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh," this is very extensive, if not universal, yet the next cause limits it, "and the slain of the Lord shall be many." But the subsequent context shews that a much greater limitation must be understood: "I will send those that escape of them unto the nations . . . that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory," &c. From this it would appear that the judgments which precede the establishment of the new heavens and the new earth, though the terms be very extensive, are limited to those who either have heard God's fame or seen his glory.

Cox, in support of a limited destruction, urges the promise of God in Gen. viii. 21, 22, and it does appear to me, that in referring to the destruction by the flood, we are specially called upon to remember the rule which God at that time laid down for himself, as to his future dealings with man. The inanimate and irresponsible creation are both freed from any future universal destruction, "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake . . . neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done," and clearly in whatever way the destruction is prevented from visiting them, in the same manner, those who have not seen God's glory nor heard his fame may be secured from its effects.
But, it may be objected, that the following verse limits the promise; "while the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease," if, now, the destruction mentioned by St. Peter denote the end of the world, in that case the promise of preservation in Gen. viii. will cease to be in force. I say, in reply, that this argument cannot be urged by those who believe that the earth will be the place of final blessedness, I have only, therefore, to refer to what I have already said respecting the eternal duration of the earth. Nor can this argument be urged by those who believe that the new heavens and new earth of Peter are the same as the new heavens and earth promised in Isaiah, for the prosperity of Jerusalem and her people is connected with that blessing, and that there will be seasons of fertility consequent upon that restoration, the prophecies abundantly declare, e.g. Isa. xxx. 23—26, Psalm lxvii. 6, Ezek. xxxiv. 27, Hos. ii. 20—23.

Reapitulation.

Seeing, then, that the object of the deluge, with which St. Peter parallels the future destruction, was the judgment of the ungodly world; that then, not the material of the world, but the animate creation suffered; that the excision of the irresponsible creation, involved in that destruction, is, with regard to any future judgment, provided against by absolute promise; that the object of the future destruction, is the judgment only of the ungodly; that, in order to carry out this object, the ungodly will be gathered to some particular locality; that the language of the Old Testament which predicts the future judgments, and to which St. Peter expressly refers us, though very general in expression, must be understood with some limitation; and that the physical effect which is expected upon the new earth, ensuing upon that destruction, will be, not universal, but limited; all these considerations seem strongly to imply that the future destruction will be limited.
Nevertheless we must not lose sight of the declaration, *Meaning of "the elements."* that "the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up," and that "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," but what are we to understand by these expressions? "The earth and the works that are therein," are generally thought to be in a kind of parallelism with "the heavens" and "the elements," so that, in that case, there are two pair of terms to be explained, namely, the heavens with the elements, and the earth with the works in the earth; the elements bearing the same relation to the heavens, that the works in the earth do to the earth; but, in that case, what are we to understand by "the elements?" It will not be satisfactory to reply, "It signifies nothing what the 'elements' may mean, that the earth will be burned up is sufficiently explicit," for we cannot be confident that we have the proper meaning of one term, if a similar mode of interpretation will not give a harmonious sense to the whole.

Mede considers that by "the elements" the host of heaven or the wicked spirits in the air are intended; but, as they are to melt with fervent heat, one would rather suppose something inanimate was intended, which is confirmed by the other expression "the works in the earth," for, according to this view of the structure of the passage, "the elements" must, in some measure, bear a relation to "the heavens" analogous to the relation which the works in the earth bear to the earth. There is, in fact, according to this view of the structure of the passage, great difficulty in fixing the meaning of the expression "the elements;" I would, therefore, suggest another mode of interpretation. May it not be possible that the expression "the earth, and the works therein" is exegetical of "the elements?" Of this there is some evidence in the structure; for it may be observed, that in the 12th verse the dissolution of the heavens, and melting of the elements is again mentioned, but there is no repetition of the mention of the earth, though, as inhabitants of this
planet, we must be more interested in the fate of it than of the atmospheric heaven. But if the earth, and works therein, are included in the elements, this would account for the omission. Again, answerable to the heavens and the elements which are to be destroyed, there are, according to the promise, to be new heavens and a new earth; the new heavens, then, are to be in lieu of the old heavens, and the new earth in place of the elements.

But, if "the earth, and the works therein" is exegetical of "the elements," there is still the enquiry, what meaning can we attach to "the elements," which will be in accordance with the usage of other parts of scripture? Twice we have the same term in connexion with "the world;" and, with the exception of the repetition of the word in the context in each of the chapters, I know not whether it occurs any where else; and in all those places the expression appears to refer to the land, and the ordinances as pertaining to the land, and seems to be in opposition to the heavenlies.

Again, as the destruction, which will be effected upon the old earth, will be co-extensive with the blessing effected upon the new, the promises respecting this will assist us in interpreting the predictions respecting that; St. Peter, indeed, refers us to the original document, "we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth." Now, the promise is in Isaiah lxv. 17, 18, and, in that place, Jerusalem and her people seem the principal feature: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind, but be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." Here, then, Jerusalem seems the prominent feature in the new earth. The same is implied in Isaiah li. 16, "I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, thou [art] my people."
St. Peter characterizes the new earth as an abode "wherein dwelleth righteousness." Now, there are special promises with regard to Zion in this respect. For example, in Isaiah xxxiii. 5 it is said, "Zion shall be filled with righteousness;" again, the promise to Zion in Isaiah lx. 21 is, "Thy people also shall be all righteous," and, not to multiply quotations upon this head, I will close with Jer. xxxi. 23, which declares that this speech shall be used in (and I suppose with relation to) the land of Judah, "The Lord bless thee, O habitation of justice." Now, all these expressions being used with respect to Judah, must imply something peculiar to Judah as different from the rest of the world, they cannot belong in the same full sense to the Gentiles.

The new heavens, of which St. Peter speaks, are also to be an habitation of righteousness; this will be when Satan ceases to be "Prince of the power of the air," and there will no longer be "spiritual wickedness in heavenly places." The apostle, it will be seen, is not speaking simply of the physical change upon the surface and atmosphere of this earth, but rather of the change necessary, and in order to the moral regeneration, when the aerial heaven will be "the heaven of heavens;" when the cloud which betokens "the excellent glory" will tabernacle upon Zion; when Jerusalem will be the throne of the Lord; and when "an innumerable company of angels" will ascend and descend upon the Son of man.

I must state, in conclusion, that I do not advance this interpretation of the extent of the conflagration of the earth, as certain: it is sufficient if I shew that possibly it may be so; for it is only proposed as a method of reconciling an apparent inconsistency. If, however, this explanation is not accepted, let it be borne in mind that the difficulty which remains to be solved does not proceed from any peculiar view of mine; for the promise of the new heavens and earth to which St. Peter refers, is that in Isaiah lxv. 17, and lxvi. 22, and being so, the consumption by fire, concerning
which St. Peter also refers us to the Old Testament, must be that predicted in the same passage of Isaiah, between the two promises of the new creation; and, according to the context, it is after this conflagration that the Gentiles are to be called. Hence the difficulty arises, not from any inconsistency in the system which I have been advocating, but from the very language of the prophet to which the apostle refers.

It will not be satisfactory to say, that we may explain Isaiah loosely, but must interpret Peter rigidly—that our exposition of the one may be figurative, but we must receive the other literally; for the apostle in referring us to the prophecy necessarily refers us to the sense conveyed by the prophecy; if we put a different meaning upon the passage it is no longer the same promise.

It must, therefore, follow that Peter may not be interpreted in such a manner as to make Isaiah inconsistent with himself; but, if the language in the third chapter of the 2nd epistle is to be taken in the most extensive sense of which it is capable, so that we are to expect the whole mundane system to be reduced to a state of fusion, in that case it must remain one of the "things hard to be understood," how, that after the Lord has pleaded by fire and his sword "with all flesh," he will then send to those who have not heard his fame, nor seen his glory.
CHAPTER XXI.

REVELATION XX. CONSIDERED.

"At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the catholic faith."—Athanasian Creed.

The next passage which I purpose examining is Rev. xx., toward the right interpretation of which there appear to be three guides, none of which should be wholly neglected:
1. The structure of the particular passage in hand;
2. Parallel passages;
3. The analogy of faith.

The two last are very similar, for they amount to this; our conclusion must be consistent with plain passages of scripture which speak of the same events.

It is important, in considering unfulfilled prophecy, to determine the point of time at which the seer is placed. The prophet is not unfrequently transported in vision to some future period, by which events, long posterior to the time of the actual delivery of the prediction, are viewed by the prophetic eye as passed, others as present, and others again as still future.

All parties admit that in Rev. xx. 1, St. John is in vision transported to the commencement of the thousand years, and that he describes what he saw as taking place at that time.
But then, in ver. 7, the prophet describes in a way of narrative, not what he saw, but what was to take place a thousand years after the events which he in vision saw as present, "and when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed," &c. Here it is evident that the apostle is not transported in vision to the end of the thousand years; and I contend that when, in the 11th verse, he again takes up the relation of what he saw, he is not transported to the end of the thousand years, but proceeds to describe what is present before him, as viewed from the same prophetic point of time, which made those events, described at the beginning of the chapter, to appear present.

My millenarian opponents consider that the 9th and 10th verses, being in the past tense, imply that the apostle is transported in vision to the end of the thousand years, and that, therefore, verse 11, "I saw a great white throne," &c. belongs, not to what the prophet saw at the beginning of the thousand years, but to their conclusion.

I consider this argument defective, inasmuch as that neither in ver. 9 or 10 does the prophet say that he saw the armies assault the city, or that he saw the devil cast into the lake of fire; and it does not appear to me that the change of tense alone is sufficient to bear the weight of such an important conclusion; for we find similar instances of change of tense in other parts of this same prophecy without similar results being deduced; for example: in Rev. xiv. 10, 11, "he shall be tormented . . . and the smoke of their torment ascended," &c. It, in fact, falls in with that law mentioned by the apostle, and already alluded to, "God calleth those things that be not, as though they were."

Before I commence examining the structure, I must observe that we have not the option of understanding the whole of the three last chapters, as being in regular succession; for my adversaries admit that Rev. xxii., from the 7th verse to the end will be fulfilled at the commencement of the
thousand years; the real question, therefore, is, whether we must suppose the larger parenthesis from xx. 5 to xxii. 7, or only the smaller parenthesis of five verses in chap. xx., which I advocate.

I shall proceed to shew, first, from the structure of the passage, that Rev. xx. 5—10 ought to be thrown into a parenthesis.

It is in accordance with the tenor of the immediately preceding context; for it says, "I saw an angel descending out of heaven," it then describes the binding of Satan for a thousand years, in order that he might not seduce the nations till the thousand years were ended; and that after the thousand years shall be ended, he must be loosed for a little time: it then continues, "and I saw thrones." Now, no one considers this vision to relate to the end of the previously mentioned thousand years, but they throw out the narrative of what shall transpire at the end of the thousand years, and bring the vision recorded in ver. 4, into direct connexion with the vision of ver. 1, because there is internal evidence to authorize this view. I only contend for the same construction in verses 5—10, and believe, in like manner, that there is sufficient internal evidence to justify this structure; in support of which I advance:

1. That there must be an interruption in the continuity of the text somewhere before the end of the book, all who hold the pre-millennial advent must admit, from the declaration, "Behold, I come quickly," "surely I come quickly." Rev. xxii. 7, 20.

(I) Interruption before Rev. xxi. 2. 2

1. That the interruption must be somewhere before xxi. 2, appears evident, from a comparison of this text with xix. 7, for in the earlier passage it is announced that "the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife has prepared herself;" and yet in xxi. 2, "John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband;" and, in verses 9, 10, of the same chapter, she is still only the betrothed one, "Come hither,
and I will shew thee the Lamb’s betrothed one, even his wife; and He . . . . shewed me that great city, the new Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God.” As the marriage of the Lamb was come, and his wife had made herself ready in xix. 7, and as she was still only the betrothed one in xxi. 9, this seems to preclude the possibility of a dispensation of a thousand years intervening between, Rev. xix. 7, and xxi. 2 and 10.

2. Again, the bride being shewn to John by one of the vial-holders, connects the period of descent, in the machinery of the book, with the time of the effusion of one of the vials. In like manner as when one of the vial-holders shews the destruction of Babylon, we are naturally brought to the time of the effusion of the seventh vial, which occasioned the overthrow of Babylon.

The synchronism between xix. 10, which follows the mention of the marriage, and xxii. 8, 9, which closes the account of the new Jerusalem, confirms the coincidence of the time:

“And I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said unto me, see thou do it not,” &c. “I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel . . . . then said he unto me, ‘see (thou do it) not.’”

Are we to suppose that John twice made the same mistake? That is not probable. Once he might have been in error with regard to the person who stood before him, but a second time would shew that he was in error as to who was the right object of worship. He knew after Rev. xix. that the angel who shewed him these things was a creature, had he after that bowed down to worship him, he had been guilty of idolatry. Moreover, when St. John mentions in the second passage, the exact time when he fell down to worship before the angel, he seems to imply that he only did it once. There is no mention of this being a second error, as one would have expected, had it been so, for the holy apostles are not backward in recording circumstances which aggravate their failings.
3. Again, xxii. 2 is before xx. 9, because the descending of The holy city. the holy city is mentioned in xxii. 2, while the attack of the beloved city* by the nations of the earth, and which must, therefore, be subsequent to its descent to earth, is related in chapter xx. 9.

4. Lastly, the promise to the overcomer, that he should inherit all things, is given in chap. xxii. 7, but the reigning of the saints with Christ, as heirs of all things, is mentioned as actually taking place in chap. xx. 4. Chap. xxii. 7, therefore, cannot be posterior to chap. xx. 4.

II. From chap. xx. 11 to chap. xxii. 8 the narrative is continuous, the events being related in their regular historical sequence; for example:

1. The appearance of the sinner upon the white throne, (1) The white throne. chap. xx. 11, causes the old heaven and earth to pass away, and therefore precedes that event.

2. Chapter xxii. 1 must be subsequent to chapter xx. 11 and 13, for in chap. xx. 11 the passing away of heaven and earth is related; and in chap. xxii. 1, the new heaven and the new earth are mentioned, the first heaven and the first earth having passed away; "I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away." This must be before chap. xxii. 1. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." It is added, in chap. xxii. 1, "the sea was no more," but in chap. xx. 13, it is said, "the sea gave up the dead which were in it," at which period, therefore, "the sea" must have been in existence; chap. xxii. 1 is, therefore, after chap. xx. 13.

* As no city mentioned in the apocalypse can deserve the appellation of "beloved" but that which descends from heaven, I am justified in assuming that the heavenly Jerusalem is intended. I have already shewn (chap. xvi.) that the camp of the saints relates to the national conversion of Israel. I shall presently shew that the glorious Jerusalem of the prophets is identical with the heavenly Jerusalem of the apocalypse.
3. In the same manner we may see that chap. xxi. 5 must be after chap. xx. 11, for chap. xxi. 5 mentions "the throne," and the sitter upon it, apparently in direct reference to the throne and enthroned one, mentioned in chap. xx. 11.

Now, as the text is continuous from chap. xx. 11 to chap. xxi. 2, &c., and as there is an interruption in the continuity of the text before xxi. 2, the interruption must be before chap. xx. 11 also.

III. The exact points at which the parenthesis begins and concludes may be fixed by comparing chap. xi. 15—18. Upon the blast of the seventh trumpet, the four-and-twenty elders declare the time or season to be arrived, in which (1) the dead shall be judged; (2) the prophets, saints, and those who fear his name shall be rewarded; (3) the quick wicked shall be destroyed.

1. In Chap. xx. 12 St. John says, "I saw the dead small and great stand before God . . . . and the dead were judged." This corresponds with what is first mentioned by the elders, as occurring upon the blast of the seventh trumpet "the time of the dead that they should be judged" "is come." We must conclude that these passages synchronize; and it does not appear possible to conceive that the judging of chap. xx. 12 shall not be in the same season, nor even in the same dispensation, but in a dispensation which shall commence a thousand years after the blowing of the seventh trumpet.

2. In the same season in which the dead shall be judged, the elders declare that God's servants, the prophets, the saints, and those that fear his name, small and great, shall be rewarded. This corresponds with St. John's vision of "the souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which worshipped not the beast nor his image, and had not received his mark upon their forehead, nor upon their hand, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." Rev. xx. 4
is then parallel with xi. 18. As, therefore, Rev. xx. 4 and 12 are each parallel with Rev. xi. 18, they must synchronize with each other. And, as if to prevent the possibility of any cavil, the rewarding of the servants in chap. xi is, in the order of narration, posterior to the judgment of the dead; but the judging of the dead being mentioned prior to the rewarding of the servants, and that with a note of time, how can it be conceived that the rewarding of the servants is to be, not only before the judging of the dead, but in a different dispensation, with a thousand years intervening?

The third head, namely, the destruction of earth's destroyers, is not of immediate importance in the present inquiry; I therefore merely mention that it accords with John's vision, chap. xix. 19—21. I will therefore conclude by briefly recapitulating the points which we have established from the structure alone of the passage:

1. The descent of the bride, described in chap. xxi. is parallel with the song of triumph, in chap. xix. 6, 7.

2. The descent of the city, chap. xxi. 2 and 10, is prior to the attack upon the city, recorded in chap. xx. 9.

3. The events are recorded in their regular sequence from chap. xx. 11 to chap. xxi. 2; therefore, as chap. xxi. 2 is before chap. xx. 9, chap. xx. verse 11 is before chap. xx. verse 9.

4. Chap. xx. 11 is parallel with chap. xi. 18; chap. xx. 4 is also parallel with chap. xi. 18. Therefore, chap. xi. 18 being parallel in common with both verses, 4 and 11 of chap. xx., it follows that these verses must synchronize with each other: from all these points we learn that the narrative, Rev. xx. 5—10, must be in a parenthesis.
CHAPTER XXII.

PASSENGES PARALLEL WITH REVELATION XX. 11—XXI.

"It is not lawful . . . . so to expound one place of scripture that it be repugnant to another."—Twentieth Article.

I now proceed to point out some passages from other parts of scripture, which seem to be parallel with Rev. xx. 11, &c., but which also manifestly refer to the commencement of the reign of Messiah, which will, therefore, force us to conclude that Rev. xx. 11 and the subsequent context will be in the course of fulfilment at the beginning of the thousand years.

Rev. xx. 11 appears strictly parallel with Dan. vii. 9, 10:

"A great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, as snow, . . . . the judgment . . . . the books were opened, and the dead were judged."

Rev. xx. 11. Dan. vii. 9, 10.

The prophecy of Daniel refers to the time of the destruction of the fourth beast, and before the Son receives the kingdom,* therefore, if the parallels be correct, Rev. xx. 11 must refer to the commencement of the thousand years.

* I have already mentioned, that, according to my conception, Dan. vii. does not symbolize the person but the reign of the Father (chap. viii.); and that the Son of man will be revealed in the glory of the Father (chap. xvi.)
In order to fix the time that the heaven and earth shall flee away, I will shew that the new heavens and the new earth, which shall be established upon the passing away of the former, are the same as those mentioned in Isa. lxv. and lxvi., and in 2 Pet. iii.

The heaven and earth mentioned by Isaiah will remain as long as the seed of Israel remains; but the seed of Israel will be saved with an everlasting salvation; the new heaven and earth of Isaiah, therefore, will never pass away; the heaven and earth of Rev. xxi. cannot, therefore, be after those of Isaiah.

Again, the heaven and earth of Rev. xx. are the "first" which pass away: therefore, none pass away before them; it is clear, therefore, that the new heaven and earth of Rev. xxi. cannot be established after the new heaven and earth of Isaiah are passed away, for in that case the establishment of the new heaven and earth of Rev. xxi. would be after the passing away of the second and not of the "first" heaven and earth.

As now, no one contends that the heavens and earth, Rev. xxi., will be established before those of Isaiah, they must be identical. But the establishment of the heavens and earth of Isaiah will be at the time of the restoration of Israel and the establishment of Jerusalem. Therefore, the new heavens and earth of Rev. xxi. will be established at the commencement of the thousand years.

In like manner the new heavens and earth of Peter and Revelation are identical; because Peter refers to the former promise; but that promise could only be the one in Isaiah, unless, indeed, those who maintain the early date of the apocalypse would insist that Peter refers to Rev. xxi. In either case, therefore, the heavens and earth mentioned in Rev. xxi. and by Peter must be the same, but I have already shewn that 2 Pet. iii. refers to the time of the second advent.
Thus the establishment of the new heavens and earth is at the commencement of Messiah's reign; hence the passing away of the first heaven and earth, and the appearance of the throne and sitter thereon, from whose presence the earth and heaven flee away, cannot be deferred to the end of the thousand years.

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God."

This, as I have already remarked, will be upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet, for then "the time of the dead, that they should be judged," will have arrived.

In Rev. xx. 13, death and hades are mentioned as the receptacle of the dead; the sense, therefore, appears the same as in chap. i. 18, and I think it refers to Hos. xiii. 14.

"And death and hades delivered up the dead which were in them." Rev. xx. 13. "I will ransom them (Ephraim) from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death."

Hos. xiv. 13.

And the following verse appears parallel with 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55:

"Death and hades were cast into the lake of fire." Rev. xx. 14. "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O hades, where is thy victory?"

1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

Both of them being parallel with the remainder of Hos. xiv. 13, "O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." The apocalypse, taking up the figurative language of the prophet, expresses, that the punishment was inflicted upon death and hades. But, as 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55 refers to the time of the first resurrection, the 13th and 14th verses of Rev. xx. cannot be deferred to the end of the thousand years.

The 15th verse, in expressing who will not be delivered at that time, declares, by implication, who will, namely, that portion in hades who "are written in the book of life."

I have already stated that Rev. xxi. 1 appears parallel with Isa. lxv. and 2 Pet. iii., both of which I have attempted to
shew, belong to the commencement, and are not to be deferred to the conclusion of the thousand years.

"And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."

St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, speaks of the Jerusalem above. He shews us that the history of Abraham, Sarah, and the bondwoman, was allegorical. Agar, who came from Arabia, represented the covenant which came from Sinai; and answered to Jerusalem and the Jewish economy which then was, the children of which church were in bondage. On the other hand, Sarah represented the church which had the promise, whose children enjoyed the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

Now, in the typical history, Sarah was married for some time before Abraham turned aside to the bondwoman; but she had no increase: this represented the patriarchal state of the church. Then there was an interval, in which there was no seed but from the bondwoman; this typified the period from the giving of the law until the resurrection of the Lord. The time then arrived when Sarah brought forth the promised seed; this represented the same free church of God which originally had the promises, but under the present dispensation of the Spirit.

All mankind, now, therefore, instead of being divided only into Jews and Gentiles, are separated into the three classes which the apostle mentions to the Corinthians, namely, 1 Cor. iii. 32. Jews, Gentiles, and the Church of God: and the promises to Abraham belong to "the Jerusalem above," or his spiritual seed, represented by the seed borne by Sarah after she had been long barren. To this history, according to the apostle, Isaiah alluded; so that "Rejoice, O barren!" does not refer either to Jew or Gentile, but to the Church of God bearing the children of promise, as the apostle applies it in the following verse.
He then draws out the allegorical history still farther, shewing that the persecution of the church by the Jews, was typified by the mocking of Ishmael; and he concludes by intimating that the casting out of Hagar and Ishmael prefigured the complete abolition of the Jewish polity, and the casting off of the nation in the destruction of Jerusalem.

The inspired view of this passage of Isaiah given by the apostle influences, I conceive, the application of many texts of the Old Testament as quoted in the New. The present is not properly the Gentile dispensation in opposition to the former dispensation; for, though it be true that God has visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people, it is that they may be grafted into the good olive tree, and so partake of its root and fatness: and, though the great proportion of the church is now from amongst the Gentiles, that does not alter the fountain from whence the blessings flow: "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made." Nor, on the other hand, when it is said "The Gentiles shall come to thy light," are we to understand the Jews nationally considered as the favoured people; but it is to the light of the new Jerusalem to which the Gentiles shall come. This Jerusalem, which is now above, and is mother of us all, is the heavenly Jerusalem, which, in prophetic anticipation, the apostle beheld descending. But St. Paul also shews that it is the same as is described by Isa. liv. to which I now turn.

The sufferings of Messiah having been described in the preceding chapter, the church, hitherto "barren," is called to "sing." The third verse mentions the adding to the church of the elect Gentiles; for our Lord says, "if I be lifted up I will draw all men unto me." The 9th and 10th verses usher in the future dispensation when "the mountains shall depart," &c., and the 11th and 12th verses correspond with Rev. xxi. 11, 19, 20.
PARALLEL PASSAGES.

"The foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones."

Rev. xxi. 19.

"I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires."

Isa. liv. 11.

Other descriptions of Jerusalem by the same prophet correspond with the account in the apocalypse:

"Having the glory of God."

Rev. xxi. 11.

"The Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee."

Isa. lx. 2.

"And the sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory."

Isa. lx. 19.

"And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising."

Isa. lx. 3.

"And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day, for there shall be no night there."

Rev. xxi. 24.

"Thy gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought."

Isa. lx. 11.

"And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it."

Rev. xxi. 26.

"And an highway shall be there, . . . the unclean shall not pass over it."

Isa. xxxv. 8.

"And they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life."

Rev. xxi. 27.

"He that remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem."

Isa. iv. 3.

It appears impossible, after comparing these two descriptions, to deny that the glorious Jerusalem of the prophets is the heavenly Jerusalem of the New Testament; which is to be “the city of the great king.”

Compare Psalm lxxvi. 2 with Matt. v. 35.
The consequence is evident:—unless we defer the fulfilment of all the above-mentioned prophecies of Isaiah till the end of the millennium, we must anticipate the accomplishment of Rev. xxi. at the commencement of that blessed season.

Heb. xi. 10, xiii. 14.

The city for which Abraham looked is that which we are also taught to expect, to the denizenship of which the privileges of this dispensation have already exalted the believer. A comparison between the Lord's promise and St. Paul's confident hope shall close my remarks on this head:

"I will write upon him . . . the name of the city of my God, new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God."

"Ye are come to Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem."

Heb. xii. 22.

Rev. iii. 12.

And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, 'Behold the tabernacle of God is with men; and he will dwell with them; and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, their God.'"

Upon the descent of the Bride it is said, "The tabernacle of God is with men," because the Bride is "the tabernacle of God." Rev. xxi. 22, 23, xxii. 3.

Now, though we may not assent to the rabbinical notion, that, in the prophecies, "men" mean Jews, yet we cannot deny that Jews are men. So, when the tabernacle of God is with the Jews, it will be with men. I shall therefore compare this verse with Ezek. xxxvii. 27.

"Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, . . . and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, their God."

"My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

Ezek. xxxvii. 27.

Rev. xxi. 3.

The context in Ezekiel is one of the most distinct prophecies that there is for the restoration of the two and ten tribes of Israel; therefore, if that is to be at the commencement of Messiah's reign, so will the descent of the Bride be also.
I also observe that it will be at the time of the establishment of the covenant of peace; which proves the parallel of this prophecy of Ezekiel with that already quoted from Isaiah liv.*

"I will make a covenant of peace with them, it shall be an everlasting covenant."


Rev. xxi. 4 appears parallel with Isa. xxv. 8.

"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and death shall be no more; neither sorrow nor crying, nor pain, shall be any more."

Rev. xxi. 4.

But we have already seen that Isaiah xxv. 8 will be fulfilled at the second advent of Jesus; "when this mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruptibility." Therefore, Rev. xxi. 4 will be fulfilled at the second advent.

The latter part of the verse may also be compared with Isa. xxxv. 10 and lxv. 19.

"And he that sat on the throne said, 'Behold, I make all things new.'"

Rev. xxi. 5.

The throne is, I apprehend, that mentioned in chap. xx. 11, to which this verse refers. "The old heavens and earth fled away," and "he said, 'Behold, I make all things new.'" That which the believer is now, with regard to his soul, "a new creature," will be extended to all creation, upon the manifestation of the sons of God. This surely will not be deferred till the end of the reign of the saints.

"And he said unto me, 'It is done.'"

Rev. xxi. 6.

* I only note with respect to the precise time, that, as the temple was built before the glory of the Lord entered, so the tabernacle of God may be with men, prior to God taking up his abode; for one is mentioned in the present tense, the other in the future.
This verse seems to mark the great completing event in the dispensations of God; I suppose the meaning to be that the mystery of God is finished, which will be upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet. The same expression occurs in chap. xvi., and in both instances the voice proceeds from the throne, the throne not yet descended to the earth.

The Lord God makes the same announcement upon the destruction of Gog.

"He that overcometh shall inherit all things."

This expression reminding us of the promises to the seven churches, induces me to inquire into the time when the victors shall be rewarded.

"To him that overcometh," saith the Lord, "will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God."

The tree of life is mentioned, Rev. xxi. 2 and 14; according to the millenarian theory, what is described in that chapter, will not be established until the conclusion of the thousand years; in which case the reward must also, I suppose, be deferred to the same period; although Jesus, who has sent his angel to testify these things in the churches, says in the next verse but one, "I come quickly, and my reward is with me." Will his reward be with him if those who have a right to the tree of life are not able to enter the city until the end of the millennium?

"He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death."

This, my millenarian friends admit, belongs to the commencement of the thousand years, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power."

"He that overcometh, and keepeth my works 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 to shivers: even as I received of my Father."
We have the fulfilment of this promise in Rev. xix. 14, 15, at the commencement of the thousand years. The promise of the morning star, although mentioned in Rev. xxii. 16, I suppose is admitted to have its fulfilment at the same time.

"He that overcometh the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels."

The two first clauses of this promise do not appear to give any definite mark as to time, for the souls under the altar are rewarded with white linen; the fulfilment of that promise may therefore be immediately after dissolution; the second clause appears to be only negative, also like the former to refer to the time when the conflict of each individual is terminated. But the third clause, "I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels," refers apparently to what our Lord says in Mark viii. 38; it therefore relates to the time of our Lord’s second advent.

The next promise embraces the great subject of dispute:

"Him that overcometh . . . I will write upon him . . . the name of the city of my God, New Jerusalem which cometh down out of heaven from my God."

The millenarian says that the descent of the city will not be till the end of the thousand years, at which time, according to his hypothesis, the promise is, I conceive, to be fulfilled; for what good were it to be a denizen of the city at the beginning of the thousand years, if the enjoyment of the privilege is not to be until the end of that period?

"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am sat down with my Father in his throne."

This promise, it is admitted, will be fulfilled at the commencement of the thousand years, but it corresponds with that of the Father: "He that overcometh shall inherit all things." How do they inherit but as joint-heirs with
Christ, who is appointed "Heir of all things?" Thus the millenarian, if true to his theory, would be forced to maintain that this promise was fulfilled at the commencement, and yet was not fulfilled till after the close of the millennium.

The Father also promises to the overcomer:

"I will be his God and he shall be my son."

On this promise I have already made some remarks: I would add, that with respect to Israel, the fulfilment of this promise has a very distinct mark as to time: "At the same time (as the return of Judah) saith the Lord, I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people." Again: "How shall I put thee among the children, and give thee a pleasant land, a goodly heritage of the hosts of nations? and I said, Thou shalt call me my Father; and shalt not turn away from me."

I will sum up this part of the argument with observing, that according to the structure which I advocate, all the promises to the victors will have their fulfilment at one and the same time, when Christ shall return and bring his reward with him. According to the millenarian theory, about half of the promises will be fulfilled at the beginning, (ii. 11, 26; iii. 5, 21,) and half at the end of the thousand years, (ii. 7; iii. 12; xxii. 7,) which seems to me very improbable.

* Upon one promise (Rev. ii. 17) I have raised no argument.
CHAPTER XXIII.

ANALOGY OF FAITH.

"It is not lawful... so to expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another."—20th Article.

It is said by the advocates for the millenarian theory, that the order of the resurrection and judgment is only by degrees unfolded; and that Rev. xx. being the latest, the succession and its intervals are set before us more clearly there than elsewhere.

It may readily be admitted that each succeeding revelation gives additional information; but we must not suppose that the revelations of Scripture, like the reveries of the Koran, are contradictory to each other. The principle of interpretation in the 20th Article of our Church, which I have put at the head of this chapter, is based upon the directly opposite idea, and is in exact conformity with the apostolic injunction: "Let us prophesy according to the proportion [or analogy] of faith."

In accordance with this principle, I will, before entering upon the interpretation of Rev. xx., examine the explicit declarations regarding the judgment in the more literal parts of Scripture; for though in point of time this revelation is the latest which the Lord has been pleased to give to the Church, yet the form in which it has been announced is not the least obscure.

St. Paul makes an important division in the judgment;
"The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." The judgment of the quick will be at his appearing; for "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

This first act of judgment, it appears to me, will differ in character from the subsequent judicial proceedings of the Lord when He shall have entered his own kingdom; for "the Son of man . . . cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." "The Son of man" will be seen "sitting at the right-hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." The comparison of these texts with the former shows that the first act of judgment will be, not by the Son of man on his own throne, but whilst still on the Father’s throne.

This view harmonizes with two passages in the book of Daniel. In the first vision of Nebuchadnezzar, it is the stone which smites the image, before the stone becomes the mountain; the stone denoting the kingdom during this dispensation, the mountain indicating the future, "when the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established on the top of the mountains."

So in Daniel’s first vision it is the throne of the ancient of days from which a fiery stream issues; and the body of the fourth beast is given to the burning, before "one like unto the Son of man" receives the kingdom from "the Ancient of days."

The same act of judgment is mentioned in the xcviith Psalm. When "Jehovah reigneth," that is, when He who is, and was, and is to come, takes to himself his great power and reigns, then "a fire goeth before Him, and burneth up his enemies round about Him."

Our Lord, in Matthew xxv., speaks of a judgment when He shall sit upon the throne of his glory; that throne pecu-
liar and proper to Him as "Son of man;" which will be "in the regeneration."

I must observe, in passing, that this is not a parable, as many suppose, but is a distinct literal narrative of what shall take place; in which, by way of illustration, the conduct of the judge is compared with that of a shepherd; not thereby giving any countenance to our interpreting the rest of the passage otherwise than according to the literal tenor of the words. I will, therefore, proceed to examine into the time and circumstances of this act of judgment as detailed by our Lord.

1. It appears to be in direct connexion with the assumption by the Son of man of his glorious throne; "Then shall He sit upon the throne of his glory, and before Him shall be gathered all nations," or "all the nations."

2. There will then be an act of segregation, "and He shall separate them one from another." Clearly, therefore, those compared to goats will be before the throne, at the same time with those compared to sheep; for the separation is after all nations have been gathered before Him.

3. When separated, the Son of man says to the blessed, "Come and inherit the kingdom;" the kingdom which the Son of man then possessed, they are called jointly to inherit; their works manifesting that "the kingdom was prepared for them from the foundation of the world." Then to the cursed he says, "Depart into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels;" they having fitted themselves for destruction, as their conduct will have manifested. Then, as if to prevent the supposition of there being any great space of time between the fate of each, the Lord, in recapitulating, first states the doom of the wicked, before he pronounces upon the blessed: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

This much appears clear: there will be a judgment of both righteous and wicked at the time of the Lord's advent.
But there is no mention in this passage of a resurrection; therefore we have no right to assume that these are raised from the dead to stand before the throne; on the contrary, their being styled "the nations" might lead one to suppose that they were those still alive; for after death they would lose their nationality. Moreover, from the grounds on which the judgment proceeds, it could only be nations that had had the brethren of Jesus among them. It therefore does not apply to those nations of former times who had not had the Gospel preached to them. Hence "the nations" may be those mentioned in Matt. xxiv., among whom the Gospel will have been preached. I may add, that our Lord in many of his parables and discourses seems to allude to previous revelations in the Old Testament; in this instance He may refer to Ezekiel xxxiv., which passage seems to relate, not to the resurrection, but to those judicial acts which shall take place previously.

I state this as the view of millenarians, and I would not positively say that it cannot refer to nations alive at the time of the Lord's advent,* nevertheless the judgment appears quite different in character from the judgment of the quick before alluded to.

In the parable, moreover, which immediately precedes this discourse, the Lord at the same time scrutinizes the conduct both of the good and slothful servants; and he who has the ten, receives the eleventh talent at the same time that the wicked servant is deprived and punished. But being a

* The glorious throne of the Son of man would in that case not be the same as the throne of David, but that previous glory in which the Lord will appear from heaven before his assumption of the throne of David. "The regeneration" denoting, not the ultimate and finished state of things, but rather the period during which the change is accomplishing, the meaning being similar to "the times of restitution of all things." This does not appear to me probable.
parable, we shall be told that we must not insist too rigidly upon its application.

The force of this demur might be admitted, did my deduction depend upon but a solitary parable, and then only upon the circumstantial and the detail;* but we could not allow that, in several parables, and merely for the sake of verisimilitude, the truth would be violated in the very pith and marrow of the discourse. When, therefore, we find the simultaneous punishment of the unfaithful and reward of the just a constant and unvarying feature in the parables, we must conclude that at least a co-etaneous retribution is to be expected.

A similar prophetic parable has, in the part already fulfilled, all the order of a regular history. The servants receive their trust, (Luke xix. 13,) the citizens (ver. 14) (i. e. the Jewish nation) reject the risen Christ; why are we not to suppose that when He returns in his kingdom, not only the rewarding of the good but also the punishing of the wicked servants will take place, as well as the judgment of those who said, "Not this man, but Barabbas?"

The parable of the marriage feast is historical: first, the call to the Jews; next, the destruction of Jerusalem; and the visiting of the Gentiles to take out of them a people; then follows the account of the man who had not on the wedding garment, a type of the many called, who, when the King returns, will be cast into outer darkness.

But I need not confine myself to parables. Our Lord,

* It is implied that those who are guilty, as well as the faithful who at the same time receive their recompense, are those very servants whom the Lord left in charge at the time He departed to the far country, [i. e. heaven;] but I do not insist upon this feature of the parable, for as it would be incongruous and would spoil the unity of the parable to suppose that one set of servants was left in charge, and another set in employ when their Lord returns, verisimilitude alone might be sufficient to account for the language.
before his transfiguration, tells Peter that the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels, and "then shall He recompense every man according to his work;" and among others who will then be recompensed will be those who were ashamed of Him in that adulterous and sinful generation.

In the 6th chapter of John our Lord justifies his breach of the sabbath, by asserting that the Son participates in whatever God does or means to do in all his works of providence as well as the dispensations of grace and judgment. By saying, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," He made himself Son to God in so peculiar a manner as to make himself equal with the Father. This He justifies: acknowledging, indeed, the pre-eminence of God the Father in being the first mover in all, yet not without the Son, who, whatsoever He seeth the Father do, that He doeth likewise, or in like manner; that is, not by imitation but co-operation.

His power and authority in Lordship over the dead and the living were to be displayed in the two great instances of "quickening whom He will," and "all judgment;" which I suppose may be distributed in this manner: as the Father has given to the Son to have life in himself, so the spiritually dead who hear his voice shall live; and as the Father hath given Him authority to execute judgment, so therefore, all that are in their graves shall hear his voice. The former is amplified in verses 24, 25, the latter in verses 27, 28, and 29.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life, and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death unto life." By "death" Christ clearly means spiritual death, and "life" as evidently denotes spiritual life. It is the privilege of such as have thus passed from spiritual death to spiritual life not to come into "judgment." An
immunity limited, however, to those who hear and believe Christ; or chiefly those who are called during this dispensation, those who receive Him, to whom He gives the power to become sons of God, and who are born of God. 

Our Lord proceeds to say, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." If the analysis above given be correct, and the interpretation of verse 24 be sound, it will follow that the "dead," verse 25, are the spiritually dead, and that they who hear the voice of the Son of God are raised to spiritual life. The millenarian agrees to this interpretation, and urges from it that the "hour" here mentioned embraces the whole period of the Gospel dispensation; the reason is evident, because he then shapes his argument in the following manner: If the hour in verse 25 embraces the 1800 years of the Gospel dispensation, then the hour in verse 28 may also embrace the 1000 years of the millennial dispensation.

I acknowledge that St. John, who seems to have had his Master's expressions much in his mind, does upon one occasion appear to countenance this large extension of the time denoted by an "hour." But admitting this, the parallel which the millenarian would draw is not complete. The voice of the Son in the one case is continuing to be exerted during the whole of this dispensation, and the spiritually dead are continually hearing and obeying, and therefore constantly witnessing to the power of Messiah in that respect. But with regard to verse 28, the millenarian must maintain either that the voice is exerted all the thousand years, and yet none of the wicked heed it until the reign of Christ be over, thereby giving no evidence of his power, but exactly the contrary: or else he must contend that the voice is twice exerted; once before the commencement of the thousand years of Messiah's reign, and once
CHAPTER XXIII. Again after He has ceased to reign, in apparent contradiction to the tenor of our Lord's words, "the hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth."

Thus, instead of a parallel there is a great contrast; which is made more evident by the nature of the power exercised in the two calls. The voice in the one instance is an appeal to man's responsibility, in the other it is a peremptory command; one a spiritual power bringing home to men the call to hear, the other a putting forth of physical power in raising men's bodies from the grave. We might suppose that in the first case some delay might be permitted through the long-suffering of God; but in the other there can be no reason assigned why obedience should not be instantaneous.

There is also a difference in the facts of the two cases, which makes the parallel still more unequal; the spiritually dead are not all in existence together, therefore they could not all hear the voice at one and the same time; but those in the state of natural death will all be in the condition at once to hear and obey the voice.*

But conceding all for which the millenarian contends, can our Lord's declaration be made to comport with this hypothesis? The hour (verse 25) means this dispensation; the other hour (verse 28) means the millennium, a dispensation during the continuance of which, according to my opponents, there will be no resurrection either of righteous or wicked; for they say the righteous will rise and meet the Lord in the air before He commences his reign upon earth; "but the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years are finished." So that "the hour" in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and come forth, is an

* And there is something collective in the expression, "All that are in their graves shall come forth," which is wanting in the opposite member of the sentence.
interval of a thousand years during which no voice is obeyed or even heard.

Thus, granting all for which the millenarian contends, his interpretation would not be legitimate. In order that the parallel between the two instances of power should hold good, the opinion of Tertullian must be maintained; "that though all the saints will arise during the millennium, they will not rise at once, but gradually or successively." If to this a corresponding opinion be added that the wicked should in like manner rise gradually or successively, then the parallel would be preserved, and the interpretation of each instance would be similar. This view has some grounds of probability, for from the nature of the judgment, it must continue for some time; and it appears rather more probable that there will be different bands in the resurrection, each band rising as they are to be judged, than to suppose all to rise at the same time, some bands waiting whilst the others are being judged.

Other passages imply that the judgment of all the wicked will not be deferred till the end of the thousand years: St. Peter, speaking of those who are guilty of lasciviousness, revellings, idolatries, &c., says, they "shall give account to Him that is ready (prepared) to judge the quick and the dead." This could hardly be a proper expression, if the Lord is not to judge the dead until He shall have exercised another office for a thousand years.

Our Lord affirms that the Queen of the South will rise up in the judgment with the Jews of his days, and will condemn them; it seems implied both with regard to her and the repentant Ninevites, that they will not rise to condemnation. Here, then, is a simultaneous rising of both justified and condemned ones.

In the prophecy of Isaiah, we learn that "in that day, when He will swallow up death in victory," some who dwell in the dust shall "awake" and sing. "The earth also shall..."
cast out her dead (Rephaim) "* The one party being called
to sing, and the other being cast out, intimates pretty plainly
their several fates.

The same prophet speaks of the carcasses of those men
who have transgressed against the Lord; whose worm shall
not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall
be an abhoring to all flesh. This awful scene shall be
witnessed at the time of the restoration of the Jews; and
our Lord, when alluding to that event, puts it in juxta-posi-
tion with entrance into life.

The language in Daniel is very similar to that of Isaiah.
The angel says, "At that time, thy (Daniel's) people shall
be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the
book. 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" or "loathsomeness" which
is, in the original, the very same word as in the evangelical
prophet is rendered, "They shall be an abhoring to all
flesh." "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh
reap corruption."

According to the received version of 2 Cor. v. 10, St.
Paul says, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat
of Christ, that every one may receive the things (done) in
his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good

* Isaiah xiv. 9 seems to give the meaning of "Rephaim." "Hell
from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirrith
up the Rephaim for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth." Ges-
enius derives this noun from the word signifying physicians, who used
to embalm, and thus the word is applied to the "great ones" who
alone were embalmed. Mede has a dissertation upon the word.

Isaiah xxvi. 19 appears to be in the form of a dialogue; and is the
response to the complaints of the former verse, "Thy dead shall live."
Christ mystical seems intended in the following clause: "My dead
body, they shall arise." Jesus then gives the command, "Awake,
and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of
the morning, (comp. Ps. cx. 3,) and the earth shall cast out the Rephaim."
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or bad." I do not clearly perceive what is meant by "that every one may receive the things done in his body." I rather suppose that as the apostle was, in the preceding verse, talking of, "Whether in the tabernacle or out of the tabernacle, (of the body,) we may be accepted of Him;" he is in this verse talking of our manifested condition with regard to our bodies when before the tribunal of Christ: "For we must all be made manifest before the tribunal of Christ, that each may receive through the body according to that he hath done, whether good or bad;" and he continues, with the same idea predominant, "But we are made manifest unto God, and I trust also, are made manifest in your consciences." Our body, whether of glory or corruption, will not only make manifest our state, but will be accessory severally to the perfect consummation and bliss of the believer, and (as we have already seen) to the consummated misery of the condemned.

Having examined the principal passages relative to the resurrection and judgment, I come to these conclusions: There will be an order in the resurrection; there will be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust; our Lord says, Luke xiv. 14. specially, that he will raise up his people in the last day, Acts xxiv. 15. John vi. 39. therefore, there will be a different kind of power put forth in the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked; at the Rom. viii. 11. resurrection the condition of the bodies of the wicked will be awfully different from that of the saints whose privilege it is to be raised in incorruptibility.

With respect to the order, it appears that the first who rise will be "those that are Christ's," that they, together with those of Christ who are alive at the time of the advent, will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, 1 Thess. iv. 17. prior to his descent to the earth. But I am not inclined to suppose by "those who are Christ's" that all are included who shall have been gathered during all the former dispensations.
Some have supposed that at this period, whilst in the air, Rom. xiv. 10, 12. "every one of us [i.e. believers] shall give an account of himself to God."* To me, however, this idea is beset with a great difficulty. The parables in Luke xix. 15, &c., and Matt. xxv. 19, seem to indicate the account which the righteous will give; but, apparently, some professed servants of the Lord will also have to give an account at the same time, and in the same locality. The justified being manifested (i.e. glorified, when) before the tribunal of Christ may there give an account of themselves without its impeaching our Lord's declaration that they come not into judgment. And this, perhaps, is what is implied in 1 Pet. ii. 12.

After the advent, there will be a resurrection of righteous and wicked; it is not improbable that there may be several bands in the resurrection, each individual standing in his own lot. The judgment will, doubtless, take a considerable space of time; thus, possibly, the resurrection of some may be deferred till the close of the thousand years.

It may, however, be objected, Is it not said that some were tortured, not accepting deliverance, in order that they might obtain a better resurrection? Yes, truly, and "better" is the comparative of "good." It is not a question then as to whether they should rise among the wicked or with the just, but as to what would be their standing in the resurrection of the just. The martyrdom of a man will not make him a saint, but the martyrdom of a saint may heighten his glory. The text may be quoted in support of different degrees of glory or of different bands in the resurrection of the righteous, but not of the thousand years separation between the resurrection of the wicked and that of the just; had that been intended, it should have been "the prior resurrection," instead of "a better resurrection."

* If this supposition is correct, it throws a new light upon the parable of the marriage of the king's son, and one not having a wedding garment. Matt. xxii. 11.
But, again, it will be objected that the anxiety expressed by St. Paul could not regard the general resurrection, for to that all must attain, either in joy or sorrow: yet, if it do not relate to the general resurrection, it must refer to a resurrection of righteous ones from among the dead wicked. I think not; St. Paul's desire to depart, because of his assurance that he would then be with Christ, and his looking for Christ to change his vile body into a body of glory betoken expectations utterly inconsistent with his saying in the same breath, that he was striving if, that by any means, he might attain unto salvation from among the wicked, and which he denies having "already attained." I am therefore inclined to adopt another interpretation "I count all things but loss," says the apostle, "for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, . . . . that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings being made conformable unto his death." He longs to know Jesus, both in his death to sin and in his resurrection life, working in him to all active obedience and holiness; and this to such a degree, so powerfully, effectually, completely, that "if by any means," says he, "I might come up to the resurrection of" or "out of the dead:" that is, if possible, I might, during the days of my flesh, come up to that perfect standard of resurrection holiness; for he immediately adds, "not, as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but," says he, "I press towards." He need not have taken this precaution, in order to prevent the Philippians from misunderstanding as to whether he had yet attained unto the body of glory; it was, however, necessary to point out that, although he aimed at no lower standard than perfection, yet he could never be "perfect," as long as he had a body of humiliation.

I now come to a close with respect to these points of enquiry; conceiving that I have shewn:

1. From the structure of the passage itself, that Rev. xx. 11 is in immediate connection with Rev. xx. 5;
2. From synchronisms with other parts of scripture, that Rev. xx. 11, and the subsequent verses, will be fulfilled at the commencement of the thousand years; and,

3. From the analogy of faith that there will be a resurrection both of just and unjust at the second advent of Messiah: all of which leads to the conclusion that Rev. xx. 5—10 inclusive, must be thrown into a parenthesis. *

* If the first clause of Rev. xx. 5 be genuine, I commence the parenthesis with that verse; but if that clause be rejected (the authority for which I shall shew in the following chapter) the parenthesis should commence with the seventh verse.
CHAPTER XXIV.

INTERPRETATION OF REVELATION XX. 5, ETC.

"At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies," &c.

Before entering upon the interpretation of the two verses in question, there is a preliminary enquiry as to what is the correct text, for the subject in debate very much depends upon the first clause of Rev. xx. 5, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished," and very considerable doubt is thrown upon the genuineness of this clause. Granville Penn, in his edition of the "New Covenant," notices that it "is unknown to the best Vatican* and Moscow MSS. . . . . it is excluded from the text by Matthæi in his second edition, though he had given it within brackets in his first edition."

The passage certainly appears to read more connectedly without the disputed clause, "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years, this is the first resurrection," &c. This would lead one to suspect that possibly it was originally a side note which had crept into the text; there being, therefore, both external evidence from two distinct families of manuscripts, as well as internal evidence against the

* The famous Vat. M.S. must be excluded from the number of authorities, for it does not extend farther than the middle of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Apocalypse in Syriac, published by L. de Dieu in 1627, which agrees in various readings with some of the best Greek manuscripts, has not got the clause in question.
clause, it is not surprising, that after mature deliberation, it should have been expunged by one, who, I believe, Bishop Middleton pronounced to have produced the best critical edition of the New Testament.

Nevertheless, as this is the only passage in scripture which separates the two resurrections by an interval of a thousand years, it is possible that it might have been expunged by some early opponents of the doctrine. As, moreover, I feel convinced that it would look suspicious if I attempted to get rid of a particular view, by rejecting the passage which is chiefly urged in its support, though I do not myself rely upon the passage, I will point out what I think ought to be the true interpretation, upon the supposition of its being genuine.

The apostle says, "I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus," &c. He does not say, "I saw those who had been beheaded," but "the souls of those who had been beheaded;" I conceive the reason of the periphrasis to be because he is relating a vision, "I saw;" but the following clause, whether written by St. John or inserted by some other hand, is added as a kind of explanatory note, and is not in the same form, but is simple narrative, and appears to be literal "the rest of the dead," and that the dead in verse 5 has the same meaning as "the souls of those who had been beheaded" appears plainly from the particle of opposition "but"—"but the rest of the dead;" that is, those who do not come under the description in verse 4.

I shall take for granted that a natural resurrection—a reunion of soul and body—is here intended, because I am now dealing with those who do so interpret the passage. But the reunion of soul and body is, in scripture, divided into two kinds—there shall be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust: that of the former is stiled the resurrection of life, and that of the latter is designated the resur-
rection, not of life, but, of judgment. Now, concerning these witnesses for Jesus, when it is said, that they lived with Christ, I do not understand that a natural resurrection simply is intended, but a resurrection of a particular kind, namely, "the resurrection of life." It is the resurrection of those who are Christ's, who come, not into judgment, but who are caught up to meet the Lord in the air.

Two things are predicated concerning them: not only that they lived with Christ for a thousand years, but that they also reigned with Christ for a thousand years. From this passage, those who limit the reign of Christ to the millennium, assume:

1. That the saints will then cease to reign with Christ;
2. That Christ also will then cease to reign.

But this interpretation, if carried out consistently, would bring us to conclusions which we should all abhor; for if the converse of reigning with Christ for a thousand years, be, that Christ and the saints shall then cease to reign, so also the living with Christ for a thousand years would imply that Christ and the saints would then cease to live; but, as living with Christ does not imply that at the end of the thousand years they will cease to live, so neither does the reigning with Christ for a thousand years necessarily imply that at the end of the thousand years they will cease to reign: on the contrary, we are told in the same book, that God's servants "shall reign for ever and ever," which is exactly in accordance with the declaration to Daniel concerning the saints, that "they shall possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever;" that kingdom which the saints shall receive "cannot be moved." The martyrs, then, will have the blessedness of living with Christ for ever, and of reigning with Christ for ever; but there is also the peculiar privilege given them of a priority in the resurrection. If, then, their privilege is in the time and not in the nature of their resurrection, "the rest of the dead" who shall live
again at the end of the thousand years, will also rise to a resurrection similar, in all but the circumstance of time, to that mentioned immediately before; namely, not to the resurrection of judgment but to the resurrection of life.

I am not aware that the resurrection of the wicked is ever called "living again;" their souls will rise in a state of spiritual death to be reunited to a body under the power of corruption, only to be consigned to the second death. Hence, the resurrection of the wicked can no more be called a "living again" than taking a criminal from prison to the bar can be called giving him liberty.

The passage, according to this view, if genuine, meets an inquiry which suggests itself naturally enough. If only the martyrs, and those who have not worshipped the beast, rise at the commencement of the thousand years, what is to become of the many who do not come under that description, but who yet are saved souls? I do not stop to inquire how many classes of believers are embraced by, or excluded from the description in Rev. xx. 4: I say in the general that those who "suffer with Christ shall reign with him," but "the rest of the dead," those, perhaps, "who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," irresponsible persons, or those who may already have been judged according to men in the flesh, but who had the Gospel preached unto them, in order that they might live according to God in the spirit,—such as these, it may be, rise not in the first resurrection, for they did not suffer with Christ; they rise not in the resurrection of judgment for they have no account to render.

"This is the first resurrection; blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power."

From "first resurrection" and "second death" being mentioned in this manner, it is often unconsciously assumed that they are correlative; but correlatives, in the order of
first and second, must be in similars; hence, "first resurrection" must be in relation to a "second resurrection" and "second death" must be in relation to a "first death."

As the first resurrection and second death are not first and second in the order of nature, so neither are they in the order of time, as is evident from the beast and false prophet passing into the state of second death even prior to the first resurrection; so that the second death cannot be second in order of time to the first resurrection.

That the first death, to which the second death is in relation, is not natural, but spiritual, appears from the circumstance of the beast and false prophet being cast alive into the lake of fire, "which is the second death." Therefore, neither is "second death," nor its correlative, to be understood in a literal, but in a figurative sense, second death following not upon natural dissolution, but spiritual destitution.

The verse which next comes under consideration, according to my supposition, is the 11th, "And I saw a great white throne." I used to suppose, in common with most others, that this was the Messianic throne, and that he who sat upon it was Jesus, because he is Alpha and Omega, and because all judgment is committed to the Son; but I am now inclined to believe that the throne of God the Father is intended; for a distinction is clearly made in other parts of the apocalypse, between the Lamb and Him who sits upon the throne; and in this passage, "He who sits upon the throne" says, "He that overcometh . . . I will be his God, and he shall be my son," which is the relation in which the Father is pleased to reveal himself to the Church. Moreover, this throne, when first seen by the apostle, is not established upon the earth, because the heaven and earth flee away from the face of Him who sits upon the throne. But the Messianic throne will be the throne of David upon th es evat ed earth.
The title Alpha and Omega appears attributable to the Father as well as to the Son. If it indicate the relation which external events have to the Deity, it would properly belong to the Son during this dispensation, when Christ is all in all: but to the Father, at the period to which Rev. xxi. 7 refers, when He will be "all in all."

As to the judgment, it will be conducted by the Messiah, but, apparently, in the presence of the Father; the first acts of judgment, indeed, will be before the Lord Jesus leaves the right hand of God.

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God."

I have, I hope, shewn a probability that "the rest of the dead" who live at the end of the thousand years, are those in a state of natural death, but who will rise to spiritual life. Are we to understand the dead who stand before God, and who are judged according to their works, as those who had been dead in a natural sense, and who are raised to life to stand before God; or are we to understand that, though subjects of the resurrection, the term expresses that they stand before God as "the dead," that is as spiritually dead?

There is no denying that "dead" and "living" are used in scripture as commonly to denote the moral condition of the soul as the physical condition of the body; sometimes indeed the word is used in the same passage in the two different senses.

I used to suppose that "the dead," Rev. xx. 11, were the spiritually dead, (1) because of their standing before God as the dead, (2) because their resurrection is that of judgment, (3) and chiefly by comparison with Rev. xi. 18, where judging of the dead is put in opposition to rewarding God's servants. But, on the other hand, "the dead" delivered up by the sea, death, and hades, (ver. 13) appear to be the dead viewed naturally and physically, and the expression, "Whosoever was not found in the book of life," &c., would lead us to infer that some were found in the book of life,
which contradicts the supposition of all being spiritually dead. I now consider that the immunity promised by our Lord, of not coming into judgment, is, with the exception of the "prophets" and some other eminent individuals of former dispensations, confined to those who hear and receive Christ, or those gathered during this dispensation. So that though it be true that "death" and "life," with regard to those who hear the Gospel, are terms equivalent to a state of salvation and the contrary; yet, it is not true with regard to those of former dispensations; for to be born of God is the exalted privilege of this present dispensation.* The judgment of the dead, therefore, does not necessarily imply condemnation, but only that they do not enjoy the peculiar privilege of Christ's people, viz., the not coming into judgment.

This 12th verse, therefore, I conceive embraces all classes, with but two exceptions. Those mentioned in verse 4 will not be judged, but will take part in judging the world; nor will the beast and false prophet be included, for they, like Korah and his company, will be cast alive into the pit; a fearful contrast to those who shall be caught up alive to meet the Lord in the air. But, with these exceptions, all must be included among "the dead, small and great;" those who have sinned without law, and those who had the work of the law written in their hearts; those who have sinned in the law, and those who, touching the righteousness of the law, are blameless; the repentant Ninevites, and the obdurate Jews; the inhabitants of Sodom to meet their more

* Had I seen Archdeacon Hare's "Mission of the Comforter" before I published my notes on Melchisedek, I should have been able to back some of my notions by his authority; I must, however, content myself with transcribing a few lines at the close of a long quotation from Olshausen: "The special work of the Holy Ghost is that of regeneration, and the whole creative action of God in the souls of men. Hence regeneration also belongs essentially to the New Testament, because under this dispensation the Holy Ghost first manifested his specific power." p. 492.
tolerable judgment, the inhabitants of Chorazin to receive their more dreadful doom.*

The rule of judgment is similar to that in Matt xxv., for it is according to works, and the fate of the condemned is the same; for they shall be cast into the lake of fire, to which Satan shall subsequently be consigned; the fire, therefore, is that mentioned by our Lord, which is prepared for the Devil and his angels.

“...and death and hades delivered up the dead which were in them.”

These I understand as particular instances under the general description of the preceding verse. But what particular classes or bodies of dead are intended may be a matter of doubt. Understanding hades to be the receptacle of souls, and death to refer to the grave or place of bodies, what are we to understand by the dead which the sea will give up? It could scarcely denote the individuals drowned in the ocean from time to time, for, taking it to refer to the accidental manner of their death, their souls are, I suppose, in hades as well as the souls of others; and their bodies are not held in solution in the water, but have descended to the bottom, and become mingled with the earth as well as others.

Still, the sea being connected with the heaven and earth must, I conceive, be understood literally. But instead of “... and there was no more sea,” which denotes a universality contrary to other parts of scripture, I would rather understand “... and the sea was no more;” the Red Sea possibly being denoted, it being in scripture styled simply and emphatically “the sea.” For example, in Psalm cvi. 7 “the sea” is mentioned, and the clause immediately following explains what sea is to be understood, for it is added in a way of emphasis, “...even at the Red Sea.” So in Isa. l. 2, and li. 9, 10, 15. The latter reference is particularly remark-

* Perhaps infants and irresponsible persons are not included in the judgment, their names, therefore, may be found in the book of life.
able, for the destruction of the heavens and earth, and the establishment of the new heavens and earth, are mentioned in the preceding and following contexts. It is, moreover, expressly declared by Isaiah that the Lord will destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, at the time of the restoration of Israel.

I therefore think it not improbable that Pharaoh and his host may be referred to in Rev. xx. 5, who were overwhelmed in the Red Sea, that persecutor of the Lord's people having been specially raised up to shew forth God's power and wrath.

There may, perhaps, be an allusion to Job xxvi. 5, which, according to the authorized version, is not very evident, but which, according to the rendering in Taylor's Hebrew Con- cordsance is not dissimilar to the passage in hand. "The Rephaim shall be brought forth from under the waters, with its inhabitants," implying a peculiar resurrection of those mighty wicked destroyed by the sea; then, in the following verse, we find mention made of sheol, or the grave, and abaddon, or destruction; in verse 12 there is direct allusion to the overthrow of the Egyptian host, "He divideth the sea by his power, and by his understanding he smiteth through Rahab."

The latter part of the verse alludes, I suppose, to Hos. Rev. xx. 13. xiii. 14. The whole verse, therefore, relates to the resurrection of Israel and of Israel's persecutors; who will all be confronted before the throne, and each party judged according to their works.

A difficulty is supposed to arise from what is mentioned in the verses which I have thrown into a parenthesis. It may be stated as follows: "The Son will not surrender the kingdom, until all his enemies shall be subjected; this cannot be whilst Satan is still loose and deceiving the nations; the king-

* In chapter xii. there is also direct allusion to the persecution of Pharaoh, probably as a type of the last persecuting power.
The question, properly, is not whether Satan will be in subjection at the termination of the thousand years, but whether he had been in subjection during the thousand years. When Satan shall be bound and shut up in prison, will he not then be in subjection to Christ? His being subsequently loosed to perform a work in the mysterious economy of God, cannot set aside the fact that he will be in subjection for a thousand years.

The Lord sold the Israelites into the hand of Jabin, and they were mightily oppressed: it cannot be said that they were not then in subjection, because Barak afterwards delivered them. Zedekiah's rebellion against the king of Babylon does not prove that he was not previously in subjection, but exactly the reverse. And to take an example which, perhaps, approaches more nearly to a type, Solomon's reign commenced with all his enemies being "under the soles of his feet;" but at the close there were wars and rebellions. So Satan, not even breaking out by his own power, but being loosed at the end of the thousand years, to perform a work as God's instrument, this only proves that he shall be Christ's footstool for the previous thousand years.

I here close my examination of Rev. xx. Striving to keep before my mind the solemn event there predicted, I have desired to be an inquirer into the truth, rather than the advocate of an opinion. I hope that no controversy, as to how or when the judgment shall take place, will efface from my mind the all-important truth, that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; and, with that thought present, I say, that the theory which defers the judgment of the wicked to the end of Messiah's reign, appears contrary to the structure of the apocalypse; contrary to the evidence derived from parallel passages; contrary to the analogy of faith; and that thus to interpret Rev. xx., instead of its giving increased light, it only produces an inverted image on the horizon of futurity.
CHAPTER XXV.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPIRITUAL HYPOTHESIS.

"In the visible church the evil be ever mingled with the good."

26th Article.

I mentioned in the commencement of this book that there must be a dependence between the expectation of the end and the opinion held as to the order of events preceding it. This is necessarily the case, because if we are led to expect a spiritual millennium before the second advent of Messiah, and that his return will be only to judge the world at the dissolution of all things, we must give up our expectation of a grammatical fulfilment of the prophecies and promises; because there would be neither time nor place for the literal accomplishment of that promise, towards which all the prophecies converge, and from which all the promises of the ensuing glories radiate.

Hence the different styles of interpretation necessarily adopted by the advocates of the different systems. Those who hold that the church’s triumph will be during Christ’s personal presence upon this earth, receive the prophecies, in the main, according to the plain tenor of their language; whilst their opponents, who expect the fulfilment of all the prophecies respecting the reign of Messiah—all with regard to the restoration of Israel, and all relating to the renovation of the earth—prior to the literal advent of the Lord, must adopt a method of interpretation which they perhaps call spiritualizing, but which, in fact, throws ambiguity and
CHAPTER XXV.

mystery over language which to the literalist appears clear and explicit.

To suppose that Jerusalem will be the throne of Jehovah, is, with the spiritualizers, a carnal notion of heavenly glory; the descending of the bride from heaven must therefore mean the ascending of the saints to heaven; and the coming of the Lord can be nothing more than our going to Him. In like manner, the restoration of Israel and the renovation of the earth, are figurative descriptions of the universal spread of the Gospel, and its benign influences.*

* Most of the spiritual interpreters would afford striking illustrations of what I have here advanced. I have collected a few instances from Mr. Brown's work:—

P. 44. "The armies in heaven," Rev. xix. 14, are "terrestrial believers."

P. 77. The "sinners in Zion" are despisers of Gospel grace.

P. 250. "He shall purify the sons of Levi"—a pure ministry springing out of the ashes of a corrupt priesthood.

P. 259. "The vengeance which Christ came to execute against the Jewish church at the destruction of Jerusalem," his first personal advent was not to do while on earth; He went up to heaven, and from thence "came to execute vengeance" against the Jewish church. So Christ's going to heaven is not only included in the description of his providential advent, but is part and parcel of his coming to Jerusalem.

P. 259. From Daniel's prophecy the Saviour, in Matt. xxiv., "borrows the vesture"—those "clouds of heaven"—the clouds being the "symbolical drapery," p. 17, the "coming" being "an august way of representing" doing. Daniel again borrows the symbols and circumstances "from the characteristics of the last judgment," p. 129, "a sublime symbolical way of expressing the righteousness of anti-Christ's destruction." p. 132. But from what literal description Daniel borrowed his sublime symbolical drapery, from which our Lord again borrows the vesture of clouds—whether from one already in existence before it was borrowed, or revealed at some period future to Daniel, we are not told.

P. 261, and note to ditto. By the double aspect of prophecy, Mr. Brown is able to make the judgment of the heathen, the destruction of Jerusalem by the heathen under Titus.
But does the spiritualizer really believe God's revelation? May it not be, that rather than test the reality of his faith by either receiving or rejecting that which is distinct and explicit, he hides the hollowness of his belief, by keeping the object of faith vague and undefined?

But from whatever cause it may spring, the result of these principles of interpretation is very evident; it becomes impossible to give any uniform, continuous, or consistent exposition of the prophecies; and the consequence is, that the prophecies, as such, are neglected; the promises respecting Ephraim and Judah are, irrespective of their contexts, applied to different sects of Christians; whilst the threatenings in the same predictions are left to the literal Israel.

I do not object to using Scripture in an accommodated sense; we may argue from what God has done, or intends to do, under certain circumstances, to what He will do under similar circumstances; but if we do not first fix its literal meaning, instead of accommodating Scripture fairly, we may be appropriating it unwarrantably.

By substituting the expectation of a spiritual millennium for that of Christ's personal advent, the practical parts of Scripture, as well as the prophetic, are seriously affected; for a relation between the Church and the world is expected to come about, which is quite inconsistent with those parts of the written word. The great practical point of difference between the two theories is, whether there shall be a sudden

P. 264. The kingdom taken from Israel was the unchurching them, p. 263, at the destruction of Jerusalem, p. 249, which the apostles unreasonably asked to be restored some thirty-five years before it was taken away, p. 263.

P. 353. The binding of Satan is his not being able to form a party. p. 310, 311.

"The rest of the dead" who live not again during the 1000 years, are just the party opposed to those who live and reign. p. 351.

The "living again," therefore, is just the nations being deceived, so that "living again" is again becoming dead in trespasses and sins.
transition or a gradual amelioration, "though chequered and variable with ultimate universality." In this latter view the extension of the Gospel, not only "as a witness," is expected, but its universal reception is anticipated; and it is even now supposed to be very generally esteemed.

If the world is to be ameliorated by the means now in operation, it must be either through the ungodly, though still remaining unconverted, yet becoming less wicked; or else, in consequence of the real conversion of the many, there will be a decided alteration in the relative proportion between the numbers of those on the Lord's side, and those still under the power of the wicked one; or else, through the combined influence of these two causes.

The first is what is implied when people talk of the influence of public opinion; the second is what is intended, when people say that through the instrumentality of missionary exertion, "the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea;" but perhaps the last is the idea, though not strictly defined, which pervades the minds of most spiritual millenialists.

To suppose that the ungodly will become less wicked, is to suppose that Satan will resign his empire, and will no longer energize in the children of disobedience; or else, that he will accomplish his purpose more effectually, by his slaves being not very manifestly on his side. The former of these opinions could scarcely be maintained were it not for an idea I fear more generally believed than expressed, that "Satan" denotes rather a personification of evil inclinations than the evil personage himself,—an error calculated to expose us greatly to his devices; the other view would equally expose us to the deceivableness of unrighteousness.

But with regard to the results from missionary exertions, though I willingly grant that the effect of preaching the Gospel throughout all the world, will be the gathering an elect people out of every nation; yet, I think we have also
reason to expect that nominal Christianity will also become more extended throughout the world: tares, I doubt not, will be sown along with the wheat. I, moreover, believe, that if we do not keep this fact constantly in mind, but expect an alteration in the relative proportion between the numbers of the ungodly and of those truly converted, the direct tendency of such a supposition is, to blind us to the perils of the last days, when men will have the form of godliness without the power; for I fear the doctrine of the world's amendment, like that of individual perfectibility, lowers the standard of christian holiness. Its advocates suppose that there will no longer be few who find the narrow path; hence that path hath no longer, in their estimation, so strait a gate; the rugged places are made smooth, and the narrow way widened: the little flock will no longer be weak and despised but in authority and power, hence the thirsting for political influence; and the idea that millennial blessedness is to be introduced by natural means gives a feverish desire for change, and a reckless destruction of ancient institutions. Conceiving that the saints will no longer be persecuted, they now mix with the world, and are at ease when they do not rouse its enmity; conceiving that the kingdom which cannot be moved is already partly established, they no longer live as strangers and pilgrims,—thus the whole life of the Christian is lowered, and perhaps we may say that with very few exceptions, even those who maintain the doctrine of the kingdom to come, have not emerged from the evil tendency of this spiritual view, which of late years has maintained in the Church.

But let us suppose the combined influence of the two causes. From the force of public opinion—the reflection of the light without the heat of Christianity—the ungodly will become less openly profligate; and from the general

* "Decision is promoted, not by blending but contrasting Christ's kingdom with those of the world."—Duffield, p. xiii.
reception of a diluted Gospel, the form of Christianity will become more general, but with its distinctive features less marked and decided. How perilous will such a time be! How difficult to “discern between the righteous and the wicked.”

My object, however, is not so directly to take a practical view of the subject, as to show the bearing of this theory upon those parts of Scripture which are practical and experimental. The theory of a spiritual millennium, as I have already observed, does not expect a sudden transition to that state in which we shall all know even as we are known, but it supposes a change gradually to be brought about, which, when consummated, will make the experimental and practical parts of the word unsuitable; its precepts, encouragements, and warnings, useless. For though some maintain that when all the earth shall make a joyful noise unto the Lord, rejoicing and singing praise; when the heavens shall rejoice and the earth be glad, the sea and its fullness, the field and all therein shall be joyful; that then the whole creation will be groaning and travelling in pain; that when the horns of the righteous shall be exalted, that then all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution; that when all God’s saints shall have honour, that then they will be calumniated as evil doers; that the growing of the tares with the wheat until the end denotes ultimate universality of vital religion; still I think unprejudiced common sense must admit that two very opposite states are described.

It follows that if there is to be no defined point of transition from one condition to the other, so neither can there be any defined point of time up to which the written word will be in full force, and then suddenly become a dead letter; but in the same gradual manner that the happier condition is approximated, will the word become unsuitable; its directions for separating from the world will gradually
become less stringent as the little flock gradually approaches to a majority and ultimately to the universality; as the roaring lion will gradually lose his activity, so the necessity for vigilance will consequently gradually decrease; principles which are despised, will gradually become honoured; the offence of the cross will gradually cease; so we may gradually relax in watchful jealousy over our own conduct, even though all the world should approve of our principles, and all men should speak well of us: a time, in short, during this dispensation, will arrive, when all Scripture will cease to be profitable for doctrine, reproof, instruction, consolation, and support.

Thus the view which boasts of being more spiritual, is, in fact, more carnal, and in direct collision with the word of God.

The advocates of a spiritual millennium say that the world will get better and better; Revelation says that "evil men and seducers will wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." The spiritualizers say that the power of the evil spirit will gradually be abridged, but the word of God says, that he will have great wrath when he knows that his time is short, and that "the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders," is a sign that the day of Christ is at hand; the spiritualizers say, that during this dispensation, all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest, but the Holy Spirit says, that there being many anti-Christis is a sign of the last time; the spiritualizer says that for a thousand years, or perhaps 360,000 years, before Christ's advent, the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, but Scripture says, that when darkness covers the earth and gross darkness the people, that then the Lord shall arise on his people, and his glory be seen on them.

If we in this manner pervert or neglect the predictions, conclusion, misapply the promises, dilute the precepts, and make the
practical and experimental parts of Scripture obsolete, are we not in the condition of the foolish virgins, having the word indeed as "a light unto our feet and a lamp to our paths," but having no oil to our lamps? If we have not the unction from the Holy One, an indwelling Spirit to lead us into all truth, the letter of the Scripture will be profitless.
CHAPTER XXVI.

LITERAL INTERPRETATION.

"The offering of Christ once made . . . there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone."—31st Article.

The evils of the spiritualizing system do not stop with its advocates: many of those who are shocked at the word of God being used so irreverently, run into an opposite extreme of literalism, and almost deny that there is either figure or symbol in the language of the prophecies; and seem to act upon the supposition that in their interpretation, the exercise of the intellect is an abuse of faith.

The result has, I fear, been detrimental to the advance of prophetic knowledge, instead of any approximation to common grounds of interpretation, the most divergent principles are advocated.

The spiritualizer shelters himself, not in the strength of his own cause, but in the absurd results to which the opposite principles are supposed to lead; whilst the literalist, conscious of the soundness of his principles of interpretation, is perhaps careless in applying them, and gives a shock to the common sense of his opponent.

The spiritualist objects to the literal interpretation of some of the prophecies, as involving the supernatural and improbable; the literalist urges in reply that the same reasoning would have caused the Jews to reject the literal fulfilment of the prophecy that a virgin should bring forth
Chapter XXVI. A son, and that that son should be God-with-us: what more contrary to nature than the conception by a virgin? What so stupendous as the incarnation of Jehovah?

Foiled in his first attempt, the spiritualist takes up different ground, and opposes the literal fulfilment of other prophecies as too minute and insignificant; the literalist replies, that by the same reasoning, the Jew would have rejected the literal interpretation of what prophecy pointed out should happen to the garment and vesture of Jesus, or what would be offered Him to drink at the time of dissolution. It is the most minute fittings to the counterpart that prove the genuineness of the indenture.

The spiritualist again objects to the literal fulfilment of the prophecies respecting the earthly glory of Messiah, as derogatory to the dignity of the Son of God; the literalist replies that a similar supposition would have led the Jew to reject the literal interpretation of those predictions concerning Messiah as the despised and rejected One; mocked, buffeted, and spit upon.

So far the literalist appears to have the advantage; but it is not to be denied that there are passages of Scripture which do present difficulties upon the supposition of their literal acceptation. Perhaps nothing is more justly repulsive to the opponents of the literal view, than the idea of the re-institution of literal sacrifices; an opinion maintained by many, but chiefly upon the authority of the latter chapters of Ezekiel,—a passage which I therefore purpose examining.

The difficulty which this subject presents is, that no arguments for the adoption of literal interpretation could be urged, which would not apply in their full force to Ezekiel's prophecy concerning a temple and temple service. No literalist would hesitate to adopt it as the literal description of what was to be, were it not for the consequences, the very ground upon which the spiritualist feels justified in
rejecting the whole doctrine of Messiah's literal reign upon earth.

The description of Ezekiel's temple is so minute and explicit in architectural detail, that it is difficult to understand any meaning but the literal one; any attempt at a minute spiritual interpretation would amount probably to little better than childishness. Besides, what warrant have we for supposing that the pattern shown to Ezekiel was not of a temple really to be built, any more than that archetypes shown to Moses and David, were not of structures actually to be erected?

It is also clear, that if the prediction is to be understood literally, it has never yet had a fulfilment. Still, I do not think that the temple of Ezekiel belongs to the future glorious condition of the Church; for an imperfect state of things is contemplated quite unsuitable to the "perfect state" which we are led to expect. There is provision "for every one that errreth;" moreover, the prince is commanded not to oppress, an injunction unnecessary, to say the least, in the "perfect state;" the year of liberty is contemplated of periodical recurrence, but who will there be to go free when the year of God's redeemed has come? It is, moreover, a condition of mortality.

The sacrifices mentioned by Ezekiel seem to me quite unsuitable to any period of the Church after the first advent of Messiah; for according to the epistle addressed to the Hebrews themselves, the sacrifices mentioned by Ezekiel are those very ones which are done away by Christ.

In Ezekiel there is provision for slaying the sin-offering and the trespass-offering, both of which were HOLINESS OF HOLINESS. The apostle, quoting from the x1th Psalm, says, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not; in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure:" then applying this quotation he says, "He taketh away the first [in order] that He may establish the second." The sacri-
fioes that were by the law must be abolished, in order that
the offering of Christ might be established. Would not,
therefore, their re-establishment vitiate the one offering of
Jesus? Would there not then be a remembrance of sin, in
opposition to the blessing of the new covenant, "Their sins
and iniquities will I remember no more?"

Again, there is mention made of the bullock whose body
was to be burnt without the sanctuary; which the apostle
applies to Christ suffering without the gate, and to the
necessity which there was, for those who would enjoy the
benefits to be derived from Christ, of going without the
pale of Jewish ordinances: while those who continue in
the use of the ceremonial law have no right to partake of
Christ.

Again, according to Ezekiel, circumcision was to be im-
perative not only amongst the Jews, but with strangers;
while the apostle tells us, "If ye be circumcised, Christ
shall profit you nothing."

And lastly, in Ezekiel's temple the passover was to have
been regularly observed; but "Christ, our passover, has
been sacrificed for us," are we to go back to what now are
"beggarly elements?"

Perhaps the advocates for the restoration of sacrifices
would say they are to be commemorative or eucharistic; I
say this view appears more objectionable than the spiritual
hypothesis, because that only evades Scripture, this opposes
it; for the object of these sacrifices is expressly declared:
they are for him that ereth; and they are to reconcile, to
 cleanse, and to purge; if they were intended as eucharistic,
they would not be called "sins" and "trespasses;" they
would rather be called peace and thank-offerings, but we
have these mentioned also, and distinct from the sin and
burnt offerings.

It appears, from some passages in the prophecies, that
the Jews will be offering sacrifices at the time of the Lord's
return. I would instance the first chapter of Isaiah; we have the authority of St. Paul for saying that it refers to the state of the Jews during this dispensation, and before the second advent; we have also the countenance of Rev. xi. 8, Sodom in that passage being "spiritually" applied to the Jews, the comparison being taken from Isaiah i., where, with the exception of a small remnant, the universal depravity of the nation is likened to the total corruption of Sodom. The latter verses of the same chapter in Isaiah relate to when Jerusalem shall become the faithful city, and when the sinners shall be consumed by fire; but in the verses which occur intermediately between the comparison with Sodom and the promise that Jerusalem shall become faithful, (ver. 11—14,) mention is made of the sacrifices which the Jews will then be offering. There is another example in chap. lxvi. 8, before the Lord shall "come with fire," (ver. 15.) Also in Psalm l., which refers to the time when Psalms shall come," mention is made (ver. 8—13) of the sacrifices which the Jews will then be offering.

Now none of the passages speak in commendation, but, on the contrary, the Jews are all described as in a state of wickedness—are reproved for not preferring spiritual sacrifices, Psalm iv. 14, Isaiah i. 16, 17,—and reproached with the interrogatory, "Who hath required this at your hand to tread my courts?" Surely the establishment of the Levitical Service could not be in accordance with the intentions of the Lord, when he says to those practising it, "Who hath required this at your hands?"

Still I think it possible that the prophecy of Ezekiel may in part become the occasion* of those Jews who reject

* I have heard it suggested that the restoration of sacrifices should not be understood in the sense of a promise from God, but that we should understand the language simply as a prediction of what the Jews would do, though not approved of by God. This appears untenable, because the restoration of sacrifices is described in the pro-
Messiah having recourse to those "beggarly elements;" and I think it is a subject of very grave consideration, whether we Christians may not put a stumbling-block in the way of the Jews, by admitting that the restoration of sacrifices, after they have been done away in Christ, can be in accordance with the will of God.

It remains for me to state how I think the latter chapters of Ezekiel can be understood according to the literal simplicity of the language, without being contrary to the analogy of faith.

It will be perceived from the 9th and 11th verses of the xxxiii chapter, that the promise was altogether conditional: "Now let them put away their whoredoms . . . shew the house to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities . . . and if they be ashamed of all that they have done, shew them the form of the house," &c.

The day upon which Ezekiel had the vision was the day of atonement which ushered in the year of jubilee; the day upon which there was a universal national profession of repentance. The Lord therefore says, now let that profession be sincere, "and if they be ashamed of all that they have done, shew them the form," &c. What a strong inducement was there held forth, through those exceeding great and precious promises, to sincere and genuine repentance. Had the nation then truly turned to the Lord, that glorious state of things, there shown to the prophet in vision, would have been established, and the Lord would have dwelt in the midst of them for ever; but they did not take advantage of the proffered mercy, therefore the prophecy as an integral part of that worship which is connected with a supernatural state of things, and crowned with the surpassing glory of Jehovah's presence. No part of the prophecy, therefore, can be considered as describing a system of will-worship, established by man without divine suggestion or countenance; the approving and efficacious will of God is undoubtedly implied.
mise lapsed, and the Israelites have no warrant to expect that the offer, as there made to them, will ever again be proposed.

Nor would the Jews be justified in attempting to found such a state of things, for Ezekiel personally was to establish it. As in the first settlement of the Levitical ceremony, there were certain things which Moses was to do, and others for Aaron and his sons to perform; so, in this prophecy, there is all along a distinction between what Ezekiel personally was to do, and what the priests, the sons of Zadoc, were to accomplish: "Thou shalt offer them before the Lord, and the priests shall cast salt upon them," &c. Had the literal meaning of the words in this respect been attended to, it would have prevented many crude opinions from ever having been brought to light.

For to think now of re-establishing any sacrifices which must be done away in Christ, would be utterly unsuitable to the Church; it would be turning again to the weak and beggarly elements; therefore all that portion of Ezekiel's vision which refers to them, to use the apostle's expression, must have grown old. But that portion of the prophecy which is still suitable for the Church, is kept alive by having been reiterated in a subsequent prophecy. (Compare Ezek. xlvi. 12 with Rev. xxi. 1, 2; and Ezek. xlviii. 31 with Rev. xxi. 12, 13, 16.) In some instances the promises are extended, (compare Ezek. xlvi. 1 with Rev. xxi. 25,) and above all there is that great blessing of the new covenant, the promises which before were conditional are now absolute. (Rev. xxi. 3.)

The question which will present itself to many minds is, Are there any other instances of promises not being appropriated and so becoming lapsed? I will mention an instance to which I have already alluded, occurring in a passage which I believe has perplexed many, in consequence
of their not having admitted this idea in their mode of interpretation. I allude to the apostle’s comment in Heb. iii. and iv. upon the xcviith Psalm, relative to the promise of Canaan.

The very land of Canaan, which the spies examined, is that very land of promise which the generation of the wilderness fell short of inheriting. But as the apostle says “some must enter therein,” and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief, it follows that the very place which was offered to them is the very identical place which some must enter. Yet Joshua, leading the next generation into the land of Canaan, did not appropriate the promise of the rest of Canaan; for though the enjoyment of the very place is one essential in the appropriation of the promise, it is not the alone ingredient. And that the promise had never yet been appropriated is evident, because the Holy Spirit proposed the original promise again by the mouth of David, many years after; and not then to the church of his generation, but prophetically to us of this generation; for the promise is reiterated upon the new covenant ground of Jesus having entered into his rest from the work of redemption.

That the offer of Canaan was originally conditional, is evident from Psalm lxxxi.; that the offer is again prophetically made in the xcviith Psalm, the inspired comment in the Epistle to the Hebrews seems manifestly to show. Now as the children of Israel, in attempting to take possession of the land after they had forfeited the promise, acted presumptuously, so, were they now to attempt re-establishing sacrifices, they would act presumptuously.

The only difference between this promise of Canaan and that in Ezekiel, is that but part of Ezekiel’s promise is reiterated, the part which is unsuitable to the present state of the Church having altogether lapsed. And the very
reason why all that promise is reiterated, is the very cause why part only of this is repeated, "because he that hath entered into his rest" has finished his work of redemption.

Those who have already formed their opinion from Ezek. xl. &c., as to the restoration of sacrifices, have their convictions strengthened by the mention of sacrifices in other prophecies which regard the future. But there is one very manifest distinction between the sacrifices mentioned by Ezekiel and those allusions to sacrifices in other prophecies.

I suppose all parties admit that the sacrifices had no efficacy in themselves, but that they had a typical import. Some of these types, which indicated the taking away of sin, were fulfilled in Christ. Now in this consists one great difference between Ezekiel and the other prophets; sacrifices which clearly indicated the removal of sin: namely, trespass-offerings and sin-offerings are mentioned by Ezekiel, and are not mentioned in any other prophecy.* Now, my position is, that God having abolished the typical trespass and sin-offerings, in order to establish the one offering of Jesus; since his soul has been constituted "Asham," the restoration of the typical sin and trespass-offerings would be unsuitable; for they could have no merit in themselves; and their typical import being fulfilled, the beggarly elements must necessarily vanish away.

There were other sacrifices typical of spiritual worship, which might refer to Messiah, or which might have shadowed forth

* Mr. Brown seems to have overlooked this important difference. He says, "It cannot have escaped the careful student of prophetic scripture, that all the chief things predicted here (Ezekiel xl., &c.) are to be met with, one by one, in other prophecies; so that without the aid of this vision at all, one might build up a complete temple service." (pp. 228, 229.) Again, "We have not in Ezekiel one point of the least consequence, which is not somewhere else taken up as characterising the religious services predicted." (p. 230.)
the spiritual sacrifices of believers. Any examples of such, 
even admitting them to be understood literally, would not 
be to the point; for the restoration of one sort of offering 
which did not vitiate the sacrifice of Christ would not prove 
the re-establishment of those sacrifices which would be tanta-
mount to setting aside the atonement.

Here, perhaps, I might leave the question; for if we 
preserve the sacrifice of Jesus untouched, we may, perhaps, 
without much danger, await the fulfilment of the others, 
before we pronounce positively. But this much I will add: 
I find in prophetic language, sacrifices used figuratively 
to denote,

Prayer, Psalm cxli. 2; 
Praise, Psalm liv. 6, Jer. xvii. 26, xxxiii. 11; 
Thanksgiving, Psalm cvii. 22, cxvi. 17; 
Joy, Psalm xxvii. 6; 
Righteousness, Psalm iv. 5, li. 19; 
Confession, Psalm lvi. 13; 
Contrition, Psalm li. 17; 
Judgments, Isaiah xxxiv, 6, xlvi. 10, Ezek. xxxix. 17—19, 
Zep. i. 7, 8.

I find, even under the Old Testament, indications that 
the spiritual worship which these sacrifices intimated, was 
more acceptable than the ceremonial offerings themselves: 
See Psalm lxix. 30, 31, li. 16, 17, Hos. vi. 6, Mic. vi. 7, 8.

I find that some of the instances adduced by the advocates 
of literal sacrifices, if taken literally, would prove more than 
those advocates would admit; for they refer not to the Jews 
but to Gentiles, e. g. Isa. xix. 21, lvi. 7, Mal. i. 11.

And, when I find in the New Testament that believers are 
a royal priesthood, 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9, and, as priests, partakers 
of the altar, Heb. xiii. 10, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 21; as priests, to 
offer spiritual sacrifices, whether of praise, Heb. xiii. 15, and 
good works, Heb. xiii. 13, 16, Phil. iv. 18, or whether of 
themselves, either in life or death, Rom. xii. 1, xv. 16,
Phil. ii. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 6; I am induced to believe that the prophets refer to the spiritual and reasonable service indicated by the typical ordinances rather than the beggarly elements themselves.

Nor do I think that this mode of interpretation can justly be charged with being a departure from the principle of literal interpretation. Each of the sacrifices enigmatically signified certain determinate parts of spiritual worship; the prophets who lived during the dispensation of shadows, used the language current at that time, and conveyed the ideas of the things symbolized, under the terms of the symbols themselves. In saying this, we do not admit anything arbitrary in the principles of interpretation; the literal sacrifices were forms by which the spiritual worship of the enlightened Jew was expressed, and shadows of a time of reformation; the prophets conveyed by words what the ceremonial worship expressed by things; and it is no more arbitrary in the one case than in the other, to say that they predicted not the shadow but the substance, not the form but the spirit of true worship.

Nor is there anything indeterminate admitted; for, as the prophets take their language from the ceremonial appointments, and as each species of sacrifice symbolized a determinate idea, so the language, when used figuratively or symbolically, equally conveys a fixed and determinate idea.

Why may not "the rams of Nebaioth," * Isaiah lx. 7, be understood symbolically as well as "the fatlings of Bashan," Ezek. xxxix. 18; or "the kidneys of rams," Isaiah xxxiv. 6; or "the calves of the lips," Hos. xiv. 2? If it be said Isaiah xix. 21. that the Egyptians shall "do sacrifice and oblation," is it violent to look for the explanation in the following words: "yea, they shall vow a vow and perform it?" Is it un-

* "The rams of Nebaioth shall serve thee;
They shall willingly ascend mine altar."—Isa. lx. 7.

Henderson's translation.
reasonable to suppose that the burnt offerings and sacrifices of the Gentiles denote the prayer which all nations will offer in God's house? or even to understand the burnt-offerings and sacrifices of the Jews, mentioned in connexion with the sacrifices of praise, as themselves indicative of spiritual worship?
CHAPTER XXVII.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE MILLENNARIAN THEORY.

"They that go to renew the fable of the heretics called millenarists, be repugnant to holy Scripture, and cast themselves headlong into a Jewish dotage." Art. 41.

"Two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided." Art. 2.

An able millenarian writer has made the following important statement: "It is a remarkable fact that whilst the single tenet of the one thousand years was by the generality [of the Reformers] carefully avoided, all the important truths connected therewith—as the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ to set up a glorious kingdom on earth, in which all the saints should partake; the dead being raised and the living changed; the literal restoration of the Jews to the literal Canaan: the earth being then renewed, and Jerusalem rebuilt; and the previous manifestation and destruction of Anti-Christ—were almost universally entertained by the Reformers."

I do not cite this passage with the view of showing that those who are not looking for Messiah's kingdom have departed from the doctrine of the Reformers, but with a desire of inducing those who are waiting for the revelation of Jesus Christ, to inquire why the tenet of the one thousand years was so carefully avoided.
The peculiarity of the millenarian view, as opposed to that of the Reformers, consists in supposing that Messiah will resign the throne of David at the end of the thousand years; the view which I have attempted to establish is, that Messiah will resign the throne of the Father at the commencement of the thousand years.

The millenarian view appears inconsistent with itself; it does violence to the expressions of Scripture with respect to time; it departs from the great principle for which we are contending, the literal acceptation of the word of God; and if I mistake not, it is subversive of most important truths, both with regard to the person, and the office of the Messiah.

The reason assigned why "the kingdom" will not be surrendered until the conclusion of the millennium is, because Christ's enemies, until then, will not be completely subdued.

Those who use this argument, acknowledge that "until" is a note of time. Christ's enemies will not be made his footstool until the end of the thousand years; but Christ sits at God's right hand until his enemies be made his footstool; therefore, Christ sits at God's right hand until the end of the thousand years.

Again, Christ will sit at God's right hand until his enemies be made his footstool; when his enemies shall be made his footstool he will resign the kingdom; therefore, Christ will sit at God's right hand until he resign the kingdom.

Hence, according to this view, Christ will not reign upon earth until the expiration of the millennium, nor will he reign after the thousand years; so that he will not reign upon earth at all.

A similar observation may be made respecting the existence of death; if death is supposed to exist as an enemy of Christ until Gog and Magog be destroyed, it appears that the following consequences will ensue:
THE MILLENARIAN THEORY.

Christ will not leave God's right hand until all his enemies be made his footstool; death, the last enemy, will not be subjected until the close of the millennium. It will follow that Isaiah xx i. and xxvi., the restoration of the Jews, the resurrection of God's people, and the shout of triumph—"Lo, this is our God!" will be deferred to that period. Thus the hypothesis is inconsistent with itself.

There is also a laxness and inconsistency in the interpretations put on the expressions of scripture relative to time. If one who limits Christ's reign upon earth to a thousand years be asked, what is meant by an "an hour," John v. 18? He will tell you "a thousand years." What is intended by "a small moment," Isa. liv. 7?—About five-and-twenty hundred years. "A very little while, Heb. x. 37?—About eighteen or nineteen hundred years. This is all justified, because they are but a moment when compared with eternal duration. But then what are we to understand by "for ever and ever," "everlasting," "no end"? That, also, we are told, means a thousand years.

The continuation of the saints' reign is equivalent to the duration of their eternal life; for "inherit the kingdom" is explained by "these shall go into life eternal." But the eternal life of the blessed is the measure of the duration of the punishment of the wicked; for the word is exactly the same, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, Matt. xxv. 6. but the righteous into life everlasting."

The punishment of the wicked, therefore, is co-extensive in time with the glory of the blessed; but the reign of the blessed, the perpetuity of which, though marked by every possible expression denoting eternity, is, by the millenarian, restricted to a thousand years; the same expression, therefore, when intimating the duration of the punishment of the wicked, may in like manner, be limited. From this reasoning, two opposing, but equally dangerous theories, respecting the future, are
deduced; some infer that all the wicked will at the last be saved, others imagine that all the condemned will ultimately be annihilated.

The theory held universally by millenarians, a few years ago, and which is still most generally maintained, is, that the reign of Messiah upon the throne of David will be limited absolutely to a thousand years; and that the reign of God "all in all" denotes the kingdom of the undivided Trinity.

This supposition seems to me to involve errors destructive of important truth, both with regard to the person and office of our adorable Lord. Whatever the reign of God "all in all" denote, it must imply some distinction from the mode of rule previously exercised by the Son. This difference the millenarian expresses in words to this effect: Jesus will reign as man during the millennium, and as "God over all," in the ultimate and eternal state. In that case, what, I ask with all reverence, is to become of the human nature of our Lord? It can neither be annihilated, or deified, or made co-essential. Now, actions are not attributable to natures but to persons;* and, though it be true that in the actions of Jesus, the attributes of either nature may predominate, still, in all that Jesus has done or suffered, or is to do, we must acknowledge the God-man. If, then, the Messiah reigns in the undivided Trinity as God "all in all," as his humanity cannot be annihilated nor be made co-essential, it must be co-ordinate. If, then, the human nature reign in the person

* The human nature of our Lord never had a personality of itself, but derived its personality from the Word; hence, it is called a "holy thing." Thus Adam's person was not the fountain of Christ's person, nor Adam's will the representation of Christ's will; but Adam was the fountain of Christ's humanity; thus Jesus came under the judicial consequences of the fall, without partaking of the sin of our first parent.
of Messiah, and all the acts are the acts of the person, it will not be the reign of God "all in all" in the undivided Trinity, but the reign of the Christ co-ordinate with the Father and the Holy Spirit; and, in nothing does it differ from that kingdom which the Son will surrender to the Father, in order that God may be "all in all," unless, indeed, it be said that in one case, and not in another, the Holy Spirit is also included; but, to say that this is what is intended by the surrender of the kingdom by the Son to the Father, would, I apprehend, be an abuse of language.

But, then, I have heard it said that Jesus will reign at the same time as man on the throne of David, and as God on the throne of the undivided Trinity. The same error, with regard to the person of Christ, is involved in this view; either the one person, Jesus, is at the same time subject and not subject to the Father, or else there are two persons; the one, it appears, would be a contradiction, the other, a heresy. You cannot say that the one nature is subject and the other nature not subject; one nature sitting on the throne of David, and the other nature sitting on the throne of God. One nature, truly, is co-essential, and one inferior; but it is the person of Jesus Christ who now sits upon his Father's throne, and it is the person of Jesus Christ who will hereafter sit upon the throne of David; therefore, whichever modification of this hypothesis be maintained, a fatal error with regard to the person of the Redeemer, seems to be involved.

Equally fatal errors with regard to the official character of our Lord also seem to flow from this theory. Millenarians seem to think that our Lord being eternally upon a subordinate throne, involves the supposition of degradation, and destroys the idea of his co-equality. I must repeat that we are not speaking of the co-essential and inferior natures of our Lord; our inquiry is whether he will be co-ordinate or subordinate to the Father, when the future eternal relations
are in manifestation. For as long as the human nature exists in the person of the Son of God, he must be in an assumed relation; either the human nature must be assumed into the relation naturally due to the Word, which is the case during the present dispensation; or the Word must be in the subordinate relation of the Son of David, which it is admitted will be the assumed relation during the millennium. For the humanity of Christ to be raised to co-ordination, seems more wonderful than for the Word to be subordinate; because, arguing from human conceptions, there is nothing inconsistent in a co-essential nature being subordinate, it is the due relation of every son to his father; but not so for an inferior nature to be co-ordinate.

I have argued thus, not that I wish to build a theory upon reasoning of this nature; but to shew that the prejudice against the subordination of the Son of God is only from want of definite ideas; for I think there is, and believe that there should be, just as strong a feeling against results which would flow from the supposition of the Lord Jesus reigning for ever upon the throne of the undivided Trinity. Will He ever cease to be the Christ? Will there ever be a disruption of the chief corner-stone from the spiritual temple? Will the Lamb ever repudiate his spotless spouse? Will the head ever be severed from the mystical body of Christ? Such a thought is more shocking to the feelings of the believer than the idea of subordination can be; and yet what is implied in these relations, but Jesus in his office character, Head over all to his Church?

If the prejudice arising from feeling be removed, the judgment will admit that God's kindness towards the Church, "in the ages to come," will be through Christ Jesus, and that glory to God will be by and through Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.
Before quitting this subject, I must notice an opinion recently put forth, that Messiah will reign for a thousand years upon a throne different from the Father's throne and distinct from the throne of David, at least so I understand the following sentence: "A special kingdom is indeed given to Christ, to sit on the throne of David, and to reign over the house of David [Jacob] for ever. But besides this, we learn that at the seventh trumpet the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and He shall reign for ever." * I know of no other throne to be held in succession by the Christ, besides the throne of David; the Lord himself speaks only of his throne and his Father's; the promise to David was that the Christ should sit upon his throne; and both that promise and the one referred to above, say, that the reign shall be for ever; but if He is to be on one throne for ever, I see not how He can ever, after his assumption of that throne, be on another throne.

Again, the advocates of this view admit that the glorified will share the throne of the Messiah during the millennium; they also maintain that this is the throne which Messiah will yield to the Father; the consequence of this view is, that there will be a throne upon which Christ will sit; the beloved sharing it with him; this throne not being the throne of God, yet not subject to God, for Christ becomes subject by resigning it.

Lastly, it cannot be said that the mystery of God will be finished when the seventh trumpet begins to sound, if the relations which are to subsist to all eternity are not assumed until after another dispensation has passed away.

* Bickersteth's *Signs of the Times*, p. 44. Though I cannot assent to this piece of detail, in a deep prophetic point of doctrine, I am happy to mention the work as replete with the most valuable practical matter.
I conclude by noticing Isa. ix. 6, 7, which embraces all the points for which I contend; it appears to be the language of the Jewish nation, when brought to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah:* "Unto us a child has been born," an expression which clearly refers to the human nature of the Lord; "Unto us a Son has been given;" this being God's gift of his Son seems as clearly to denote the divine nature of the Messiah . . . "of the increase of his government and peace [there shall be] no end; upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever." As it is the throne of David it is the throne of a creature, or the subordinate throne; on this throne the Child that has been born, the Son that has been given, the mighty God, or God the mighty man, will sit; clearly, therefore, the two natures in the one person of Messiah are included. As it is the throne of peace, it is that which the Prince of Peace will assume when all his enemies shall be under his feet, which will be when He shall leave the right-hand of Jehovah the Father. This reign will be thenceforth from the time of the conversion of the Jews; and it will continue even for ever, and of it there shall be no end. Manifestly, therefore, Jesus the mighty God, will for ever sit on the throne of David, in his office character, (for I speak not of his essential relation,) subordinate to the Father. And we must not attempt to get rid of these plain declarations of Scripture, with regard to the office character of the Lord, by mystifying one kingdom with another; or with regard to the blessed Lord himself, "either confounding the natures or dividing the person."

Rather let us adore Him for his condescension than attempt to honour Him by holding doctrines inconsistent

* I have attempted at some length to show the connexion of this prophecy in Hor. Heb.
with the revealed purpose of Jehovah. "Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for Him?" "Be it Job xxxi. 7. far from thee, Lord," may meet with the rebuff, "Get thee behind me, Satan."
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A.

EXAMINATION OF MR. BROWN’S WORK ON THE SECOND ADVENT.

Mr. Brown’s hypothesis appears to be,—that our Lord is now during this dispensation sitting on the throne of God, and on the throne of David. (p. 143.) That there will be a thousand years of spiritual blessedness, (p. 121, 122,) the Lord still remaining in the heavens, (p. 110,) and that at the close of the millennium our Lord will come to the general judgment: that the earth will then undergo an igneous transformation and become a congenial abode for the glorified church. (p. 19.)

Viewed as a system, the point on which I differ from Mr. Brown is, whether Messiah be now sitting on the throne of David, or whether that reign be still future. But though this be the chief point of difference, Mr. Brown establishes his theory by “those principles of interpretation* which

* Brown, preface, p. vi. In every instance, when quoting from Mr. Brown, I give the italics and capitals as they are printed in his work.
if well founded, will carry us without difficulty through all similar portions of Scripture," that is, similar to those bearing upon our Lord's kingdom, which are interpreted by Mr. Brown. I, however, fear his "principles of interpretation" would be equally effective in carrying us through any portions of Scripture, and in setting aside any doctrine.

Mr. Brown commences by stating what he calls certain misconceptions.

i. "One gross misconception relates to the belief . . . . that those who repudiate a pre-millennial advent, are not expecting their adorable Lord at all. So they go abroad to prove that he will come, and spend many useless pages in showing that it will not be a providential, nor a spiritual, but a personal coming." (p. 13.)

We do not deny that our opponents believe in the personal return of our Lord; but they cannot be "expecting" the advent of Christ, when they do not believe that the Lord can come till a thousand years or more after they shall have gone to the Lord and shall have remained with the Lord for that thousand years, so that when the Lord shall return they will not be looking for, but accompanying Him. This we say, cannot be called "expecting" Christ.

Our opponents admit that certain texts speak of the personal advent; but there are other texts which speak of the "coming," which they deny to be a personal coming, because in these passages the coming is connected with other events which evidently precede the reign of blessedness. Mr. Brown, for example, so treats 2 Thess. ii. 8 (p. 270—276) and Matt. xxiv. (p. 258—262.) We certainly strive to prove that in such passages the coming is not merely providential or spiritual, but personal.*

* Mr. Villiers' Sermon, to which Mr. Brown alludes, (p. 14,) was not a controversial work, but introductory to a course of lectures on prophecy; and the preacher, it appears, believed that some of his congregation required that the fact of the advent should be pressed upon them.
ii. "A second misconception relates to the Scriptural sense of certain terms and phrases. . . . When the Lord's COMING or APPEARING is spoken of, it cannot be determined, by the mere terms employed, whether it be a providential, a gracious, or a personal coming, in any given case: that must always be decided by the nature of the case and the scope of the passage." (p. 15.)

Though Mr. Brown considers this so obvious a canon of interpretation, that a work undertaken without attention to this law, will be vitiated by crude and loose interpretations amounting to a perpetual begging of the whole question; I greatly doubt whether it should be admitted as a canon of interpretation at all. The words "coming" and "appearing" do not require interpretation, the idea is already expressed in its simplest form. I should rather say, therefore, that if in any case the terms "coming" and "appearing" are not intended to convey the simple grammatical idea, it becomes the province of the interpreter to prove that exception.

When Mr. Brown speaks of a providential or gracious coming, he does not mean to deny that the Lord is always providentially present in the world, and graciously present in the Church; therefore by "coming" I suppose he means "acting." Mr. Brown's canon, therefore, is, that "coming" is sometimes to be understood in the sense of "acting." We are to determine whether it is so used by "the nature of the case and the scope of the passage." By "the nature of the case," I suppose we must understand the nature of the subject matter in hand, which is either the advent, or the object of the advent, or the accompanying terms; much the same, therefore, as "the scope of the passage."

We admit, of course, that the scope of the passage must be considered; but we do not admit that the expressions "coming" and "appearing" are doubtful terms, and therefore to be thrown aside, when we consider the scope of the
passage; but this usage of the terms in their literal sense is what Mr. Brown calls "begging the question."

The difference, therefore, between the literalists and Mr. Brown, is, that they conceive "coming" to convey a simple and determinate idea; and that when not used to convey that idea, it must be viewed as an exception, the particular sense being proved. Mr. Brown supposes "coming" to be so indeterminate that we must exclude it from conveying an idea until we have decided from the other parts of the passage whether "coming" or "acting" be the proper sense.

iii. "Another misconception relates to the final destiny of the present physical system." (p. 17.)

Mr. Brown supposes, with Dr. Urwick and Mr. Fairbairn, that "the earth abideth for ever," in which fortunately I agree with him. As, however, the earth is to be the place of ultimate and eternal blessedness, and as Messiah is to reign for ever on the throne of David, of which kingdom there shall be no end, it seems to follow from this concession that Messiah will hereafter reign upon the throne of David on this earth. If such be the case, the one point in which Mr. Brown differs from us is in his supposing that Messiah must reign for at least a thousand years more on the throne of David in heaven, before He comes to reign upon the throne of David in this earth. He also, of course, attaches a different idea to "the throne of David."

Mr. Fairbairn's arguments for the ultimate possession of Canaan agree, in some measure, I am glad to say, with those which I have been urging. I, indeed, do not see how the idea of this earth being the state of final blessedness, can be supported but by arguments which establish the views I have been advocating.

After ten or twelve pages of very beautiful sentiments with regard to our Lord's advent, "the vessel is marred in the hands of the potter," by Mr. Brown's dis-
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discussion upon what he considers the fourth miscon-
ception.

iv. 1. "Eighteen centuries have elapsed since the Mr. Brown.
Church was divinely informed that her Lord was 'at hand,'
that He would come 'quickly,' and 'as a thief in the
night.' Still 'the heavens retain Him,' and the Church is not re-
leased from her expectant attitude. Now, according to the
pre-millennial way of reasoning, had the Church known this,
it would have been fatal to the watchfulness required of
her." (p. 32.)

Mr. Brown, in common with us, believes that these scrip-
tural expressions are true in some sense; he also believes
that the manner in which they could have been received as
true notwithstanding the lapse of eighteen centuries, is
"to separate from such statements what we may term the
chronological element." (p. 37.) To this I also assent;
and I think the pre-millennialists fall into an error, when,
departing from their own principle of literal interpretation,
they suppose "a day" to mean "a year," and "a time,"
"three hundred and sixty years;" thus virtually holding
that the times and seasons are not in the Father's own
power; and that in order to suppose that they were in the
Father's power, it behoved the Church, as Mr. Brown truly
remarks, to misunderstand the prophecies.

But Mr. Brown, by introducing a chronological element
in his own argument, is likely to cause confusion: "Eighteen
centuries," says he, "have elapsed." (p. 32.) Now what-
ever strength there may be in the argument from the period
elapsed, it is clear that as the duration increases, the argu-
ment strengthens, and therefore will have its greatest in-
tensity the moment before the advent; which shews "there
must be a fallacy somewhere." (p. 36.) "If in Paul's day
it could be said, 'Yet a little while and He who shall come
will come and will not tarry,' has the lapse of more than
1700 years made that little great, or given just ground to
the scoffer to say, 'Where is the promise of his coming?''

*Vaughan's Churches' Expectation*, p. 2.

But Mr. Brown is still more unjust to his own position. The point in dispute between us is, whether a chronological element can legitimately be admitted. This we deny, but Mr. Brown virtually affirms it; for he expects the chronological period of a thousand years' blessedness before the advent. Therefore, at the same time to fancy the advent "transportingly near," (p. 40,) is to believe in contradictions; "What faith believes, hope brings near," &c.; but in this case, it behoves faith to be under a strong delusion with regard to the nearness of the event. Mr. Brown's position is not that the event *may* prove to be far off; but that it is believed chronologically to be afar off; hence faith must believe "in defiance of mere dates," that which is directly contrary to what, according to Mr. Brown, is the revealed truth.

2. "This apostolic warning (2 Thess. ii. 1—8, &c.) as to the expectation of Christ's speedy appearing gets too much of the *go by* from Mr. Brooks and other pre-millennialists. Let us examine it a little more narrowly. The first thing, then, that strikes one on reading this passage, is the bold and very explicit intimation that 'the day of Christ' was not 'at hand,' and the apostle's desire to keep the Church from believing that it was at hand." (p. 36.)

Mr. Brown raises his argument upon our generally very excellent translation, but which in this instance will scarcely support him. "The word translated 'is at hand' (2 Thess. ii. 2,) is not the same which Christ and John used when they preached 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand';" (Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17;) the word they used means *drawing nigh, approaching*; the word, however, which the apostle uses does not mean *approaching*—something near, but not yet present. Its import is not relative, like that which Christ and John used, but absolute. It denotes actual in-
terposition, establishment, collocation, or presence; and the idea is, that they should not be alarmed as though that day had begun, was present then."—Duffield, p. 293—295.

Mr. Brown, therefore, seems hardly justified in saying that there is a bold and very explicit intimation that "the day of Christ" was not "at hand,"—there is a denial that it was present, but no intimation that it was afar off.*

The Thessalonians were just commencing to suffer persecution for the cause of Christ, (1 Thess. ii. 14,) an event quite new among the Gentiles. The apostle had also announced to them shortly before (if the relative dates of that first epistle and the first to the Corinthians be correct) a hitherto unknown mystery; namely, that they should be caught up alive to meet the Lord and their sleeping brethren. The Thessalonians naturally enough supposed that they were actually entered upon the tribulations of the last days, and were consequently in a great state of perturbation, even to the neglecting of the duties of their calling. (2 Thess. iii. 12.) It must be observed, that the apostle is not speaking of the moment of Christ's appearing, but of "the day of Christ." The revelation of the man of sin not being a sign of the approach of the day of Christ, but an indication both in this passage and in the xxiv. of Matthew, ver. 15,† that the end has actually arrived. The revelation of the man of sin is not that which hindereth the coming of Christ, but is the provoking cause of the advent.

* As to the general meaning of the passage, Mr. Brown is aware there is considerable difference of opinion amongst students of prophecy. And as I differ from most others in the view which I have adopted, I will merely state it in an appendix, without raising any argument upon what would be viewed by many as a peculiarity of my own.

† St. Paul probably had in his mind the prophecy of our Lord, which is recorded in Matt. xxiv. Mr. Brown, p. 39, notices a verbal agreement between Matt. xxiv. 6, and 2 Thess. ii. 2.
But the apostle in saying "We beseech you, brethren, by (or concerning) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering together unto Him," most strongly implies the possibility of the Lord returning before all those whom he addressed had passed away. By such language he necessarily would leave upon the minds of the Thessalonians an expectation of the advent, which expectation, I think, must have been founded upon a truth, and that was not more, neither could it have been less, than a possibility of the second advent: therefore there has been, ever since our Lord's ascension, a constant possibility of his proximate return. Whether many will go along with me in this view I know not, but most, I think, will admit that this expectation could not have been kept alive by the apostle in opposition to any revealed truth; this, therefore, excludes the admission of the chronological element, but does by no means warn us against "the expectation of Christ's speedy appearing;" on the contrary, we must watch the signs of the times; thus are we "left sufficiently remote from precision to excite instant and continuous watchfulness; sufficiently remote from uncertainty to shield us from disappointment and contradiction."—Vaughan, p. 21.

"When the Churches were told, as they were perpetually, that 'the Lord IS AT HAND,' (Phil. iv. 5,) that 'the night is far spent, and the day IS AT HAND,' (Rom. xiii. 12,) and that 'the end of all things IS AT HAND,' (1 Pet. iv. 7;)—this is not to be understood in point of chronological date; for, in that sense, it is expressly intimated to the Thessalonians that he was NOT AT HAND." (pp. 36, 37.)

This paragraph is to be regretted; for a careless reader would naturally suppose that in all, or at least in some of these texts, the "at hand" was in the original the same as in 2 Thess. ii. 2. It would have been more to the purpose had Mr. Brown referred to Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26, Gal. i. 4, Heb. ix. 9, in all which passages we do find
the same word, but in our version rendered "present." It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament but in 2 Tim. iii. 1, where, though differently rendered, the sense is also manifestly the same. For the apostle does not mean to say that, in the last days perilous times will be at hand, but that in the last days there actually will be perilous times.

Mr. Brown should also notice, that St. Paul did not tell the Thessalonians that Christ was not at hand or present, but that the day of Christ was not. This is an important distinction; for it does not appear that the actual presence of the Lord will mark the very commencement of the day of Christ.

But how can Mr. Brown affirm that it is expressly intimated to the Thessalonians that in point of chronological date, Christ is not at hand? "The interposition of an event is very different from the interposition of a period," . . . . "no time is given, and it is the absence of time that is the foundation of watchfulness;" "an interposed period must destroy vigilance, but an interposed event does not."—Bonar's Landmarks, p. 93.

I have now gone through what Mr. Brown calls our misconceptions; and must proceed to the less pleasing task of pointing out what I consider some of his misconceptions.

Mr. Brown's third chapter is entitled "Christ's second coming viewed in relation to the glorification of the Church with him." He maintains that the glory of the millennial era is prior to the glory of the Redeemer's second appearing to reign with all his saints, (p. 42.) His first proof is, that when Christ appears the second time, he will come with all his saints, that is, all the redeemed, (p. 43, complete, p. 54.) By which we are to understand, not simply all who shall have been saved up to the time of the advent, but all who shall ever partake of any benefit from Christ; and that it excludes any from being, after that time, blessed, (pp. 44,
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54, 61.) "Christ's redeemed will be complete at his coming—He will come absolutely and numerically with all his saints." (p. 54.)

Before examining into the truth of this position, it may be well to find out the nature and object of the argument. Mr. Brown's object is to prove a difficulty which is supposed to attach to the doctrine of Messiah's pre-millennial advent, as regarding those who will form the population of the renovated earth during the reign of blessedness. There is, therefore, in the nature of the argument, nothing positive; the most that could be inferred, even if the difficulty were proved, is that it is probable there is some error in the detail of the pre-millennial scheme, but no proof that the advent shall be post-millennial.

Mr. Brown's first "proof text" is 2 Thess. i. 10, which does not mention anything about who will come with Christ, it speaks rather of the opposite effect which the advent will produce upon the righteous and wicked in the day of Christ's appearing. Mr. Brown himself, when alluding to the passage, (p. 55,) clearly shews that he does not expect all the saints to come with Christ. "There is," says he, "something transporting in the prospect of his coming to be admired in all them that believe;" but, instead of continuing the quotation, "in that day," he adds this gloss, "from the first trophy of grace down to the very last, 'all made alive,' either by resurrection or instantaneous transformation."

Here Mr. Brown very properly states that there will be some to whom our Lord will come, and upon whom his advent will work a transforming effect. This, I believe, to be the truth; I only go a little farther than Mr. Brown, not supposing "the saints" and "them that believe" to be exact synonyms, and denoting the same individuals.

The next text quoted by Mr. Brown is 1 Thess. iii. 13, "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints," (p. 43,) which he also quotes when closing this proof,
(p. 54.) In this passage it is clear there is the same limitation as in the last; the apostle contemplates some who will be established in holiness, &c. to whom the Lord Jesus will come.

Upon the third text, 1 Cor. xv. 23, Mr. Brown seems to place more dependence, unfolding it at some length, and beginning his assertion with this very important canon of limitation: "Universal terms and expressions are to be interpreted according to the nature of the case and the scope of the passage where they occur," (p. 52,) which Mr. Brown brings to bear upon his interpretation of this passage, in the following words: "as in Adam all die," that are his, "so in Christ shall all" them that are his, "be made alive." Mr. Brown does not feel this to be "a violent, offensive, and perilous departure from the plain meaning of the words," (p. 52,) or "a prodigious latitude of interpretation," (p. 55.) Nor do we consider it violent, offensive, or perilous to make a limitation more obvious; and, had not Mr. Brown doubted it, I should have said that it was what common sense demanded. "They that are Christ's at his coming," we say must be limited to those of Christ who shall have died before that time; excluding those of Christ who shall be alive at that time, as also the people of Israel who will not be Christ's until his coming, and the nations who shall join themselves to the Lord after he shall have come. This, it will be observed, is the obvious sense, and is no departure from the literal meaning.

The truth is, Mr. Brown admitting, that universal terms are, in certain cases, to be understood with limitations; the whole of his objection resolves into this, "None can be brought into a state of salvation after the appearance of our blessed Lord." This, I think, must be his real difficulty, else he would not have fallen into what appears almost like a frivolous inference, that "all" could not be so limited as to exclude some "before they are born." p. 59.
But if this view of Mr. Brown’s objection be correct, the difficulty which he feels is not incident to our hypothesis, but consists in his not being able to receive what we believe scripture has revealed. “The difficulty lies not in the things but in the texts,” (p. 55.) Texts which speak of conversion after the Lord’s appearing.

The two last texts in support of this argument quoted by Mr. Brown, Eph. v. 25—27 (p. 53) and Rev. xxii. 2, 9, induce me to state, though very concisely, a view which I believe to be well founded, regarding the peculiar character and exalted privilege of the present dispensation; nevertheless, as I cannot say that it is generally entertained even by my pro-millennial friends, I cannot expect that it will be very demonstrative to others. I give it, because not desiring to withhold what I believe to be the truth, without, however, wishing it to be supposed that the question of our Lord’s kingdom depends upon it. Mr. Brown, I apprehend, supposes that every individual who shall be saved, or who shall derive any benefit from the work of Christ during all the different dispensations, from the days of Abel down to the last soul who will be brought into the fold, will form part of “the Bride, the Lamb’s wife,” or of the mystical body of Christ. I do not think that either the language of scripture or the character of the dispensations is in accordance with this idea.

St. Paul tells us that “there is one body,” connected with which there is “one baptism,” a baptizing into Christ and a putting on of Christ, obliterating the religious distinction between Jew and Gentile, not bringing the Gentile into the religious privilege of the Jew, but making “of twain one new man” in Christ, “the body of Christ,” of which body Christ personally is the head, “from whom the whole body joined together maketh increase,” this is “Christ” mystical; and all baptized into Christ are baptized into his death, are quickened together with him, and are raised up together and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.
The gifts necessary for forming the Christ mystical were not conferred until after the ascension of Jesus—"When he ascended up on high he gave gifts unto men," "some apostles and some prophets," &c., "for the edifying the body of Christ [mystical] till we all come unto the perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" [mystical]. We could not, therefore, say with propriety that the Church under former dispensations was "Christ."

Now, as to the other figure: The Bride is the New Jerusalem, of which city the twelve apostles compose the foundation, which corresponds with St. Paul's figure "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner [stone.]" St. Paul, it may be said, mentions the foundation of prophets as well as of apostles; but I do not suppose that "the old prophets" are meant, (though it be true respecting them, that "not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister," &c.) But the order of the words seems to lead us for an explanation to the same expression with the same order in two other places of the same Epistle. It does not run "prophets and apostles," as we should have expected had the old prophets been intended, but "apostles and prophets," those gifts which Christ (here called the corner-stone) ascended on high in order to confer, "he gave some apostles and some prophets," &c. those "holy apostles and prophets" to whom the mystery had been now revealed—unknown in former ages—that "the Gentiles are fellow heirs."

Now, the great glory of this New Jerusalem is, that it is the abode of Deity. But for the believer to be a habitation of God is the peculiar glory of the dispensation founded on the apostles, according to that promise of our Lord, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

Four Chiliads were directed to preparing a people for the objective manifestation of the Invisible. Deity, in the person
of the Son of God, coming into limitation, was "God manifest in the flesh." During this dispensation of nearly two Chiliads, the spiritual temple is in the course of construction. Deity, in the person of the Holy Ghost, inherently and permanently in each spiritual stone which shall compose that spiritual temple which shall be "a habitation of God"—God the Father—"God all in all,"—for "the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in [the New Jerusalem]."

Mr. Brown speaks of the absurdity of a theory which excludes the myriads that are to be converted during the spiritual "millennium, from the honour and privilege of swelling the train and gracing the triumphal appearing of their Lord." (p. 55, 56.) I do not like to test theories which regard Divine things by what we may consider absurd; "because the foolishness of God is wiser than men;" and, what we may think folly may be God's truth; otherwise I should say, have we not more right to talk of the absurdity of a theory which expects such different results from the same causes which have already been for so many centuries in operation. It appears that a hundred thousand times more redeemed, during the millennium, than from the beginning of the world to that time, (p. 58,) is far beneath the true calculation. (p. 56.)

"What will the Jews and Gentiles be, with whom you people the world during the millennium; and over whom you make the glorified church to reign with Christ? They cannot belong to the [elected, the blood bought, the regenerated and justified] members of Christ's mystical body." (p. 65.)

This argument could only be of weight upon the supposition that the blood-bought or justified are necessarily all raised to be members of Christ's mystical body.

Mr. Brown seems to suppose that all dispensations were much the same; and that it would have made little or no difference whether our Lord's first advent had been imme-
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diately after the fall, or immediately before the day of judg-
ment. The same idea is more plainly expressed a little
farther on. "It being to the divine mind infallibly certain, Mr. Brown.
from the foundation of the world, that at the appointed
time Christ would suffer, it was held, done, and accepted in
the court of heaven, and authority was given him from the
very first to extend salvation to as many of his people as
should live before his incarnation; in other words, to bring
all the mediatorial offices into play through the Spirit's
agency, from the very date of the fall." (p. 111.)

Surely the Spirit's agency was not the same before and Answer.
after the ascension; our Lord seems to say that before his
ascension there was the influence upon, but after his ascen-
sion, the indwelling of the Spirit in the believer. But, on
this point, I would rather refer Mr. Brown to writers who
are giving their sentiments without reference to the contro-
versy in question; such as Hare on the Mission of the
Comforter, where the opinions of many divines upon this
point are given and discussed.

"Whatever may constitute the felicity of that period, it Mr. Brown.
will not be Christianity—it will not be saintship. The
Faith and the Hope, the love and the purity, the superiority
to things seen and temporal, the spirituality and heavenli-
ness of true discipleship—of converted men and subjects of
God's grace—will not shed their lustre over that long
period." (p. 65.)

This is not what those who look for the Lord's kingdom Answer.
believe; it is only what Mr. Brown supposes to be the con-
sequence of their theory. We must go a little into detail.
Christianity and saintship Mr. Brown believes to be the
same; but in "the felicity of that period," we find mention
made of the camp of the saints, as also of the beloved city.
The beloved city is the bride, but what constitutes the
camp of the saints? When Mr. Brown says there will
be neither love nor purity, I think he is stating that for
which he has no warrant, either direct or inferential. With respect to "Faith, Hope, superiority to things seen and temporal, spirituality and heavenliness," he is only to suppose that state on earth during the thousand years which he expects will be upon earth at the end of the thousand years, when Faith and Hope will exchange for fruition; when, with regard to the Bride, sight will be occupied with the beatific vision; and when the nations walking in the light of the new Jerusalem will be "converted men and subjects of God's grace;" when such will be "the lustre of that long period," that the city will not need the sun or moon to shine on it, for "then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed."

It will be perceived that the "glaring inconsistencies," (p. 62,) statements "hopelessly unintelligible," (p. 65,) "inexplicable difficulty," (p. 66,) are removed by simply denying "the great [un] scriptural doctrine of the completeness of Christ's Church at his coming." (p. 71.)

The subject of Chapter IV. is Christ's second coming viewed in relation to his mediatorial offices.

Mr. Brown commences by describing the offices or functions of the Messiah. "In the work of illumination, he acts prophetically; in expiation and intercession he acts sacerdotally; while in subjugation and rule he acts royally." (p. 72.) These functions "are mutually related and in every exercise of them inseparable." (p. 72.) It is by the Church's instrumentality, and the Spirit's agency, that these functions of Christ are exercised. (p. 73.) As the Spirit of truth, he exercises Christ's prophetic office; as the Spirit of grace, he exercises the priestly; and as a spirit of power, he exercises the kingly function. (p. 73.)

I would venture to put the question to Mr. Brown which he proposes to us; "Do you believe your own representation?" (p. 280.) I have no doubt that when Mr. Brown wrote all that passage about the functions or offices of
Christ, he believed in the truth of his statements; that he did not compose a case on which to raise arguments against pre-millennialists. But that even his own mind is not imbued or even influenced by the truth of his own statements, appears probable from what he says in the chapter on the prophetic office of Christ, and when discoursing of baptism. Mr. Brown possibly does not believe baptism and illumination to be the same; but I suppose he would say it was necessary that adults, before receiving baptism, should be enlightened. Here then the agency of the Spirit, and instrumentality of the Church, would exercise Christ's prophetic office. But Mr. Brown thus paraphrases Christ's commission to baptize; "Go subjugate the world to me; bring all nations to the obedience of Faith." (p. 80.) But in subjugation and rule, Christ acts royally, (p. 72,) by the Spirit's agency and the instrumentality of the seven stars. (p. 73.) Therefore, according to Mr. Brown's definition, the kingly office of Messiah is exercised by the Spirit through the instrumentality of missionaries. Again, in the same chapter, which is still headed "Christ's second coming viewed in relation to his prophetic office," Mr. Brown towards the close says, "We have endeavoured to show that the old order of things, which Christ's coming is to supersede, includes not only the present means of grace, but the grace itself conveyed by them." (p. 88.) But Mr. Brown is discoursing of the Spirit's exercise of Christ's prophetic, not of his priestly office, and therefore, according to his definition, as a Spirit of truth, and not as a Spirit of grace. I have no desire to point out inconsistency in Mr. Brown; but it was needful to shew that the theory of Christ's offices, which he would set up against the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom, is not much depended on by himself. And though Mr. Brown supposes that he has given a test, the fairest and most satisfactory which can be imagined, (p. 74,) the truth is, no inferential
reasoning can be so satisfactory as the direct evidence from Scripture.

Mr. Brown's objection in this chapter is stated in a sentence which, for the sake of clearness, I have divided into two heads.

1. By the word and by the ordinances all saving illumination is ordinarily conveyed to the mind.

2. The word and ordinances shall, at Christ's coming, absolutely cease as means of grace and salvation to mankind. (p. 75.)

It appears from Mr. Brown's argument, that by "the word," he means "the written word;" yet I do not suppose him to be one of those who would exalt the sacraments above the ordinance of preaching, as a "means of grace and salvation." I will therefore view his statement both ways.

1. If the preached word be included, we deny that that will cease at Christ's advent; for we believe from the prophets, that after the Lord comes with fire, Isaiah lxvi. 15, his glory will be declared among the Gentiles, ver. 19.

2. If the preached word be not included in Mr. Brown's statement, we deny the written word and sacraments to be even the ordinances by which saving illumination is ordinarily conveyed.

But of what avail is his argument, unless he can show that the word and sacraments are not only the ordinary means, but the means essential to saving illumination? For an inference from what is ordinarily the case during this dispensation as to what must of necessity be the case after Christ comes, is, as an argument, very defective. Let us, however, test Mr. Brown's position when stated more exactly. "Grace cannot be conveyed by any other means than by the word, written or preached, and by the sacraments." Yet the Scripture seems explicitly to affirm that the Spirit will act as a Spirit of grace after the Messiah has
appeared; but if it be so, clearly either the ordinary means of grace will not have ceased, or else grace will be conveyed without the ordinary means: either supposition would show that Mr. Brown's argument is futile. I will bring a proof from Rev. i. 7, compared with Zec. xii. 10, "Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him;" or, "all the tribes of the land shall mourn because of Him." Few, I conceive, will be sufficiently hardy to deny that the personal advent is here intended. But St. John appears manifestly to refer to Zec. xii. 10, where we have the same expression in the Sept., and the context informs us why all the tribes of the land will look on Him whom they have pierced, and mourn; it will be in consequence of his pouring out upon them the Spirit of grace and supplication.

With respect to the Scriptures becoming obsolete, Mr. Brown and we, I apprehend, partly agree and partly differ. We both agree in supposing that at no time before the second advent of our Lord will they be unsuitable to the Church; but that, after his appearing, they will become so. (See. p. 76.) We differ, in that we believe the period of blessedness, upon which the prophets delight to expatiate, will be after the advent, while Mr. Brown supposes the spiritual millennium will be established when the whole creation is still travelling and groaning, and not only they, but we ourselves groaning within ourselves, &c. Mr. Brown expects that the "national forgiveness of Israel will be publicly sealed." (p. 266.) Now when all "Israel shall be saved," will such passages as the following be still in force, or will they have become obsolete: "Except the Lord of Hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah;" and, "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace?"
These texts characterize the condition of the Jewish people during this dispensation. Will they characterize the condition of the Jewish people when their national forgiveness is sealed?

With regard to fresh revelations, when a little mistake of Mr. Brown's is cleared up, I do not think we shall differ much. We both agree, I conceive, in expecting that 1 Cor. xiii. 10—12 will be fulfilled at the second advent. Now, partially we know, but when that which is perfect, "the perfect" (state) is come, we shall know even as we are known. There will then be abundance of new revelation. But Mr. Brown has fallen into a slight error in supposing we expect "a book." (p. 89.) His quotation from Mr. M'Neile (p. 88) shews that the revelation we expect is of and from the Lord himself.

I am not quite clear as to what Mr. Brown intends when he says, "Most people will imagine that they have got rid of some important features of Christianity itself. Satan is gone; the world is gone—that is to say, as in any respect inimical to salvation." (p. 89.) Satan and the world are not important features of Christianity; Christianity will retain its own features; it is true that these features will cease to be distinctive when all the world have turned to the Lord, and when they are no longer under the power of the wicked one; but that does not prove that Christianity will have lost its features, any more than it would prove that there would be no Christians in heaven.

CHAPTER V. (p. 90) is on the intercession of Christ. Mr. Brown's position is, that Christ must remain in heaven itself . . . "as long as there are any sinners to be saved, or saints to be perfected." (p. 93.) By which I understand him to affirm that the elect, whilst children of wrath, are the objects of Christ's intercession. Three texts are advanced in support of this view, Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25; and ix. 24; but in all these passages the justified alone are
the objects of intercession. It is true Mr. Brown finds a sense (p. 92) for Heb. viii. 25: "Wherefore he is able to save them that come to God by Him 'as long as there shall be any such to come,' seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." But I like better the sense which Flavel finds out of Cameron; "'Save to the uttermost,' giving our salvation its last and complete act." From which he raises this doctrine; "Jesus our High Priest lives for ever, in the capacity of a potent intercessor in heaven for believers." It is those that come unto God by Him who are the objects of his intercession. Mr. Brown will perceive that the passage which he quotes from "Horse Hebraicae," (p. 90,) does not say anything about the necessity of the intercession of Christ in order to bring in elect sinners; and "he cannot expect to establish his point by substituting for argument of his own, the statements of others in a sense the reverse of what they were intended to bear." (p. 103.)

Having said so much in order to remove a slight misunderstanding, that I be not misunderstood in the other direction, I must add a few words on the great typical ordinance to which the apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is admitted to allude.

The whole of this dispensation seems to correspond with the day of atonement. Whilst Jesus is in the most Holy, the position of the believer is, to be looking for his second appearing. (Heb. ix. 7, 14, 24—28.) Bearing this in mind, I will run over the order of events as mentioned in Lev. xvi. Aaron was to take a bullock for a sin (offering) and a ram for a burnt offering, (ver. 3,) which he was to offer for himself, and to make an atonement for himself and his house, (ver. 5). In the sacrificial ordinances there are two offerings which should be distinguished; the offering mentioned in this verse is of the victim which is to become the sin; this is of course before its death. To this offering I
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apprehend St. Paul alludes when he says, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." This bullock was the sin offering for the high priest "himself and for his house." To this St. Paul alludes, I conceive, when he says, "Who needeth not daily ... to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins ... for this He did once," &c. (Heb. vii. 27.) The high priest's sins were the sins of his family, including probably the whole priesthood, compare Psalm cxxxv. 19, "Bless the Lord, O house of Aaron," with Lev. xvi. 33, "And he shall make an atonement for the priests," distinct from that, "for all the people of the congregation." This offering, then, typified Christ's offering for his family, the spiritual priesthood; and the iniquity of his family He calls his iniquities. The bullock, however, was not yet slain. We have next an offering distinct from the one for the high priest and his family. Aaron cast lots upon the two goats; the goat which was to be slain was "for the people." (Lev. xvi. 15, compare with Heb. vii. 27.) "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this He did once, when He offered up Himself." "The whole disposal of the lot being of the Lord," (Prov. xvi. 33,) was to mark, probably, that Jesus was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. (Acts iv. 28.) The way in which this part was unconsciously acted out by the high priest is strikingly recorded by St. John xi. 49—52. The high priest pronounced upon whom the Lord's lot had fallen, "to die for the people;" (ver. 50;) which St John explains was "for that nation." (ver. 51.) In the 52nd verse St. John marks out another end in the death of Christ, which, I suppose, was set out by the bullock. Those gathered during this dispensation are the children or sons of God, the family of the high priest.

The slaying of the bullock and of the goat then followed, and though in the type, in order, as I apprehend, to mark
the distinction, the high priest entered twice into the holiest, St. Paul tells us that the once entering into the most holy fulfilled both. (Heb. vii. 27.) When the high priest had entered the holy place, then was the second offering, to which St. Paul alludes. (Heb. ix. 14.) Christ offered himself, i.e. in opposition to the blood of bulls and goats.

Then after Aaron had made an end of reconciling the holy place, &c., he comes out and confesses over the live goat the iniquities of the children of Israel. The iniquities are removed, they are taken into a land of separation, (ver. 22;) but there is no slaying: which is not, I think, yet fulfilled in the antitype, for Jesus has not yet made an end of reconciling the holy place; He has not yet saved to the uttermost those who come to God by Him; therefore He has not yet left the holy place. The fulfilment will, I conceive, be when the people of Israel shall say, in the language of the ciiird Psalm, “As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us.” Jer. 1. 20, I apprehend, alludes to the same period: “In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none, and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve.” Again, (Rom. xi. 26,) “So all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.”

I only make one more observation, and that rather by way of caution. This last incident is transacted whilst Aaron has on the robes with which he entered the most holy. (ver. 23.) The time denoted being those “times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord,” though after Messiah has left the most holy, yet before He surrenders the
supreme power to God the Father, in order to assume his own throne.

The burnt offering was after Aaron had put on his other garments, and, as I conceive, denotes ascensions perhaps of praise, but probably of much more. "The zeal of thine house hath consumed me," was applied exclusively to Messiah in the days of his flesh; it will be applicable to all the saved in the perfect state.

In Chapter VI. Mr. Brown discourses of Christ's second coming in relation to his kingly office. I am sorry to be constrained to make one or two observations upon his quotations from his opponents.

He quotes the Presbyterian reviewer, "that Christ has not yet received any kingdom which he can deliver up;" saying it is essential to the system, that Christ has not now, nor has ever been on, any throne of his own. (p. 106.) He then quotes Mr. M'Neile, that Christ will "sit on his throne . . . when He shall have delivered up the kingdom which He at present enjoys;" which he calls "language nearly identical." (p. 107.) "With this addition, however, that the present administration of Christ is represented as purely providential." Which does not seem to be quite a correct representation of even what Mr. Brown quotes. His providential rule is, no doubt, part of his present administration; but subduing "all things unto himself," according to both Mr. Brown and Mr. M'Neile, embraces something more. The enemies to be subdued are "moral and physical." (p. 165.)

Mr. Bickersteth is very vague* . . . to make out the

* Did not that dear and highly honoured servant himself seem to feel some justice in this charge, I should almost think myself presumptuous in admitting its truth. But Mr. Bickersteth, in a sermon, in which he notices this work of Mr. Brown's, prefaces his view of the thrones of Messiah in these words: "The glory is such as to con-
futurity of Christ’s proper kingdom is undeniably the main object of his chapter... ‘there is, however, a preparatory and spiritual kingdom already established.’”

found us with its brightness. It seems to have contrast and opposite elements. Our Lord gives up the kingdom, and our Lord reigns for ever... We can little discern yet his everlasting kingdom as God over all, in harmony with his dominion as the Son of David.” He then states his view as follows: “As the Son of God, or the Lamb, He shares for ever in the glory of the everlasting kingdom. ‘The throne of God and of the Lamb’ shall be in the heavenly Jerusalem...

Thus, as Son of God, one with the Father, He for ever shares in the worship of the redeemed creation to the invisible Godhead.

“As the Son of man, he reigns over the house of Jacob for ever, one with the Father, the head of all worshippers, the King of kings for ever: He is the Son of David, and as such in glorified humanity He sits on his throne and continues to reign for ever.”—Bloombury Sermons, 1847, pp. 129, 130.

Surely the supposed contrast and opposite elements are in consequence of Mr. Bickersteth’s excluding from the title “The Lamb” the formal consideration of the humanity of our blessed Lord, and making it to designate the co-essential sonship; by this interpretation he creates the contrast between “the everlasting kingdom as God over all,” and the reign over the house of Jacob “as Son of man.” But the throne proper to the Messiah as the Lamb, (“the Lamb who had been slain,”) is not the throne of God over all.

It will, however, be said, that as it is “the throne of God and of the Lamb,” it must be the throne of “the Son of God, one with the Father.” It might with more appearance of truth be said, that it is the co-ordinate throne; for it is the Lamb who had been slain who does sit upon that throne. That throne is not, however, elsewhere called the throne of the Lamb, but the throne of the Father, or the throne of God; some term, in short, which excludes the idea of its being proper to the humanity of our Lord.

Before stating what I suppose to be conveyed by “the throne of God and of the Lamb,” I will just point out that the other supposed “contrast and opposite” throne, the reign over the house of Jacob, is in Scripture called the kingdom of God, (1 Chron. xvii. 14,) and Solomon’s throne is expressly called “the throne of the Lord.” (1 Chron. xxix. 23.) I think it will be found that these thrones are not
“Lord Mandeville is equally explicit; ‘There are two thrones,’ says he, ‘mentioned in connexion with Messiah; one on which He is now sitting, the other on which He is hereafter to sit. The one the throne of God, the other the throne of David; the one for a limited, the other for an unlimited period.’” (p. 107.)

Mr. Brown ought to observe that there are very essential contrariant, but coincident, and that the same truth, in a very slightly different phase, is to be gathered from either expression.

First, with respect to ‘the throne of God and of the Lamb.’ Mr. Bickersteth and I agree in supposing that it refers to some time after Messiah shall have resigned the kingdom. I therefore deny that it is the co-ordinate reign, and, as I have already observed as regards ‘the Lamb,’ the idea of ‘the invisible Godhead’ is excluded. I think it is necessary for us to preserve distinct ideas with regard to the offices sustained by ‘God’ and ‘the Lamb.’ In Rev. vii. 15—17 there is the promise of what shall be, and the distinction preserved between him who sitteth upon the throne, and the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, and the appropriate offices which each will sustain. Now when it is said, in this latter passage of the Apocalypse, that the Lord God and the Lamb are the temple, and the glory of God and the Lamb are the light of the New Jerusalem, I do not apprehend that each Divine Person is the light of the temple in the same manner, but that the manifestation of the Father will ever be through the Son, and that the Father, as the ultimate object of worship, will ever be approached through the Son. Considered co-essentially, the Son is equally invisible with the Father; it is the Lamb who is the image of the invisible God. And as the true object of worship is known only by means of the Lamb, so the right mode of address is only through the Lamb that had been slain. In like manner will the divine rule be through the Lamb, not co-ordinately, but as the link of connexion between the creature and inaccessible Deity; thus will it be ‘the kingdom of Christ and of God.’

Now with regard to the reign on the throne of David, what is that but the bringing out of ‘the Just One,’ ‘ruling in the fear of the Lord,’ God’s king manifesting the rectitude of the divine rule? But as God’s king He will hold of the Invisible; thus, in like manner, will it be ‘the kingdom of Christ and of God.’
points of difference between these statements. Mr. M'Neile and I differ nearly as much from the Presbyterian reviewer, as we do from Mr. Brown. This oversight is the more unaccountable, because Mr. Brown himself reproves Mr. Wood for not observing this very distinction. He says in another place, "Mr. M'Neile, however, Lord Mandeville, and several others, hold 'the kingdom' which Christ is to 'deliver up,' to be his present one, and which, at the millennium, He is to exchange for his own—the Davidical throne and kingdom. We are surprised that Mr. Wood should call this last view of the kingdom to be given up, a 'new theory of Mr. James Scott's.' No one well read in the controversy can call it so." (p. 164.)

The passage which Mr. Brown quotes from "Horæ Hebraicæ" was actually directed against the pre-millennialists. I still think that what I wrote twelve years ago about the confusion between the two thrones is not ill-timed even now; but the confusion, as it appears to me, is not confined to the pre-millennialists. Mr. Brown also quotes from the appendix to "Horæ Hebraicæ," "combining in one sentence the contents of two or three." (p. 106, note.) I there advanced a proof that 1 Tim. iv. 1 refers to the personal advent, and I further used the text to fix the time when Messiah should commence to reign on his own throne. Mr. Brown quotes it, as if I were describing the nature of our Lord's present rule, and as if I held that it was purely providential.

Mr. Brown's position is, that "Christ's proper kingdom . . . commenced . . . on his ascension to the throne of God, so it will continue—stretching across the period of the thousand years—in its present form" ("its external administration the same—its constitution, structure, organic form unaltered—no change of dispensation," p. 113,) "till the final judgment." (p. 110.)

I say, in opposition, that there will be no change of dis-
pensation at the end of the thousand years, and that when the Messiah comes to this earth to the final judgment, then, and not till then, will he assume his own throne.

The first passage examined is Dan. ii., with which prophecy Mr. Brown assumes that the parables in Matt. xiii. are conterminable; but that being the very point in debate, we will, for the sake of clearness, examine the meaning of each separately.

"The kingdom of Christ, instead of commencing with the millennium, will, it seems, have run one entire stage of its career before that era arrives." (p. 119.)

I would notice that there is no mention of Christ's kingdom in this vision of Daniel. "The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom," is what is said; and though I am ready to admit that, according to my principles, it is the reign of Messiah, Mr. Brown should prove that, according to his principles, it is the reign of Messiah on David's throne; but in doing so he might be forced to make some admissions fatal to his theory. How does he prove that it is not the kingdom of the God of heaven himself? He cannot, according to his theory, say it is established in opposition to other earthly monarchies. Mr. Brown believes that a time will come when Messiah will resign the kingdom to the Father; he should prove that this will not be the kingdom which (Dan. ii.) the God of heaven will set up.

"There is but one kingdom of Christ in 'two states,' commencing during the existence of the last of the four monarchies; that is, on the Redeemer's exaltation to the right-hand of power, stretching across the era of the latter day, and losing itself in the final state. However different its aspects as 'the stone,' and as 'the mountain,' it is the stone that becomes the mountain." (pp. 119, 120.)

So we say: but a change from a stone to a mountain is more than a change of aspect. Had the prophecy described the stone as growing till it filled the earth, if it had
still been a detached stone, that would have answered Mr.
Brown's idea of a difference "merely of prosperity and ex-
tent;" but it becomes a mountain. We must notice in the
figure, the process of detaching the stone from a mountain,
implied in the expression, "Thou sawest till that a stone
was cut out without hands." Next we find the stone, when
completely detached from the earth, suddenly falling on the
image. In the last place, we find the stone become a
mountain, "which cannot be moved, but abideth for ever."
(Ps. cxxv. 1.) Not only increased in extent, but firmly
fixed; and again part of the mundane system. Contrary,
therefore, to its losing itself in the final state, "it shall
stand for ever." So that Mr. Brown denies that there will
be a change, when the vision appears to imply that there
will be one; and affirms that there will be a change, when
the vision denies that there will be any.

Mr. Brown appears to lose sight of another feature in the
vision. The last form of earthly rule is signified in the
image, by the toes partly of iron and partly of clay; and
the explanation says, "in the days of these kings," not in the
days of the last king or kingdom; which necessarily would
have been the language, upon the supposition that Messiah's
kingdom was set up at the period of the ascension. As
Mr. Brown identifies the vision of the iiind of Daniel with
that in the viith chapter, it might have occurred to him,
that it would be the last kingdom in its tenfold division,
that would be smitten by the stone. So that "these kings"
(Dan. ii. 44) are the "ten kings which shall arise." (Dan.
vii. 24.) This would have freed Mr. Brown from the diffi-
culty he seems to have felt, (p. 125,) for there he speaks of
God's kingdom being set up "in the days" . . . "of the
four famous kingdoms." He saw it was necessary to get a
plural form somewhere, so he includes all the four
monarchies.

"From Daniel we learn . . . that its (the kingdom's) Mr. Brown.
advance from the beginning up to the millennial era, though real, will be relatively insignificant, in consequence of certain gigantic obstructions, &c." (p. 122.)

The advance of the kingdom will be real up to that period which Mr. Brown calls the millennial era; but which I consider will be the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. That progress, however, will not be insignificant, but it will be perfectly different in its nature from the act of overthrowing the image. Mr. Brown supposes the stone to be the Church; but the progress consists in the stone being severed from the mountain without hands; separating the Church from the world; a work not human but divine; but if this be the meaning of the figure, neither Mr. Brown nor any who remember the rock whence they are hewn, will consider the work insignificant, but they will acknowledge it to be mighty.

"It is the kingdom of Christ, it seems, with its present resources and agencies, that is to 'break in pieces and consume all those kingdoms;' whilst itself 'stands for ever.' In other words, Christ's presently existing kingdom has within itself, the whole resources, by which it is destined to crush the anti-christianism, that obstructs its universal triumphs, and to win its way to the throne of the world." (pp. 122, 123.)

An important truth is contained in this sentence, but it does not appear quite correctly stated. It is the kingdom which Christ at present administers, which will "break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms;" but whether that be the kingdom of Christ is the point in dispute. Christ will be revealed "in the glory of the Father."

There is also another truth implied in this statement. The kingdom of Christ has not yet won its way to the throne of the world. It will be on the sounding of the seventh trumpet that the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. It ap-
pears incorrect to call the kingdoms "anti-Christianism." It is all rule, and authority, and power, which Christ is to put down. "The God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory," . . . "and hath made thee rule," &c. "And after thee shall arise another kingdom." This language does not accord with Mr. Brown's, "As kingdoms simply—as a mere succession of civil monarchies—the vision has nothing to do with them." (p. 123.)

Mr. Brown says, "The Church complete in her living and ever present Head" (p. 125) "is not physical or political." (p. 124.) The blow to be inflicted by it, therefore, is "not physical or political;" it is just "a conflict of interests;" the kingdoms shall "be re-constituted upon Christian principles." (p. 124.) This construction is, I fear, only a building of hay and stubble. The kingdom of the God of heaven shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms; they shall become like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind shall carry them away, and no place shall be found for them. This does not accord with Mr. Brown. I prefer the interpretation given by the marginal reference in our Bibles. "The ungodly are . . . like the chaff which the wind driveth away." (Ps. i. 4.)

Mr. Brown next compares Dan. ii. with Dan. vii. "To Mr. Brown. Nebuchadnezzar, being a king, the four powers are represented as kingdoms. To Daniel . . . they are represented as nothing else than so many wild beasts." (p. 127.)

This is not quite accurately stated. To Nebuchadnezzar Reply. there is the representation of an image, which is interpreted to denote four kingdoms; and the representation of a stone, which is interpreted to denote the kingdom of the God of heaven. To Daniel there is the representation of four beasts; which is interpreted to denote as many kings or kingdoms. The fourth being the fourth kingdom upon
earth, out of which ten kingdoms shall arise. The session of the Ancient of days is represented to Daniel and interpreted of the judgment; and the reception of the kingdoms by the Son of man is interpreted to denote the saints possessing the kingdom.

"Let it be carefully borne in mind," says Mr. Brown, "that the scene has nothing to do with persons as persons. It is the trial and condemnation of a system, and of that alone." (p. 120.)

The interpretation given to Daniel is that "the ten horns are ten kings that shall arise, and another shall rise after them." . . . "And he shall subdue three kings . . . and the saints of the Most High shall be given into his hand," &c. The interpretation shews the three kings and the one king are similar; as Mr. Brown truly observes on another occasion, "all is homogeneous." (p. 209.) The little horn being a system, I apprehend, subdues three systems; and the saints of the Most High, be they persons or principles, (for "the vision has to do with them solely in the light of their principles," p. 135,) are delivered into the hand of this system. "It is surprising that a scene whose purport is so plain should have been so much mystified as this is by premillennialists." (p. 131.) "Nothing can be more evident than that the judgment . . . is a sublime symbolical way of expressing the righteousness of anti-Christ's destruction." (p. 132.) We do, however, get an important admission: there will be a point of time when "the stage being clear, the Son of man will be seen, putting in his claim for the sovereignty of the world," (p. 132,) and getting that claim recognized by Him that sitteth upon the throne. "Ask of me," says the Ancient of days in effect, "and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." (Ps. ii. 8.) The quotation is apt, and would have been still more to the point, had Mr. Brown compared the following
context: "Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel," with the breaking of the potter's clay or earthenware feet, in Dan. ii. 34, 35. "It is just that in symbolic language which Zechariah expresses in naked terms, referring to the same period: 'And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord and his name one.' Zech. xiv. 9." (p. 133.) Mr. Brown, however, omits to mention the period; although Zechariah expresses it "in naked terms;" namely, when Messiah's "feet shall stand upon the Mount of Olives." (ver. 4.) "When the tables will be turned, irreligious opposition being more thoroughly put down than before it was rampant." (p. 135.)

It seems strange that Mr. Brown should have chosen a symbolical prophecy upon which to base the proof of his system. For though he be so confident of his interpretation, as to speak of what the Spirit of God says in contradiction to the system of his opponents; still usage and custom have not fixed and defined the ideas which should be conveyed by symbols so certainly as to prevent another saying, "I also will shew mine opinion," Job xxxiii. 10. To me, for example, the stone seems to intimate the kingdom of heaven, not in the primitive but in a derivative sense. The kingdom being those individuals who shall compose the kingdom: "a kingdom of saints," (p. 128,) who, during this dispensation of grace, are being hewn out of the mass of the men of the earth; Messiah himself being the germ of the kingdom. When the whole number of the elect is severed from the world, then the Lord will come and all his saints with him, then will the wicked be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord; and then will the mountain of the Lord's house be established on the top of the mountains . . . and all nations shall flow unto it." To suppose that the stone will become a mountain during this dispensation, is to suppose that this earth will be the
rest of God's people while it is polluted; which is one of the evil effects that those who look for the Lord suppose to flow from the belief that the Lord delays his coming.

Mr. Brown, however, takes the parabolic scriptures to assist him in interpreting the symbolical.

"The parables of the Tares and of the Fish . . . might be held to settle the whole question . . . the Saviour making the kingdom in its gracious state, stretch from its commencement to its final judgment, without making the millennium so much as a break in it—without so much as noticing any such period." (pp. 120, 121.)

To this statement I fully assent, because I believe that there will be no such period before the day of judgment. But if "the Lord alone is exalted in that (millennial) day," Isa. ii. 11, 17, (p. 133,) how is it that it is not noticed in the parables? How is it, if there is to be "progress on the whole, though chequered and variable, with ultimate universality," (p. 122,) that the parables describe a mixture to the end?

In Chap. vii. Mr. Brown tells us that the burden of all the recorded addresses of the apostles, is "that the nation had misunderstood the Prophets, and had mistaken the nature of the kingdom which they predicted." (p. 140.) He proceeds to examine Peter's address, Acts ii.: "We give the quotation," says he, "somewhat in brief." (pp. 141, 142.) That is to say, he leaves out verses 34, 35. This I conceive to be unfortunate, because nothing is gained in brevity, as these verses are quoted in p. 161; and the omission has caused Mr. Brown to mistake the argument. Instead of distributing the two titles "Lord and Christ," ver. 36, and allotting to them their respective proofs, he, in p. 142, appends them both as an inference from the one proof; and, in p. 161, he makes them both an inference from the other proof. I will, therefore, state the apostle's argument, as I think it ought to be distributed: "David . . . . being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the
fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ (rather, "the Christ") to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses, ... therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified ... Christ."

"Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted; and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified ... Lord."

The argument is entirely respecting identity; which, by a curious mistake in p. 161, Mr. Brown shews he has overlooked. "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Lord, (instead of Jesus,) whom ye have crucified ... Lord." This, I have no doubt, was a slip of the pen; but which could hardly have escaped observation, had Mr. Brown perceived how much the argument depended on the personal and not on the official designation.

"Here it is stated as explicitly as words could do it, that Mr. Brown, the promise to David of Messiah's succession to his throne, has received its intended accomplishment—that God has raised up Christ to sit upon that throne, in the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, as the fruit of David's loins, to the right hand of power, and that his first exercise of regal authority, from the throne of Israel, was to send down the Spirit, as had that day been done." (p. 142.)

Here we perceive the unfortunate result of Mr. Brown's Reply quoting in brief; he confuses the Messianic rule on David's
throne with the Lordship at God's right hand. If Mr. Brown's view was correct, would not our Lord's answer to the disciples, Acts i. 7, be unaccountable? To say "It is not your business to know times and seasons which the Father has put in his own power," at the very moment that He was going to mount the throne, and to imply that the apostles had a work to perform before that could take place, would certainly be calculated to deceive them. Mr. Brown seems to lose the point of St. Peter's argument, when he says, it is stated explicitly that God has raised up Christ; it is explicitly stated that God has raised Jesus, which is Peter's proof to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ. But it is not explicitly stated that the promise to David of Messiah's sitting upon his throne had received its accomplishment. The "resurrection of Jesus" was the fulfilment of the promise to David, that God would raise up the Christ. The exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of power was the accomplishment of the prediction in the cxth Psalm, "Sit thou at my right hand," &c. Hence the exercise of regal authority, of which Mr. Brown speaks, was not from the throne of Israel, but it was the exercise of Christ's Lordship from the throne of God.

Mr. Brown speaks of "Jesus, as the fruit of David's loins," who was to succeed to David's throne. Surely then as one is the humanity, so is the other the throne of the humanity of Christ. But the one member of the sentence, that which has become history, Mr. Brown takes literally; the other member, that which still, according to my apprehension, remains prophecy, he takes spiritually; which in this instance, I suppose, is to be understood typically. (See p. 144.) This is arbitrary.

"When, moreover, he adds that God had made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ, he manifestly wished to be understood—and could not fail to be understood—as affirming that his present exaltation was his proper Lordship or royalty as Messiah." (p. 142.)
We still perceive in this passage the unfortunate consequence of suppressing the two verses, 34 and 35, in St. Peter's argument. Both parts of the inference, ver. 36, being thus made to depend upon ver. 30—32. But had Peter "manifestly wished to be understood" in the sense which Mr. Brown supposes, he could not have said, that Jesus was "both Lord and Christ," but that Jesus was Lord or Christ. Peter did affirm that his present exaltation was "his proper Lordship;" but Peter did not confound the present Lordship of Jesus with his Messianic royalty, though he does call on "all the house of Israel to know assuredly," that both these offices centred in the same individual. A mystery so profound, that when Jesus, about eight weeks before, propounded it, none of the house of Israel could solve it.

"Pre-millennialists . . . ask, with all seriousness, in what possible sense the throne of the living God can be said to be David's throne." "I answer," says Mr. Brown, "first, it is not the throne of 'the living God' as such, which Peter says Christ is now sitting on, as David's successor; but the seat of rule over the Israel of God," &c. (p. 143.)

Mr. Brown appears in this passage to see the necessity of distinguishing between the present Lordship of Christ and his Messianic rule; which I conceive he had confounded in the preceding page. Messiah, it appears, is not sitting on the throne of God as such; but the throne of the living God, as such, is also occupied by Christ, as fellow of the Lord of hosts; "fellow of the Lord of hosts, in the nature of his people." (p. 143.) As, however, the nature of his people is not co-essential with the nature of the Lord of hosts; Christ in the nature of his people is occupying the throne of God co-ordinately. That is a truth which I admit.

Messiah is "set down with his Father on his throne:" this Peter proves out of Ps. cx., and this is very properly styled by Mr. Brown "the right hand of power;" but this is the
Lordship of Christ; and, as I observed, it is most necessary to distinguish this Lordship from the Messianic reign which he will inherit "as David's successor." In what sense he can be supposed to sit upon the throne of God as David's successor I cannot conceive, for whether we understand the session at the right hand of God to denote either the locality of Messiah's throne or the nature of his rule, the anointed Jesus could not sit upon the throne, "as David's successor," unless David had sat there before him.

Mr. Brown says Messiah is sitting on the throne of the living God "as David's successor," under which consideration it is "the seat of rule over the Israel of God," (p. 143,) by which I understand Mr. Brown to mean the rule of Christ in the hearts of his people, in contradistinction from his providential rule over the ungodly, which he exercises sitting on "the throne of the living God, as such." (p. 143.) He seems, therefore, to be speaking of the subjective, rather than of the objective character of Messiah's present rule.

Mr. Brown uses "Israel of God" in a spiritual, that is, in an accommodated sense, intending thereby, I apprehend, the whole church. It does not affect the argument. I may, however, be permitted to enter a protest against this use of the term. It occurs in Gal. vi., distinguishing that portion of Israel from those Jews, not the Israel of God, who would constrain the Galatians to be circumcised.

This seat of rule over the Israel of God is Christ's "own throne, different from the other, not in locality, but in the nature, grounds, and objects of the rule, which from thence he exercises." (p. 143.)

The nature of the rule, with respect to the Father's throne, "is undoubtedly divine." One would suppose then that the nature of the rule upon David's throne, not only because it is the throne of a creature, but also because in its nature it differs from the throne of God, is undoubtedly human; but, no! that is "undoubtedly divine" also. To fellowship
in this rule, Christ promises to exalt his people. As then the expression, "the throne of David," denotes not the locality, but the nature, grounds, and objects of the rule; the conclusion to which we are legitimately brought is, that the rule which Christ's people will enjoy will be "undoubtedly divine" also. But that, of course, Mr. Brown does not admit. Then, I think, he must admit that the nature of the rule is not the same with respect to Messiah and his followers. This he meets by saying, "Christ's person elevates the rule itself as high above that of David as the Lord is superior to the servant." (p. 144.) But, then, how can any be admitted to the "fellowship of his throne;" or "dare aspire" to it, any more than to the Father's throne, "as such?"

This inconsistency is in consequence of Mr. Brown professing to talk of the nature of Christ's rule, but in reality arguing from the dignity of his person.

Mr. Brown says, "His first exercise of regal authority from the throne of Israel, was to send down the Spirit." (p. 142.)

If such, indeed, be the nature of the throne, is it possible that Messiah's followers could aspire to fellowship with him upon it? I think I do no injustice to Mr. Brown, when I say that though, according to him, the term is intended to denote the nature of the rule, he, under the same term, includes two distinct natures of rule, one to suit his theory of Messiah's reign, the other to suit Messiah's promise to those who shall overcome. If he do not admit that there are two distinct natures of rule on this one throne of David, let us see the consequences.

The throne of David, according to Mr. Brown, is "a mediatorial exaltation to be the head of his redeemed," (p. 148,) "to the fellowship of which, according to the measure of their capacity," the redeemed are to be exalted. How can they be exalted to a mediatorial exaltation to be the head of themselves? Moreover they are to be exalted
to this when Messiah comes again, at a period when, according to Mr. Brown, (pp. 98, 94,) Christ's mediatorial kingdom will come to an end. Surely the headship of Christ over the redeemed and over all things for their behalf is that co-ordination on the throne of God, which we have seen from Mr. Brown, is Christ's present position. Turning to Eph. i. 20, 22, to which he refers, we shall see that St. Paul alludes to the same exaltation, which St. Peter proves from Ps. cx.

Mr. Brown understands "the throne of David" in a spiritual, that is, a typical sense. "This is the rule of which David's over God's chosen Israel was but a faint shadow." (p. 144.) The shadow is faint no doubt; for, says Mr. Brown, "the rule of David's successor is not like the rule of David himself." (p. 146.) But how are Christ's victorious people to reign over the Israel, which embraces under it the believing Gentiles?

Mr. Brown proceeds to strengthen his view respecting the throne of David from Rev. iii. 7, 8, 12. "The key of David's house, (says he) which Christ claims to be in possession of, is the same as is mentioned in Isa. xxii. 22." This is not quite exactly stated; but Mr. Brown subsequently explains his meaning, by saying, "Christ has that anti-typical authority in David's house, which Eliakim's robe, girdle, and key, faintly shadowed forth." (p. 152.) The one, then, is not the same, but is the type of the other. Mr. Brown, not keeping this clearly before his mind, has got into some little confusion. The circumstance is "in the apocalypse (as usual) symbolically represented." (p. 174.) Here we agree with Mr. Brown; but, unfortunately, we differ from him, in supposing that in Acts ii. things are related literally, and are not "symbolically represented." Therefore a proper application of an unusual sense, to terms in a symbolical prophecy, would not justify the application of the same unusual sense, even to the same terms, when in
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a simple narrative. But, even according to his own assumption that the throne of David is used symbolically in Acts ii., there is not a proper parallelism. The chamberlain in David's house being a type of Christ, does not prove that the throne in the heavens is the antitype to David's throne.

"Thus clearly does it appear from the Redeemer's language to the Church of Philadelphia, that the 'house of David' is the house of God's church or people, over which David had a rule of a very inferior kind in Palestine." (p. 154.)

The house of David is the family of David, over which he had paternal authority. If this be taken typically, it is the Church, as the family of Christ. But this has nothing to do with the throne of David, either in the type or the antitype.

From this antitypical allusion to Isa. xxii. in Rev. iii. Mr. Brown gets a principle of interpretation, by which to determine "the true and only sense of." Isa. ix. 6, 7. (p. 153.) If the parallel be correct, Eliakim, in the one instance, being a historical personage, Isa. ix. 6, 7, must, in like manner, have a literal meaning, applicable to some historical personage, (let us suppose, with the Jews and rationalists, that it is Hezekiah,) whose reign on the throne of David was a type of Messiah's reign in heaven. But this is not Mr. Brown's view, therefore the analogy falls to the ground. The literal view Mr. Brown considers to be "carnal." (p. 152.) He interprets Isa. xxii. spiritually, i.e. typically, (p. 152,) and in an extended sense. (p. 154.) From this he derives countenance for the interpretation of Isa. ix. spiritually, i. e., not typically but analogetically. But "that is the vice of the system." (p. 156.)

I do not object to comparing scripture with scripture; but, as Peter implies that David's prediction in Ps. xvi. was in accordance with his "knowing that God had sworn with
an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." (Acts ii, 30.) It would have been more suitable to have shewn that David understood the Lord's promises in the sense which Mr. Brown puts upon them; and as the angel (Luke i. 32, 33,) probably alluded to (Isa. ix.), it would have been well had Mr. Brown shewn that the sense he puts on the prophecy is the same as was conveyed by Gabriel to Mary.

"In his next address . . . . the same idea is expressed with equal beauty and brevity . . . . 'Ye . . . killed THE PRINCE OF LIFE, whom God hath raised up from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.' (Acts iii. 13, 15.) Here Messiah's Princedom is not only admitted but proclaimed; but the sense given of it is as opposite as the poles from the Jewish one, and expressly intended to displace it." (p. 155.)

Mr. Brown is arguing with regard to the period of "the formal commencement of Christ's reign and kingdom," (p. 161,) which he affirms commenced at his ascension, (p. 161,) but this passage speaks of what Messiah was before he was "killed;" but, perhaps Mr. Brown would say, he was Prince of life "on credit," (p. 111,) but in that sense he was Prince of life from the very first. But the fulfilment of the promise to David, it is clear, was to commence some time after the patriarch's death. (2 Sam. vii. 12.)

Mr. Brown makes the same little anachronism in his application of Pa. ii. The application in Acts iv. 25, 27, is to what was done when our blessed Lord was upon earth. How, then, were Herod and Pontius Pilate gathered together against "the present sovereignty and rule of Jesus in the heavens?" (p. 156.) The psalm extends over a period which embraces the close of the former dispensation and the commencement of the next. But we have no authority from
Acts for saying that Messiah's session on Zion does not belong to the future dispensation, as I think it does.

"Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." (Acts v. 29, 31.) Mr. Brown seems to think that this passage bears upon the question—but there is nothing about the throne of David mentioned. It is Messiah's co-ordinate rule. The same is true with respect to all the quotations from, and allusions to, Ps. cx. 1.

When this session on God’s right hand is called Christ's "proper throne," (p. 159, bottom,) there appears a want of exactness. If the throne proper to his nature is intended, the expression is ambiguous. It may be the throne proper to his nature as Son of God, or as Son of man. The throne proper to the seed of David is the subject of dispute. So, unless a limitation be admitted, which is quite contrary to Mr. Brown's view, and, indeed, conceding the point under discussion, the term, Christ's proper throne, conveys either an incorrect idea or else no definite one. The session at God's right hand is of Jesus as David's Lord; the session on David's throne is of Jesus the Christ. This is the distinction in Acts ii., and which it is very necessary to preserve. Each throne is "proper" to Christ in his office. That which Mr. Brown calls his "proper throne" is proper to him as co-ordinate not as co-essential; the throne of David is proper to Messiah, as seed of David, and proper to the God-man as subordinate. We must bear in mind that as the humanity of our Lord will never be either deified or annihilated, on whatever throne he may sit, it must be in his office character, and in an assumed relation to his Father. For the essential relation which the one nature bears is opposite to that essential relation which the other sustains. Co-ordination must be an assumed relation with respect to the humanity. Subordination may be compatible with
co-essentiality, but to the extent which I apprehend scripture contemplates, subordination will be, as it has been, an assumed relation by the Word.

In p. 165 Mr. Brown opposes the views I entertain respecting the delivery of the kingdom to the Father; but when we mutually understand each other, I hope the difference will not be very great.

"Christ's reign (1 Cor. xv. 25) . . . is his rule in his own proper kingdom, as the enemies are those of that rule." (p. 165.)

Mr. Brown supposes the enemies of Christ are such during Christ's proper reign. I rather conceive that the enemies are those which oppose and prevent the establishment of his proper kingdom. In the passage, (Hosea Heb. p. 90,) of which Mr. Brown quoted a part, I attempted to shew that by Messiah's having "a sceptre of rectitude" it was implied that absolute and undeviating righteousness, as to overt acts, would be established in his kingdom.

"The apostle, it will be seen, divides the enemies of his reign into two classes—moral and physical; and this specification leaves no room to doubt what rule and kingdom of Christ are meant." (p. 165.)

The rule of Christ is one thing. That, I agree with Mr. Brown, is his present rule. The kingdom of Christ is another, which I shall presently shew Mr. Brown has unintentionally admitted is still future. The moral enemies are "rule, authority, and power;" these will be put down when the image is broken. (Dan. ii.)

Mr. Brown refers to Zec. xiv. 17—19, and Rev. xx. 7—9 in proof that there will be opposing rule during the millennium. These texts mention national and geographical distinctions. But I see no mention in either of them concerning "rule, authority, or power," as existing during the commencement of that period called the millennium. The former passage speaks of a theocracy over all the
earth, (Zec. xiv. 9,) which will be established after Messiah's feet stand on the Mount of Olives. (ver. 4.) Consistently with this "sceptre of rectitude," disobedience will be visited with judicial excision. The latter passage mentions an outbreak at the close of the thousand years; but this does not prove that there will be opposing rule during the thousand years.

The physical enemy is death; which Mr. Brown says is "passively inimical." An error may lurk under this expression. Death, when personified, is described as actively inimical: "O death, where is thy sting?" implies an armed enemy, and victory implies conflict. But, if death be not personified, we ought not to speak of it as passively inimical, for it has no real being, separated from the condition of its subjects. Christ destroyed or abolished death in himself when he rose. Christ will destroy or abolish death in his people when they are raised; and then death, if we personify it, will be an enemy under Christ's feet. Death, I admit, is the "last enemy" of Christ's "present saving authority," (p. 167,) and the throne which he at present occupies he "acquired at an infinite cost." (p. 168.) But, then, I suppose that our Lord calls it his Father's throne: "I overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne;" (Rev. iii. 21;) and, though Mr. Brown calls this "Christ's proper kingdom," (p. 110,) acquired "in his own right," (p. 168,) it will be seen that we do not differ in idea; for, he says that when he delivers up the kingdom, he will give "an account of his stewardship." (p. 170.) Then he will be greeted from the throne with "Well done good and faithful servant." (p. 171.) This language is suitable to one surrendering a trust, when the delegated authority is again resumed. Mr. Brown adds, "This delivering up of the kingdom seems to imply the end of the kingdom in its present form." (p. 171.) This he explains by "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore,"—implying that both the authority to issue that commission,
and the power to sustain in the execution of it, were given to the Mediator expressly for those saving purposes. When therefore the work is done, the whole commission is at an end." This "all power," therefore, which Christ now exercises, is a delegated authority, which is to cease; but "there is a glorious sense, in which it will be the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (pp. 112 and 174.) If all power in heaven and earth is delegated, that is Christ's co-ordination; and if that "all power in heaven and earth" be resumed, and Christ has an everlasting kingdom, that cannot be co-ordinate also.

"Thus in the strictest sense will it be the 'kingdom of Christ and of God,'" (p. 175,) [of God supremely and of Christ subordinately,] 'his appearing and his kingdom.' (2 Tim. iv. 1.) [i.e. his kingdom will commence at his appearing] "The everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" [i.e. Christ's proper kingdom will never be delivered up to the Father, for it will be everlasting.] "He shall reign for ever and ever," (Rev. xi. 15,) [which reign will commence upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."]

"At the head of this magnificent kingdom of new creation, Jesus shall sit, the life of all its activities and of all its felicities; and the very prop of its being . . . the trust character of Mediator is at an end, but mediation itself is not at an end. The stewardship has ceased, with all its mutual engagements . . . the covenant stands fast for ever, and 'his throne as the days of heaven.' (Ps. lxxxix. 28—37.)" (p. 176.)

This is all very beautiful and very true, and had Mr. Brown mentioned that the Psalmist is speaking of the throne of David, (ver. 35, 36,) it would have been very complete.

Chapter VIII. is the continuation of the same subject; but is one of "pure interpretation." (p. 177, note.) The
first portion interpreted is the second Psalm. I have given in
the body of the work a sketch of what I think is the mean-
ing; and it seems to me to avoid some difficulties which
attach to Mr. Brown's view, and which prevent it from being
altogether "consistent and worthy." (p. 179.)

"The 'breaking of his enemies with a rod of iron and
Mr. Brown.
dashing them in pieces like a potter's vessel,' as it has an
immediate reference to his getting 'the heathen for his in-
heritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his pos-
session,' must be intended to express pre-millennial judg-
ments, which are intended to sweep away Daniel's anti-
Christian and obstructive power—or, in other words, to
the stone's smiting the image, in order to its becoming a
great mountain, that shall fill the whole earth." (p. 180.)

I have the pleasure of agreeing with Mr. Brown in a Reply.
great part of this statement; but I do not assent to his
idea that it is only "public bodies as such;" "that the
scene has nothing to do with persons as persons; [that]
it is the trial and condemnation of a system, and of that
alone." (p. 180.) For in order to preserve the consistency
of the interpretation, we must maintain that the heathen
whom Christ is to get for his inheritance are the heathen
systems alone; if you deny this, consistency requires that
those who shall be dashed in pieces will be the enemies—
persons, and not systems only.

"This last verse carries the mind forward to the final Mr. Brown.
triumphs of the King, when He shall have put, not this
anti-Christian confederacy merely, but "all enemies under
his feet." Accordingly, participation in these very triumphs
is one of the promises which Jesus makes from the skies,
'to him that overcometh,' at the day of account and in the
state of subsequent glory." (p. 180, note.)

We have learned from Mr. Brown that the wrath of Ps. Reply.
ii. ushers in the millennium. The day of wrath mentioned
in Ps. cx. he also attributes to the same time. (p. 182.)
"In these very triumphs" the overcomer shall participate, "in the state of subsequent glory;" that is, according to Mr. Brown, after the millennium. How does he reconcile these statements? He does not believe that the whole millennium will be a day of wrath, but he introduces a method of using the quotations from the Old Testament in the New, of which he subsequently makes much use. "We must not," says he, "confound what is in a passage, and meant to be conveyed by it, with what is its more direct and immediate scope, with reference to the occasion which called it forth," (p. 181, note.) By which he means to say, that the immediate scope of Ps. ii. 8, 9, was the "destruction of certain organized forms of hostility to the progress of Christ's kingdom;" but that there is another sense in the Psalm, and meant to be conveyed by it; and it is in this other sense in which our Lord uses it in Rev. ii. 26, 27.

I venture to express a hope that this is not a sound canon of interpretation; for, if it be, instead of our deriving any aid from the New Testament, in fixing the direct and immediate scope of the Old, it would be calculated to mislead us. Instead of the context in the Old assisting us in discovering the recondite sense of the passage in the New, it would blind us; instead of considering our Lord and the apostles as infallible interpreters of the inspired prophets, we must suppose the prophets to speak one language, and those who quote them, another. The words when used by one, ought to convey one set of ideas, but from the same words, when used by the other, we must elicit another interpretation. I believe that it is quite as "consistent and worthy" a principle of interpretation, to suppose that when the Holy Ghost indited the Psalm, the verse had the same sense in its context, as when the blessed Lord quoted it; and that both the Son, in whom there was no guile, and the Spirit of truth, spake of the gift by the Father to the Son, in the same univocal and unequivocal sense.
To his exposition of Ps. cx. Mr. Brown appends a note: "We do not mean that Zion is never employed in its literal sense, in predictions relating to gospel times, and yet unfulfilled; we believe the contrary." (p. 182.) I will meet this important concession by also admitting that "Zion," "the upper city," may sometimes denote "the Jerusalem which is above," but which shall descend. And as we learn from the New Testament that the 1st and 4th verses of Ps. cx. are now in the course of fulfilment, it is possible that verse 2 is also.

In interpreting the xlvth Psalm, Mr. Brown does not appear to be guided by the epistle to the Hebrews; but I shall shortly have to show that "this is the vice of the system." (p. 185.)

In interpreting the xcviith Psalm, however, Mr. Brown does take advantage of Rev. ii. 13, "just in the sense in which it [the earth] was Satan's seat or throne—there He [the Lord of Sabaoth] comes to plant his throne and set up his gracious rule." (p. 187.)

I do not know where Mr. Brown supposes Satan personally to be at present. St. Peter would imply that he is not very far off; so perhaps there may be much truth in the analogy. Mr. Brown, however, means the "usurped dominion" of Satan; "in the Apocalypse (as usual) symbolically represented." (p. 174.) From which he deduces a law for interpreting a Psalm which is not symbolical. There are figurative expressions in the Psalm no doubt; but God's mercy and truth to the house of Israel is no more a figure in Ps. xcviii. 3 than it is in Luke i. "God's fidelity to his promises," (p. 186,) forbids the thought; neither can we admit the announcement that "the Lord cometh to judge the earth," to be only a figure.

"Secondly, let us look through the PROPHETS." (Page Mr. Brown. 189.) . . . "If we do not come to the study of [these glowing prophecies] with right conceptions of their method,
and sound principles of interpretation, we may find them either melting away in our hands, into a mere anticipation of a golden age, or giving utterance to nothing but a few unhistorical spiritualities, or leading us astray into the most extravagant Jewish expectations." (p. 190.)

I think the difference between the two systems of interpretation is discernible in the commencement of this passage. Instead of coming to the study of the prophecies with right (i.e. preconceived) conceptions of their method, I believe we ought to study the prophecies in order to attain right conceptions of their method.

Sound principles of interpretation are very desirable, but I think we must, in like manner, deduce them from the prophetic writings, and not come to the study with our principles of interpretation, or rather our conclusions, already determined.

For which class of interpreters the dissolving view is intended, I know not; the second danger is, I suppose, that of the spiritualists; the third, I conceive, is intended for the literalists.

Mr. Brown.

"Two general remarks may not be without their use here. (1.) Every one must have observed the unchronological and discursive character of Old Testament prophecy; as in the visions of the night, the events of centuries are here compressed into the space of as many hours, and associated together by the laws rather of resemblance and analogy than of time." (p. 190.) "The prophetical spirit observes in the discursive prophecies, the law of association or relative suggestion." (p. 191.)

Reply.

I will only notice for the present, that we consider one of the evils of Mr. Brown's mode of interpretation, is the impossibility it involves, of giving a connected and continuous interpretation of the prophecies. Much of what he considers to be their unchronological character is attributable to his "principles of interpretation."
"Daniel and the Apocalypse ... taken together, constitute a chronological synopsis or digest of the predicted destinies of the Church in relation to the powers of this world." (p. 191.)

There is some difference of view amongst students of prophecy, as to whether Daniel and the Apocalypse do form a chronological synopsis. I shall be obliged to notice the use Mr. Brown makes of this axiom, in opposing that constant expectation of the advent which we advocate.

"(2.) ... Jewish events announced, carry along with them, and adumbrate the corresponding Christian events; whose analogy, both in their general character and design, is such, that the one can lie embosomed in the other; and is intended to fit into it." (p. 191.)

The meaning I apprehend to be this: certain predicted Jewish events adumbrate, that is, are shadows of certain Christian events. And as the one is intended to fit into the other, we may say that these predicted events are ordained also to be prophetic types. The remainder of the sentence seems to give us rather a different idea:

"The Spirit ... employs language whose catholic fulness, and amplitude, and pregnancy, are such as to suggest —certainly, at least to admit, more than the primary and partial subject of prediction, with which the particular strain happens to start; the full tide of inspiration bursts the bounds which partial vision would lay down for it; and hastens forward, or swells out into those corresponding events of a brighter dispensation: whose analogy is so singular, that they can be conveyed in a language, and seen clearly through the thin transparent covering of the original subject. Examples of this will presently be noticed." (p. 192.)

The idea conveyed here, I apprehend to be, that where these mutually embosomed events are predicted, some of the language is more suitable to the antitypical than to the
adumbrating event: combining the two parts of the sentence, we learn, that sometimes we are to interpret the prophecies by way of type, and sometimes by way of analogy.

Mr. Brown proceeds to Isa. ii., observing, (1.) "that here, as in many other cases, the unbelieving Jews and the pre-millennialists are substantially at one." (p. 193.)

There is a truth in this statement; but not that which Mr. Brown intended to convey. The point of agreement between the Jews and pre-millennialists is not that point on which Jews are unbelieving. Both believe that what Isaiah said was "concerning Judah and Jerusalem;" both, therefore, are equally incredulous of Mr. Brown's interpretation. His objection to the more literal interpretation is, that by "the requirements of the prediction the whole religious worship and obedience of nations is made to radiate from and to hold of their metropolitan temple service at Mount Zion." (p. 193.)

There is another prediction in Isa. lvi. 7 to the same effect: "Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people." Our Lord considered it to refer to "a literal and material temple," (p. 193,) and did not seem to feel the difficulty consequent thereupon, which Mr. Brown considers to press against the literal acceptation. The prophecy of Micah iii. 12, and iv. 1, &c., will also perhaps assist in interpreting Isa. ii. "Therefore shall Zion for your sake be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps; and the mountain of the house, as the high places of the forest. But in the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the Lord's house," &c., the same prophecy as in Isa. ii. And we must admit, that either the literal Jerusalem which was destroyed shall be restored, or else that Mr. Brown's spiritual Zion is to be ploughed as a field, and to become heaps, before we can expect his spiritual millennium. Let Mr. Brown apply his principle of interpretation, "and go through with it." (p. 193.)
I am happy to find that, according to Mr. Brown, Isa. xi. 4, is "language which Paul takes up in 2 Thess. ii. as expressing anti-Christ's destruction." (p. 200.) We may consider them both together hereafter. Mr. Brown considers Isa. xi. 6—8 figurative, so I believe do many premillennialists. "It may safely be regarded as an open question." (p. 19.)

Mr. Brown next calls our "special attention" to Isa. xxv., "for the sake of an important principle of interpretation which it brings up." (p. 202.) The principle is that of "divinely ordained and arranged analogies." (p. 203.) "The analogical connection of events, under the two dispensations, as a principle of interpretation, is capable, we think, of scientific justification." (p. 203.)

If it can be established, I can only say, that I for one Reply. will receive it gladly, from whatever quarter it may come; for it is not to be denied, that there are passages in the prophecies difficult of solution.

According to this principle, "Doubtless it (Isa. xxv.) and Mr. Brown. announces the fall of literal Babylon; followed as it was by the restoration of the captive Israelites and the reconstruction of their church and state. And without question the hopes of devout Israelites of that time would be sustained, and their joyous feelings in the end expressed, by these elevated strains." (p. 202.)

The difficulty in the way of a "scientific justification" of Reply. this interpretation appears to be in the mixture of a "literal" city, and the "elevated strains" respecting feasting on fat things. Mr. Brown, if I correctly understand his meaning, supposes two parallel senses, one literal and one spiritual, to be contained in the same words. Now, be it admitted that there is something very analogous between the "fall of literal Babylon" and that of "the anti-Christian interest;" that will not be sufficient, there should be "exact counterparts or correlates." (p. 102.) And in order
to get a homogeneous interpretation in relation to the literal
destruction of literal Babylon, we should be forced to go
to Neh. viii. 10 to countenance literal feasting on fat things;
or else we must have another law than that of divinely
arranged analogies to account for "the evangelical and millen-nial events" being "announced as direct results of the
fall of this Babylonian city," (p. 202, 203,) when in fact
these events "but remotely and indirectly resulted from the
fall of literal Babylon." (p. 203.) Though few, perhaps,
will be inclined to admit that these evangelical and
millennial events resulted even remotely from the fall of
literal Babylon.

But when we have got over these difficulties, we find a
disturbing force which intimates a new and undiscovered
analogy in the distant future. We must scientifically
adjust its orbit also:

Mr. Brown.

"(8.) What is this 'swallowing up of death in victory'
which immediately follows? . . . undoubtedly, the apostle
quotes the words with an express intimation that 'then'—
in the resurrection state of the Church—'shall the saying
come to pass.' (1 Cor. xv. 54.) And of course, if the re-
surrection of the Church's sleeping dust was not in the
saying, that apostle could not have said that it was; but the
question is, not what is in the words, but what is the im-
mediate object of them, as they stand in the prediction of
this chapter? Now we have no hesitation in replying to
this, that the one direct and immediate object of the whole
prediction is, to announce the Gospel Church as shedding
its varied blessings upon all lands." (p. 206.)

Reply.

The "divinely ordained and arranged analogy" fails then
here altogether. Paul brings us back to the literal.
Homogeneity would require, that Paul's literal interpretation
of this verse should be connected with the destruction of
literal Babylon. The Holy Spirit in Isaiah had "one
direct and immediate object," namely, to announce the
Gospel Church; then "without question the hopes of devout Israelites" were not well founded, nor "their joyous feelings" properly expressed, when they applied the language to literal Babylon. But this is not all, Mr. Brown rather unguardedly says the passage should not "be dragged out of its proper connexion," for he should perceive that it is the same Holy Spirit in Paul whom he charges "with dragging the passage out of its proper connexion," (p. 207,) and using it in a sense not agreeable to "the one direct and immediate object of the whole prediction" by the Holy Spirit in Isaiah, "as it lies embosomed in the chapter." The apostle's meaning is only in the prophet's prediction, inasmuch as a state of glory is "seminaly" (p. 207) contained in a state of grace. We may say with equal truth, that when a soul is converted, "then is brought to pass the change of his vile body into the likeness of Christ's glorious body: his mortal has at that time seminaly put on immortality." Is this more in accordance with the mind of the Spirit than the supposition that "the rebuke of God's people shall be taken away" at the same time that "the dead saints shall be raised?" I cannot believe this to be "the proper key to the Spirit's announcement." (p. 208.) It is more like a skeleton-key—a passe-par-tout—admirably adapted to evade all the wards, and to rob the treasury of truth of its richest jewels.

The next clause in Isaiah xxv. 8 goes through a different process. Instead of the resuscitation of the Church, Paul talked of the resurrection of the body; thus Isaiah in his hands is materialized; but in the hands of John he is "aetheralized." (p. 213.) In subsequent passages, we find the same difference between Peter and John, in their use of Isaiah. John "pares off the rind of the prophet, defaces the picture from the dregs of mortality, and celestialisizes it." (p. 223.) John is on a "higher platform." (p. 224.) Peter, on the other hand, together with John, in
this same celestialized passage, sees something more than a
moral change in Isaiah's words; and Peter refuses to hold
them fulfilled till a "physical" change is accomplished.
(p. 228.)

It does not appear to me that Mr. Brown's principles of
interpretation (although they do give great latitude, and
even admit of considerable laxness of interpretation) can be
gone through with; and "when an interpretation will not
go through with, it is worthless." (p. 225.)

I ought, perhaps, before leaving this subject, to state why
I think that St. Paul's literal acceptation of Isa. xxv. 8, and
Peter's of Isa. lxv. 17, 18, are the only admissible ones.
"He will swallow up death in victory" appears to be an ex-
planation in the way of parallelism, of the more figurative
clause, "He will destroy in this mountain the face of the
covering," or "the face-covering, cast over all people."
The face-covering was the indication of death: "As the
word went out of the king's mouth, they covered Haman's
face." (Esther vii. 8.) See, also, John xi. 44. Perhaps
John xx. 7 also mystically intimates that Jesus had abol-
lished death; be that, however, as it may, if the clause in
Isa. xxv. 8 is exegetical of that in the preceding verse, it
prevents our putting a figurative interpretation on it also.

I see no necessity for the principle of analogical sug-
gestion in the prophecy; I see nothing about literal Baby-
lon in it; I understand from chap. xxiv. to xxvii. inclusive,
to be one prophecy, neither unchronological nor discursive,
but belonging wholly to the last days, as both Paul and
John intimate.

In like manner, I do not see why the sense of Isa. lxv.
17, "as embosomed in the chapter," should not be that
which Peter gives and John confirms, fortified as their view
is by a third apostle; for the first and second verses of
the chapter are interpreted by St. Paul as referring to the
relative state of Jew and Gentile during this dispensation.
Still, notwithstanding their present state, the Lord promises to bring forth a seed out of Jacob, (ver. 9,) who are to "be glad and rejoice in that which God will create;" namely, the new heavens and new earth. For in that new world (and not before) "Jerusalem will be a rejoicing and her people a joy."

Passing the observations on Ezekiel, as they do not apply to the views which I hold, I turn to Joel. (p. 238.) "These things are here announced, all in connexion with each other—a glorious effusion of the Spirit,—a 'great and terrible day of the Lord,'—and 'deliverance in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call;' even 'as many as shall call upon the name of the Lord.' . . . 'The great and terrible day of the Lord before which this effusion was to take place, is obviously the day of Jerusalem's destruction." (p. 238.) "The pentecostal effusion . . . was the formal donation of the Spirit for all time—and the generic fulfilment of Joel's prophecy." (p. 243.)

I do not object to part of this statement, only for the sake of clearness; instead of "all time," I will keep closer to Joel and say, all "the last days." The prophecy commenced its course of fulfilment on the day of Pentecost, continues to be in the course of fulfilment so long as that promise holds good, "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved," and terminates when the great and notable day of the Lord comes; but it is not obvious to me that Joel speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

"It is perfectly obvious that 'the day' here spoken of refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. The two things immediately connected with it in the prophecy, as events of the same time, and bound up with it in the same scheme,—namely, the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit, and the sal-
vation of 'whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord,' put it beyond a doubt" (p. 247.)

From these words of the prophet I draw an opposite conclusion; the period is the period of the last days, the first term of which is the day of Pentecost; the last term is the terrible day of the Lord; the intermediate period is the time of grace, during which whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. There is another circumstance which I am inclined to say will "put beyond a doubt" that the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus is not intended. This prophecy speaks of deliverance in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem; (Joel ii. 32;) but at that time, instead of deliverance, there was destruction in Jerusalem. Unfortunately for the unbelieving Jews of that day, in their view of this prophecy, they were "substantially at one" (p. 198) with Mr. Brown, but they suffered for it.

P. 249. Mr. Brown compares Malachi. "The third chapter opens with the announcement of Messiah's coming:" i.e. personal. He continues: "But who may abide the day of his coming?" (p. 250,) i.e. not personal but providential. "He came to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord," i.e. he came personally, "but they turned it" (i.e. I presume the acceptable year) into "the day of vengeance of our God."

"Gentile Christendom . . . is the analogous case under the Gospel, which will identify the anti-christianism of the Gospel at once with BABYLON and JERUSALEM." Mr. Brown should shew that there is the same "divinely arranged and ordained analogy in each case," else there may be nothing but a fancied analogy which an ingenious man thrusts upon us. (p. 208.) We will examine a "particular analogy in the present case." (p. 250.) "'He shall purify the sons of Levi,'—a pure ministry springing out of the ashes of a corrupt priesthood." Instead of a purifica-
tion, Mr. Brown means a substitution; and not the substitution of one priesthood for another priesthood; for there is no priesthood now in opposition to the Levitical sacrificers, but the priesthood of God's elect, who offer spiritual sacrifices.

"Now mark how the Lord's coming is to affect these two Mr. Brown. classes. It is to separate them." [By 'coming,' here, I apprehend Mr. Brown means a providential coming.] "The day cometh that shall burn them up... it is just the total excision of a corrupt and faithless Church from its previous standing in the kingdom of God." (p. 251.) But Answer at the time of Jerusalem's destruction there was no separation; the separation had been before.

"But unto you that fear my name"—the little party Mr. Brown. that waited for the consolation of Israel—"shall the Son of righteousness arise with healing in his wings, and ye shall go forth—irradiated by the beams of the Gospel sun." (p. 252.)

I am not confident whether Mr. Brown means a spiritual Reply. or a personal coming in this passage. But the allusion to Simeon, (Luke ii. 25,) and the subsequent mention of John, leads me to conclude that he intends the first personal advent of Christ.

"The prophecy closes with a solemn announcement of Mr. Brown. the approach of Messiah's Elijah-like forerunner, as the next notable event before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord, (Joel's 'day,') failing the success of whose mission to save the Church, the Lord would 'come and smite the earth with a curse,' in the verse above mentioned." (p. 252.)

The coming in this instance, according to Mr. Brown, Observation. is providential. There is a want of uniformity in this method of interpretation: it also makes Malachi very "un-chronological and discursive."

These views of Joel and Malachi are "for the purpose Mr. Brown.
of letting us into" . . . "our Lord's much controverted prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem;" (Matt. xxiv. &c.;) (p. 253;) that prophecy in like manner "opening up" the context of Joel. (p. 260.)

The argument, if I understand Mr. Brown, is that Joel and Malachi, when speaking of the terrible day of the Lord, predict the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish polity, by Titus. Our Lord's prophecy must also, in its primary sense, (p. 257,) be limited to the destruction of Jerusalem, because of Matt. xxiv. 34. (p. 254.) That there is a precisely analogous judgment awaiting the Gentiles, (p. 257,) hence, "How can it well be doubted that there is couched under a primary prediction of Jerusalem's overthrow, the analogous event in the Gospel church. Indeed, the prophecy itself sinks the two judgments together in a way strikingly confirmatory of the reference throughout to both; and they (the Jews) shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (p. 257.)

The present dispersion of the Jews is a real token of the divine displeasure resting on them. (p. 266.) It is therefore part of their judgment. If, therefore, there is to be a precisely analogous judgment on the Gentiles, there must be a period during which they will be cast off; if it be not so, the law of analogy fails. In fact, Mr. Brown proceeds to show that the prophecies respecting the future judgments, instead of being "embosomed," (p. 257,) or "couched under" (p. 255) the prophecy of the destruction, are "hung on" (p. 261) that which had its "primary fulfilment at the destruction of Jerusalem." (p. 262.) A detailed application of every verse in Matt. xxiv. to the two judgments is precluded. (p. 258.) So that after all, when Mr. Brown applies his principle, he does not greatly differ from those
who refer part of Matt. xxiv. to the destruction of Jerusalem, and part to the end of this age; only they preserve a little more chronological order. (See p. 253.) Mr. Brown, it is true, gets "principles of interpretation," "of great breadth," (p. 263,) not only in the sense of being applicable to a large portion of Scripture, but also of considerable latitude. For example: "Christ came to execute judgment in Jerusalem, not personally;" "even his first personal advent was not to do so while on earth. He let himself be rejected, and then went up to heaven, and from thence, as the insulted king of the Jews, in the wrath of his trampled blood, He inflicted the vengeance which in this prophecy himself predicted." (p. 259.) So that Christ's personal departure was one of the principal links in the chain of his providential coming. It almost appears as if the whole object of this mode of interpretation were expressed in the following sentence: "All sober advocates of the personal advent, as the coming, here (Matt. xxiv. 29) announced, interpret these things (i.e. the darkening of the sun, &c.) figuratively; and if so, why should the coming itself be necessarily personal, here? Of course this would not prove it to be figurative in the prophecy, but does it not prove that there is nothing in the language in which the coming is announced, which demands that it be personal?" (p. 260.)

I am not one of those sober ones who admit that the expressions alluded to are figurative; nor do I know the reasons why they are supposed to be figurative: but 'coming' means personal coming, unless it can be proved to the contrary, which cannot, I submit, be the case in this passage; for the disciples asked our Lord about his personal coming, and he gave an answer in good faith.

In like manner, when the disciples asked of Him saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" the answer of our Lord must be taken in the same
sense as their question, which I doubt not was in accordance with the promise, (Mic. iv. 8,) "Unto thee shall it come; even the first (or 'former') dominion, the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

"Our reply is, that the kingdom to be restored to Israel is the same that was taken from them and given to the Gentiles. What was that? The kingdom of God . . . they were unchurched." (p. 268.)

But could the disciples have asked for the restoration of the kingdom before it was taken away? The Jews, however, were not unchurched until the destruction of Jerusalem; which was the judgment of the visible Church, then standing in the Jews." (p. 250.) "It is just the total excision of a corrupt and faithless Church from its previous standing in the kingdom of God." (p. 251.) It does not therefore appear so very obvious that the kingdom being restored to Israel, will be Israel "added to the Church." (p. 264.)

The authority of Perry is quoted upon Acts iii. 19—21. His difficulty appears to have arisen from overlooking one word; instead of saying "until the restitution of all things," (p. 269,) he should have said, "until the time of restitution of all things;"* the term apparently denoting a period

* The word restitution, Mr. Faber contends, does not denote the act of resettling or restoring of all things, but the completed result, the actual settlement or restoration of all things. . . . But this is not the meaning. . . . Verbal nouns among the Greeks are derived from the first, second, and third persons of the perfect passive. Those derived from the first person denote the thing done, from the second the act of doing, and from the third the doer, as the purification, the act of purifying, and the purifier. Thus, in the text, the word restitution denotes the act of resettling, and the meaning is until the times of resettling, that is, when that great and decisive act, or series of acts, is to be performed which is to restore or resettle all things."—Duffield, p. 273.
after the Messiah shall have left the heavens, but before the throne of David shall have been built up; when the "national forgiveness of Israel will be publicly sealed," (p. 266,) and when the living wicked will be punished with everlasting destruction, both apparently "from the presence of the Lord." (Acts iii. 19; 2 Thess. i. 9.)

Mr. Brown admits that undoubtedly the personal coming of the Lord is the subject of St. Paul's discourse; (2 Thess. ii.;) and that understanding 2 Thess. ii. 8 to denote the personal coming, gives a consistent and good explanation of the whole passage. (p. 271.) Still Mr. Brown thinks the appearing, or "outshining of his presence," (p. 275, note,) "may denote" "a coming not personal." (p. 272.) This appears contrary not only to all established laws of interpretation, but even to Mr. Brown's own rule, "whether it be a providential, a gracious, or a personal coming in any given case, must always be decided by the nature of the case and the scope of the passage." (p. 15.) The scope of the passage in this instance is admitted to be the personal advent; what then can justify our understanding the words out of their usual and proper signification? for in this instance the context, even according to Mr. Brown's own admission, is decisively in favour of the personal coming.

Mr. Brown says the apostle's object was not to tell the Thessalonians when, or even in connexion with what events Christ would come; his object was merely to tell them when He would not come.

I reply (1) the only foundation for this assertion seems to be in the italics supplied by our translators. (2) The opposition in the sentence is not properly preserved; "To tell when Christ would not come," is a very good opposite to "not telling when Christ would come;" but it is no opposite to "not telling in connexion with what events Christ would come." For my own part I believe the apostle does tell "in connexion with what event, Christ will come."
There was to come an apostacy first, and then the revelation of the man of sin, and when he shall be revealed the day of Christ will have arrived.

Mr. Brown justifies the change from a personal coming, in the former part of the chapter, to a providential coming in verse 8, because the contemplation of the revelation of the man of sin, as necessarily previous to the personal coming of Christ, is a different subject from the consideration of the man of sin as destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. (p. 274.) I cannot admit that; St. Paul in verse 8, seems to me to revert to what he had said in chap. i. 9, The presence (or face) of the Lord would cause the everlasting destruction of those who knew not God, and obeyed not the Gospel; here he says, "Then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall destroy with the appearing, or outshining, of his presence, as well as those who believe not the truth." In either case his face, or presence, causes the destruction. "What was it that the Thessalonians were looking for? The literal advent. Then, by that advent, anti-Christ was to be destroyed. What event was it that was agitating them, and which the apostle tells them was 'not to come' till there 'should come a falling away?' The literal advent. Then it must of necessity be that very advent which was to take place as soon as the falling away had come to pass." (Bonar, p. 125.)

Mr. Brown next alludes to the parable of the tares and wheat, and that of the good and bad fish. (Matt. xiii.) He meets the argument raised from these parables, by asking, "Do you believe your own representations?" (p. 280.)

If we do not believe what we profess, we certainly are greatly to blame; but we must consider what we are required to believe. Mr. Brown may think that we are called upon to believe more than we suppose. If the two parables have precisely the same extent, the question is only with relation
to the visible Church; that of the fish has only to do with those fish which are within the net, which I suppose to be the professing Church; and the explanation is, the wicked shall be severed from among the just. So, in the other parable, the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity. (Matt. xiii. 41.) This is the explanation of the severing of the tares from among the wheat; and if, as I apprehend, the kingdom of heaven does not mean the earth, which will be the locality of the kingdom, but the individuals who will compose the kingdom, then, clearly, it only relates to the severing of the wicked from among the just, in the visible Church. I will not be guilty of asking Mr. Brown whether he believes his own representation; but he ought to know that we equally see a difficulty in the way of reconciling his theory of gradual advancement in spiritual religion to ultimate universality, with the parable which describes a progression in degeneracy in the visible Church, up to the time of the second advent.

To prevent being misunderstood, I must however add, that after the kingdom of Messiah is established, no overt acts of sin will be permitted to go unpunished; for the sceptre of Christ's kingdom is a sceptre of rectitude. Nor will there be any yielding feigned obedience among the children of the kingdom, or those gathered during this dispensation.

"Your whole argument is, that there cannot be any millennial state amongst mortal men before Christ's second coming; because mortal men, according to the teaching of the parable, wax worse and worse, onwards, till Christ's coming; after which the evil will be purged out and an unmixed millennium take place." (p. 281.)

Our argument would be more exactly stated, if, instead of Reply, "mortal men waxing worse and worse," Mr. Brown had
said, a portion of the visible church will wax worse and worse. This also would have avoided ambiguity.

"You must mean, that after Christ's coming there will be no tares—no imperfection—mixture—evil—among mortal men, and in the Church below."

By "mortal men," in this passage, different people are intended from "mortal men" in the former sentence. In the former passage "mortal men" are members of the visible Church during this dispensation. No "mortal men" of this class will be on the earth after the advent of Christ; for of these, the righteous will have put on immortality, the wicked shall have been cast into punishment. In the second passage, "mortal men" denote those nations who will be brought into obedience to Christ, after his judgments have been in the earth. (Isa. xxvi. 9; lxvi. 19.) Now, any of these yielding feigned submission will not bring them within the scope of the parable; and therefore it will not make tares to be among the wheat. Mr. Brown assumes that our view of the standing of the nations, after the advent, is that which the parable describes. We say the parable describes the state of the professing Church alone, and only up to the time of the advent.

Mr. Brown supposes that the millenarian expects a mixture of open vision with the exercise of faith, which he styles "a mongrel state of things; an abhorred mixture of things totally inconsistent with each other." (p. 288.) But why is it necessarily so inconsistent? The state of the disciples when our Lord was on earth before, has happily been expressed to have been "faith wrapped up in sight." However, we may be wrong in our detail; but Mr. Brown, with the intention of making the sense more clear, has sometimes increased the confusion, by adding words of his own to the quotations from others. See, for example, the quotation from Mr. Brookes on this very subject. (p. 285.)

Mr. Brown's next two heads are, "the removal of all dif-
ficulties in the way of salvation," (p. 290,) and "a total absence of Satanic influence," (p. 298.) It would be clearer to consider this latter proposition before the former, because if the expectation be well founded, it would prove that at least the principal difficulty will be removed. After quoting 1 John iii. 8—10, Mr. Brown says, "the propagation and maintenance of a race of sinning men is much his (the devil’s) continued and never-closing work in the *individuals,* as ever was his producing such a race of sinners at the first, as the great parent of them, the 'murderer from the begin-
ning.' . . . . The apostle in this passage (1 John iii. 8) makes the devil an inseparable part of the fallen system and reign of sin; the parent of all its hateful brood, and the life of all its black fruits." (p. 301.) "Such is the Scripture doctrine of Satan’s connexion with men; he is so tied to and bound up with the fallen system of things, that as it came in by him, so it holds of him, and is never parted from him." (p. 302.)

If there be this inseparable connexion between Satan and _Answer._ this fallen state, it must be either by the ordinance of God or necessity of nature: if you maintain that it is by the ordi-
inance of God, you must show us the scripture authority. Nor do I see how it can be by necessity of nature, unless by "Satan" is meant, not a person, but the vitiation of our nature. I do not suppose this to be Mr. Brown’s view, though he does seem to approach it in his interpretation of Romans xvi. 20. "‘The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.’ This,” says he, “refers, not to any Satanic temptation distinct from those which spring from other sources, but evidently to *all that the Christian has to struggle against here.*” (p. 302.) I had rather supposed that St. Paul directly referred to Genesis iii. 15.

“*If mankind during [the millennium] will not be under Mr. Brown. the law and conditions of the fall, then may Satan have no*
power over them, and nothing to do with them.” (pp. 302, 303.) “If the unregenerate be gone—if sin in the unregenerate, with all its inseparable evils, be gone—if the fall itself be gone, during the millennium, then undoubtedly will it be distinguished by a total cessation of Satanic influence.” (p. 303.)

It would be desirable, in considering this question, to distinguish between the work of Satan as the instrumental cause of the fall, and that of Satan as the tempter of man when fallen; and again, between the condition of mankind as condemned for the one sin of Adam, and the consequences of the fall upon man as prone to sin and compassed with infirmity. If the capability of Satan to deceive the nations be part of the law and conditions of the fall, that part of the law and conditions of the fall will cease to be in operation; and when many nations will be joined to the Lord, (Zec. ii. 4,) it is certain that Satan will no longer be deceiving those nations; and when those nations are joined to the Lord the judicial consequences of the fall with respect to them will have ceased. There is another and more difficult part of the question still to be noticed: whether those nations, when joined to the Lord, will be regenerate, as are individuals when joined to the Lord during this dispensation. But as the doctrine of Messiah’s kingdom does not depend upon the inquiry, I will not enter upon it.

The second head of Mr. Brown is intended apparently to meet the argument, that the practical and preceptive parts of scripture, which mark the character and nature of this dispensation, would be unsuitable if there were a state of universal, or even of very prevalent, righteousness. He says:

“'When the world ceases to persecute Christians, it will only be that on a great scale, which on a small one has been seen hundreds of times in the past history of the Church; and on a still smaller scale occurs in the domestic circle every day.” (p. 293.) He quotes Acts ix. 31, with regard
to the past history of the Church; supposing that the conversion of Paul was the cause why persecution ceased.

I would only answer, "He that does not see the difference between the two cases"—between such brief, rare, and exceedingly partial "periods of peace" and "a thousand years constant" prosperity—"he that sees no difference between these two cases, or so little that the truth of the one perfectly reconciles him to the belief of the other, is not likely to be convinced by anything we could say on the subject." (p. 289.)

Mr. Brown's idea of the millennium is, that "over the whole earth" the Churches will have "rest, walking in the fear of the Lord and comfort of the Holy Ghost." That state which, during this dispensation is the exception, will then be the rule. Instead of being partial and transient, it will be permanent and universal.

"What, in this case, becomes of such passages as these? Mr. Brown.

'In the world ye shall have tribulation; 'I am not come to send peace upon the earth, but a sword;' 'the father shall be divided against the son and the son against the father,' &c. What becomes of them? Why, just what becomes of them when 'one of a family,' after having been the object of incessant and virulent opposition, is blessed to the gaining of every one of them." (p. 293.)

This argument strikes me as being shaped in an objectionable form. Mr. Brown seems to admit that, according to the theory of a spiritual millennium, these passages of scripture will be generally unsuitable, which he meets by saying, that in certain circumstances so are they now. But I suppose Mr. Brown will admit that these, or similar expressions, do truly characterize this dispensation. But I ask, will our Lord's declaration, "In the world ye shall have tribulation," be in any respect suitable when "sorrow and sighing" shall have fled away? or when our Lord says the effect of his advent is "not peace, but a sword;" will that still be
the result when "nations shall not learn war any more, but shall beat their swords into ploughshares," &c. ? The last text is, I suppose, for the sake of the analogy already mentioned; but it does not appear to me to bear upon it; because in the case supposed by Mr. Brown, the individual does at one time suffer persecution, which is all that scripture affirms; but in the future state of things contemplated by Mr. Brown, there will be many generations of individuals who will, at no period of their lives, suffer persecution. Secondly, when the relatives of the individual in the supposed case leave the world, there is still a world left; but in the future state of blessedness, when all the world has left the world, there will no longer be a world; and the question is, will the direction, "love not the world," be then obsolete or pertinent?

In like manner, we do not talk of the cause of the one way being narrow and the other broad, but of the relative proportions, as characteristic of this dispensation. Now "few," comparatively, find the way to life, and many the way to destruction; In the future dispensation "many" will find the way to life, and "few" the way to destruction. The text will "cease, of course, to be descriptive of the actual state of things" (p. 296) throughout the world for a thousand years.

Mr. Brown, upon this passage, seems virtually to admit all that his opponents affirm; and as distinctly in p. 339, where he says that, in Rev. xi. 18, "the millennium is represented as the triumph of that righteousness, which all God's people in every age have more or less suffered for at the hands of the ungodly." Up to the commencement of the thousand years, therefore, the righteous are to be persecuted; but after which righteousness is to be triumphant. Again: "The millennium itself will be distinguished by the universality of the kingdom, its control over all the affairs of men, its spiritual prosperity, and the blessings which it
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will shed over a happy world." (p. 318.) I will only make one more remark upon what Mr. Brown calls "the foregoing specimens of interpretation." (p. 318, note.)

"If the pre-millennialists are right, in holding that [the binding of Satan] means the total cessation of Satanic influence on the earth; then it is not only a revelation made here alone . . . . but it is a revelation in direct opposition to the whole teaching of scripture elsewhere." (pp. 312, 313.)

(1.) The argument, from the doctrine being based upon a solitary text, comes with more force against Mr. Brown's mode of interpretation than against the literal method, because whilst both parties admit, that if God is pleased to make a revelation but once, that once is a sufficient warrant for faith to receive it; the difference however consists in, that one party, by the mode of literal acceptation, can have considerable certainty as to the idea intended to be conveyed, but the other party must come with the mind already prepossessed, which prepossession, if there be but one text on the subject, cannot have been formed from the direct testimony of scripture, but must have been derived from a system founded on the same uncertain mode of interpreting other scriptures which do not even bear directly on the subject.

(2.) We do not admit that this is the only text upon the subject; we maintain, for example, that Rom. xvi. 20, is a direct reference to the same event.

(3.) We maintain that "the whole teaching of scripture, with regard to the future, bears the same testimony." But now let us apply Mr. Brown's argument to his own theory of a millennium. Is a millennium a scriptural expectation? There is but one passage of scripture which speaks of a thousand years. "How comes it to pass, if this be a scriptural expectation, that no mention is made of it, nor so much as a hint given of it, in all scripture but there only?"
(p. 299.) "And here one cannot but be struck at the outset, with the character and the amount of the evidence offered us in proof of such a position—one direct intimation of a [thousand years], and one only, is alleged to exist; and where is that one plain statement? In the same vision of the twentieth chapter of Revelation, on which [pre-millennialists] build the doctrine of a total cessation of Satanic influence during the millennium. (p. 327.) From which they also deduce the other great error with regard to the first and second resurrections, which leads them into "revolting speculations" (p. 816) "in the last degree repulsive." (p. 319.)

Chapter IX. treats of the advent in relation to the resurrection. Though Mr. Brown and I partly agree, in opposition to the pre-millennialists, upon this point, we differ as much here as elsewhere as to the mode of interpreting scripture. For example: he "unanswerably determines" the resurrection (Rev. xx. 4) to be figurative; (p. 388;) whilst a passage a few lines farther in the same chapter, which continues the description of the resurrection, is admitted by Mr. Brown to be "amongst the plainest in the word of God, [i.e. most literal,] and speaks for itself." (p. 367.) Mr. Brown's two reasons for making the one passage figurative are, that if literal the martyrs only rise, and the persecutors do not rise at the same time. But these objections only affect the millenarian view, and do not affect my hypothesis. I therefore, of course, think his figurative interpretation arbitrary.

But his interpretation of Dan. xii, 2, Mr. Brown will, I hope, forgive me for saying, appears to be a serious tampering with the word of God.

"Doubtless the literal resurrection of both righteous and wicked is here—and the very next verse telling us of the everlasting reward which shall be conferred on the wise and soul-converting believers, brings it out very clearly. But
the pre-millennialists are perfectly right in saying, that the passage as it stands—in connexion with the foregoing and succeeding context—relates to the 'time' of unparalleled 'trouble,' which is to usher in the millennium.” (p. 342.) . . . "The real resurrection, I mean the personal one,—which though it be farther forward in the divine scheme than this one, is seen looming through it and almost absorbing it.” . . . “The next verse about the wise shining as the brightness of the firmament furnishes another of [Christ's] descriptions of glory at the same time.” (p. 343.)

Mr. Brown admits, that the resurrection of the dead is the Reply. obvious sense of the passage; so obvious is it, that it looms through and almost absorbs the hazy and undefined spiritual or figurative meaning, which he assumes to be the sense of the verse, as seated in its context. Yet he goes on to affirm, that the succeeding verse confirms this obvious meaning, inasmuch as that both verses, taken literally, supply the language to our Saviour, for his literal description of the day of personal judgment. Still Mr. Brown assumes "a figurative resurrection,” (p. 342.,) and affirms that individual persons are not meant at all. (p. 348.) But "the cause which was slain has risen to life.” (p. 342.)*

That the expression, "sleeping in the dust,” is figurative, I do not deny; but of what is it figurative? I find similar expressions in Job vii. 21, Ps. xiii. 8, Isa. xxvi. 19, but these all denote a state of literal physical death; and I am not aware that sleeping or dwelling in the dust anywhere denotes a slain cause. This Mr. Brown may admit; but "sleeping in the dust” is a figurative mode of expressing death, and death is used figuratively, i.e. analogically, for

* "I reject as blasphemous the modern Rationalistic doctrine, that the New Testament writers cited the Old Testament as the Talmudists do, without regard to the context or the proper meaning; and that, therefore, it is open to us to re-consider their meaning.”—Dr. McCall's Bloomsbury Lecture, 1847, p. 43.
the state of a soul not sensible of divine truths; and that may be a very proper mode of expressing a "slain cause." What is this but the shadow of a shade "looming through" an adumbration? What warrant has Mr. Brown for this figurative interpretation contrary to the context—contrary to the obvious sense—and contrary to the sense in which our Lord himself alludes to the passage? Warrant there is none, but the motive is plain. "The passage as it stands—in connexion with the foregoing and succeeding context—relates to the time of unparalleled trouble which is to usher in the millennium." (p. 342.) But the resurrection of the dead prior to the millennium is contrary to Mr. Brown's hypothesis; therefore the resurrection must be understood spiritually.

Isa. lxvi. 24. "Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh." By this passage is also meant the defeat of a cause, (p. 345,) the destruction of the Lord's enemies, which introduces the millennium; (p. 344;) but "beneath the folds" and "mortal dress," "the state of everlasting punishment is undoubtedly wrapped up." Our Lord stripping this "cause" of its mortal dress, applies the description to hell. In this passage, as in the former, the figurative and less palpable sense was intended by the spirit in Isaiah; the more obvious sense was the more recondite meaning elicited by Messiah. This interpretation, like the former, depends upon the exigency of hypothesis, rather than upon enlightened exegesis, as appears from this sentence: "As it stands in Isaiah it undoubtedly relates, as the context will show, to the destruction of the Lord's enemies which directly introduces the millennium." (p. 344.) The case, therefore, stands thus: our Lord's acceptation of the literal meaning of the texts in Isaiah and Daniel prove one part of our position. The contexts in those passages prove the other part. The only way, therefore, to avoid our
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conclusion, is to adopt this theory of a double fulfilment in its most dangerous form. Dangerous, because it invents a meaning for the words which they do not properly bear—dangerous, because it forces that meaning in defiance of the context—dangerous, because it maintains that meaning in opposition to the interpretation of Him who is the wisdom of God—dangerous, therefore, because the same principles may force any sense upon any words in defiance of all restraint either from the laws of interpretation or the authority of God, and thus set aside any truth or uphold any error.

Mr. Brown next urges, (p. 346,) that Rev. xx. 4 may be figurative [q. symbolical] of the cause which was slain being raised to life because the national restoration of the Jews (Ezek. xxxvii. 12, 14) is figuratively [i.e. symbolically] so described. If, in Rev. xx. we had the interpretation given, as we have in Ezek. xxxvii. 11, Mr. Brown would have been on surer grounds. Hos. vi. 2 also uses a similar figure, for the national restoration of Israel, which the context sufficiently explains. St. Paul also uses the figure as a comparison to indicate the change which will pass upon the souls of the mass of the Gentiles after the national conversion and restoration of the Jews; and our Lord uses the expression in a parable as indicative of regeneration, which St. Paul also does in Ephes. ii. 5. None of these later instances are to the point; in regeneration, the change denoted is in the same individual; and this is the very point of difference between Mr. Brown and us, in interpreting Rev. xx. 4. We affirm that the change indicated is upon the identical individuals. The two first instances, it is true, do not indicate a change upon the same individuals, but they do collectively upon the same nation; which, after having been for a long period without a political existence, will be restored nationally to favour; and consequently to national independence and importance. These examples, however, do not go one step towards proving that "the
souls which were beheaded" denoted "a slain cause." Mr. Brown assumes, (p. 348,) that "a resurrection of the churches' cause" is what is represented in Rev. xi., but as it partakes more of the symbolic character than the one it is advanced to elucidate, as is to be expected, there is still greater diversity of interpretation.

Mr. Brown affirms, (p. 349,) that the blessing ascribed to the sharers in the first resurrection (ver. 6) plainly implies that all who are not sharers shall fall under the power of the second death. The resurrection, therefore, cannot be literal, but "is descriptive of all who shall not finally perish." (p. 350.) Mr. Brown's meaning would, I apprehend, be more explicit, were it stated thus: all who partake of the first resurrection have immunity from the second death; therefore all who partake of the second resurrection shall be under the power of the second death. But thus stated, his fallacy is very apparent, and is contrary to what is plainly implied in chap. xx. 18, 14, that the names of some participators in the second resurrection will be found written in the book of life; Mr. Brown himself considers it to be so implied. "The book of life is admitted to be the record of the elect; and the production of it, we naturally conclude, is an evidence that the elect are in the scene." (p. 367.) I would observe, in passing, that "second death" is in antithesis to the kind of first death which had been endured for the sake of Christ. (chap. ii. 10, 11; xx. 4, 6.

Mr. Brown.

"On the other hand, how naturally do the words explain on our principle—blessed and holy are these representatives of resuscitated Christianity." (p. 380.)

I should rather say, how naturally do we slide from the resurrection of a cause to the blessedness of individuals. We are first told that individual persons were not meant at all. (p. 845.) This is essential to Mr. Brown's view, because that which is slain is that which is raised to life; therefore
it is not a literal resurrection; it is the resurrection of a system. But then, when it is said, "blessed and holy is he that hath part," &c., a system cannot be intended. The representatives of a system must be understood. Surely, then, it must be admitted, that not a system but the representatives of a system must rise; a literal resurrection, therefore, must be indicated. I think Mr. Brown will perceive that he glides from party to system, and from system to the representatives of a system, as his theory may require.

Mr. Brown quotes from Fraser of Kirkhill, by way of answer to the argument, that the first and second resurrections are of like kind. I do not know the general merits of the writer, but in this instance the analogy does not appear to be happy; he compares the first and second resurrections to the first and second births. I am not aware that Scripture speaks of the first and second births; but even did we find the terms, the same individual is the subject of both births; which even without the distinct explanation which we have, would be sufficient to show that the new birth was one different in nature from the old birth. In the other member of the comparison, one subject does not partake of the two resurrections; and the first resurrection does certainly imply another resurrection, second in order; and the reciprocal relation as certainly implies a similarity of kind. The two resurrections must be of the same type.

As I in great measure agree with what Mr. Brown says in chap. 10, upon the day of judgment, any additional remarks are unnecessary. I shall, therefore, conclude with saying that the Church is under an obligation to Mr. Brown for his extensive examination of the subject; for whether his views be ultimately adopted or not, the discussion of the question must tend to advance the truth.
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B.

THE PROPHECY ON THE MOUNT HARMONISED.

**MATTHEW XXIV. 1—35.**

And Jesus went out and departed from the temple.
And his disciples came to [him for] to shew him the buildings of the temple.
And Jesus said unto them,
See ye not all these things?
Verily I say unto you there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down.
And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying,
Tell us when shall these things be? and what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?

**MARK XIII. 1—33.**

And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings!
And Jesus answering said unto him,
Seest thou these great buildings?
There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down.
And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter and James, and John and Andrew, asked him privately,
Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?
And Jesus answering them, began to say,
Take heed that no man deceive you:
For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many.
And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet.

**LUKE XXI. 5—38.**

And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, he said [as for] these things which ye behold, the days will come in which there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down.

And they asked him, saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign when these things shall come to pass?
And he said,
Take heed that ye be not deceived:
For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many.
And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be ye not troubled: for these things must first come to pass, but the end [is] not by and by.

Then said he unto them,
MATTHEW XXIV. 1—22.

For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places.

All these are the beginning of sorrows.

MARK XIII. 1—32.

For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles:

these are the beginnings of sorrows. But take heed to yourselves, for they shall deliver you up to councils, and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten; and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them.

And the gospel must first be published among all nations. But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye meditate: but whatsoever shall be given you, in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.

Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted,

and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake, and them shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise up and shall deceive many, and because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold.

But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.
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LUKE XXI. 5—32.

Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom.

And great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven.

But before all these they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake, and it shall turn to you for a testimony.

Settle it therefore in your hearts not to meditate before what ye shall answer.

For I will give you a mouth, and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist.

And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends;

and some of you shall they cause to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all [men] for my name's sake.

But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.
And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand,) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains. Let him [which is] on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house, neither let him [which is] in the field return back to take his clothes.

And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days.
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MATTHEW XXIV. 1—36.

MARK XIII. 1—32.

LUKE XXI. 5—33.

But pray ye that your flight be not in winter, neither on the sabbath-day: for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.

Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ; or, Lo, he is there: believe it not.

And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, for [in] those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be. And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.

But woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days, for there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people, and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

But there shall not a hair of your head perish. (In your patience possess ye your souls.) And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter therein. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.
MATTHEW XXIV. 1—30.

you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For whereas ever the carcasse is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven,

and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.

And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn;

and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory.

And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

Now learn a parable of the fig-tree:
When his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh:

MARK XIII. 1—32.

you, Lo, here is Christ; or, Lo, [he is] there; believe [him] not: for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things.

But in those days after that tribulation shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall,

and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken.

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds, with great power and great glory.

And then shall he send his angels and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

Now learn a parable of the fig-tree:
When her branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near:

LUKE XXI. 5—33.

And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars;

and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth:

for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.

And when these things begin to come to pass then look up and lift up your heads; for your Redemption draweth nigh.

And he spake to them a parable. Behold the fig-tree, and all the trees, when they now shoot forth ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand:

A A
MATTHEW XXIV. 1—30.
So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things,
know that it is near [even] at the doors.
Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.
But of that day and hour knoweth no [man] no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

MARK XIII. 1—32.
So ye, in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, [even] at the doors.
Verily, I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass till all these things be done. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.
But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

LUKE XXI. 5—33.
So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.
Verily, I say unto you: This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.
CONSIDERATION OF OUR LORD’S PROPHECY CONTAINED IN
MATT. XXIV. AND LUKE XXI. *

Among all the predictions of Holy Writ perhaps none
is more worthy of minute and serious study than the one
given by our Lord when leaving the temple for the last
time;—the immediate Author; the solemnity of the season;
the concise yet comprehensive manner in which the destinies
of Israel and of the Church are sketched, even until the
time when Messiah shall come again, each and all establish
the claim to paramount importance.

As may have been expected, much has been written upon
the passage, but alas! there is still great variety of inter-
pretation. This may be pleaded as an excuse for adding
even one more exposition to the number, for from there
having been so many, we may argue that no one has been
very generally satisfactory.

Mr. Browne says, “Few refuse to admit that the dis-
course relates in part to the end of Jerusalem, in part to the
end of the world. Yet it is impossible to draw the line
(exegetically) between the two parts: the two distinct ac-
tualities are inseparably blended in the terms of the descrip-
tion; and that because they are one in idea.” †

This idea more or less pervades all the expositions of this
passage which I have seen, but yet, if I be not mistaken,
when once it is admitted into the mind, it puts an end to
the discovery of the real solution of the prophecy; the cause

* The substance of this interpretation first appeared in the “Christ-
ian Herald” for February and September, 1832. As it does not so
properly belong to the branch of prophecy which the present work
contemplated, I should not have appended it but for the allusion to
the prophecy in Mr. Brown’s work.

† Browne’s Ord. Sec., p. 669. Not Mr. Brown, whose work I have
noticed above, but the Rev. Henry Browne, author of Ordo Seclorum.
of the error I believe to be chiefly in consequence of its having been assumed that the expression in Matt. xxiv. 15 is synonymous with that in Luke xxii. 20; the one being, “When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet stand in the Holy Place, whoso readeth let him understand;” the other being, “And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.” Now an abomination, in Scripture language, denotes an idol, (see 1 Kings xi. 5, 7; 2 Kings xvi. 3; xxiii. 13; Jer. xxxii. 34; Ezek. xviii. 12,) and the holy place is the temple; (see 1 Kings viii. 10; 1 Chron. xxiii. 32; Heb. ix. 2, margin;) and an idol being placed in the temple is so abhorrent to God that formerly it brought about the desolations not only of the temple, but of Jerusalem also with it. (Comp 2 Kings xxi. 2, 7, 11, 13; xxiii. 26, 27.) Hence, as the transgression of desolation is understood to be the “transgression which maketh desolate,” or causeth desolation, so the abomination of desolation is the abomination which causeth desolation; in plain language, therefore, the expression, “The abomination of desolation standing in the holy place,” is an idol being placed in the temple which will cause desolation; this, then, would not be placing of a Roman idol there, against the inclination of the Jews, and above their power to resist, but it must be that sin of the rulers of the land which will bring their calamity upon them. At any rate, a Roman idol in the temple after the taking of Jerusalem would be too late for a sign to depart from Jerusalem, in order to avoid the horrors of the siege. It appears, then, evident that there is no resemblance of idea between an army outside of Jerusalem and an idol inside of the temple.

But then it will be said that there is a similarity in the direction to flee. It is true that both these events are to be taken as signs for departure from Jerusalem, but the concomitant circumstances mentioned as connected with these
signs prove that they could not refer to the same time. In Matthew and Mark there are expressions denoting the necessity of departing with the most urgent haste, upon the idolatrous sign being exhibited, but which are not mentioned by St. Luke as necessary when the disciples would be called upon to act upon the exhibition of the sign of Jerusalem encompassed with armies. Now, following the dates of Clinton, Cestius Gallus encamped before the city, and took the northern suburb of Jerusalem, before Oct. A. D. 66, but withdrew, dissuaded by the emissaries of Florus; was pursued in his retreat and routed on Nov. 8th, in the 12th of Nero, A. D. 66. After this, many distinguished Jews, principally Christians, left the city.* Soon after Cestius died; and Nero appointed Vespasian president of Syria, and gave him the conduct of the Jewish war. About spring, A. D. 67, Vespasian marched his army into Judea, and shewed no mercy. During this and the three following years, Jerusalem was torn by factions; which in the year 70 rose to such a height, that the prevailing party set fire to the stores, which were sufficient to have enabled the people to have endured a siege of many years. Aware of these dissentions, Vespasian refused to attack Jerusalem, saying, “It is far better to let the Jews destroy each other;” he, therefore, in A. D. 68, crossed Jordan and desolated the country beyond. The death of Nero and the ensuing civil war in Italy, produced a cessation of hostilities during A. D. 69.

Nero died June 9th, A. D. 68; and Vespasian was saluted emperor by his army, July 3rd, A. D. 69; and the battle of Cremona, on October 18th, A. D. 69, secured the empire to him. Vespasian returned to Rome, and left his son Titus to carry on the war. In the year 70 Titus advanced to Jer-

* "At this time it was that many illustrious Jews forsook Jerusalem; and the Christians, mindful of their Saviour's warning, retired into Pella, a small city on the other side of Jordan, in the tetrarchy of Herod; whither the war did not reach."—Univ. Hist., vol. x. p. 654.
rusalem, and laid siege to it at the time of passover, (April 14th;) his first assault was made on the close of the Paschal week, (Sunday, April 22nd;) he burnt the temple, Sunday, August 5th; and burnt the upper city on Sunday, Sept. 2nd; the lower city having been in his hands ever since May 16th.*

It will be seen from the above summary that a period of about three years and six months (from October, A.D. 66, to April, A.D. 70,) was given for escape from Jerusalem. How does that comport with the language of Matthew and Mark? How does the small moment of time which there would be of difference between running down through the house, and so out of the gates, and the running over the roofs of the houses and so over the wall—or the few seconds that a man might lose in going to the end of the field for his upper garment,†—suit with the fact of there having been a period of about three years and a half?

* Hales' Chron. vol. iii. p. 552, &c. Dr. Hales, however, gives one year earlier for the retreat of Cestius, and so makes the distance of time one year longer than I have argued from.

† "These are as strong expressions as one can imagine to urge the speediest retreat . . . Elsner has impaired the beauty of the text by interpreting it as a caution not to go home to fetch . . . his upper garment. . . . Not to turn back implies fleeing directly without going back so much as a land's length."—Doddridge.

Although I agree with Mr. Dallas in many points, I cannot assent to his view of this part of the prophecy. The army of Cestius was never within the walls of the city. The abomination of desolation could not, therefore have been in the Holy Place.—(Jos. War. ii. xix. 4—6.) Mr. Dallas also says the Christians had but a moment to escape, because the Jews, "upon their return from pursuing the Roman army closed the gates of the city and prevented any body from leaving Jerusalem: so that if the Christians had lost that opportunity of escape they never would have had another." This does not appear to me quite correct; Josephus expressly says that it was "after this calamity [the defeat of his army on the 8th of Diua,] had befallen Cestius, [that] many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city as from a ship when it was going to sink." (War. ii. xx. 1.) But long after that, the shutting of the gates is spoken of as a strange
We have, then, the announcement of two distinct signs; the encompassing of Jerusalem by the Roman army was the sign which was to warn the Christians to depart from Jerusalem; but there are no expressions connected with this sign which denote the necessity for vehement haste. Our Lord also mentions the setting up of an idol in the temple, which is to be taken as the sign of the necessity for the most precipitate retreat from Jerusalem. Hence, I shall consider myself freed from the embarrassment occasioned by supposing that these two expressions—so different, both in meaning and in the concomitant circumstances—are synonymous, or that they describe synchronous events.

There are other passages in the records of this prophecy, as given by the different Evangelists, which denote that St. Luke xxii. 12—15. Luke was more minute in detailing the predictions of events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, while St. Matt. xxiv. 10—15, 20—26. Matthew states more fully the answers to the questions respecting the sign of Christ’s coming and of the end of the world, which are proposed in his Gospel alone.

Perhaps St. Luke did not mention these questions in this passage because he had elsewhere recorded our Lord’s discourses upon these points.

Before proceeding to make some remarks upon the prophecy, it may not be amiss to mention the mode in which I conducted my inquiry. The first step which I took was to harmonize the accounts in the three Gospels, in order to secure that the interpretation of one should not be inconsistent with the other two. I next separated the interpretations of Matthew, thus acquired, from the other occurrence. (War. IV. iv. 3, 4.) Implying that they were not always closed. After that, again, we hear of the Idumeans leaving the city. (War. IV. vi. 1.) And, even still later, many of the Jews deserted to Vespasian, though at that time their flight was difficult. (War. IV. vi. 3.) Had the Christians had to make a very precipitate flight after the overthrow of Cestius, it would have been in the winter.
two, both for the sake of clearness and also that none of the
inferences and dependencies of one part on another might be
weakened. It is due to the veracity of each independent
witness to admit that the sense which he conveys, when
considered separately, is true, and that the mode in which
we may interpolate any one of the Gospels with the
others will not alter its meaning; they may assist in
determining the sense, or they may give further information,
but they may not alter the sense. It is in like manner due
to the veracity of all the Evangelists to suppose that all
their accounts, when properly combined, give a true represen-
tation of the discourse as it really transpired.

In the prophecy under consideration the difference which
I conceive discoverable between the Gospels, when har-
monized, and Matthew, when considered alone, is this:
The Gospels, when harmonized, present, first, a general
summary, by which our Lord separates and distinguishes
the three questions; this is embraced in Matt. xxiv. 1—13,
Mark xiii. 1—13, and Luke xxi. 5—17. He then gives a
particular answer to the first question, embracing the whole
period of the days of vengeance commencing with the
advance by Cestius Gallus and running down to the tribula-
tion of the last days. (Luke xxi. 20—24.) The next
period embraces the tribulation. (Matt. xxiv. 15—28,
Mark xiii. 14—23, Luke xxi. 23, 24.) And, lastly, we
have the revelation of the Lord. (Matt. xxiv. 29, &c.,
Mark xiii. 24, &c., Luke xxi. 25, &c.) But St. Matthew's
Gospel, when not incorporated with St. Luke, gives the
general summary, bringing us at once down to the time of
the end, and enlarging in regular order upon the events of
the last days without the interruption which is caused by
the mention of the sign which was to precede the destruction
of Jerusalem by Titus. This view appears to me impor-
tant, not only in this particular instance, but as a general
truth, because, whatever we may gain from harmonizing
scripture, the omissions of events or incidents in the individual Gospels, and perhaps also the different order of events is not without its use, either bringing out some relation or dependence more forcibly which may not be so evident in the historical order, or which might be lost sight of in a fuller enumeration of particulars.

It is recorded in the conclusion of Matt. xxiii. that the blessed Lord Jesus had, "with the most merciful severity, with the most compassionate justice," pronounced the national desolation of Jerusalem, and declared the separation of levitical forms and shadows from the life and substance of religion. "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 Lord.'" Of old he had said, "Woe unto them when I depart from them," for however magnificent the outward structure, or richly ornamented with dedicated things, all places of worship are alike desolate if Jesus be not there. But they would not listen to the admonition, "Be thou instructed, O Jerusalem, lest my soul depart from thee; lest I make thee desolate, a land not inhabited."

Some suppose that this expression, "Your house is left unto you desolate," denotes the destruction of Jerusalem, but I do not think that it can bear this interpretation; nor does it accord with the reason assigned, "for I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth;" moreover our Lord speaks of the 'house' being at that time left desolate, which is explained at the beginning of the xxivth chapter: "Jesus went out and departed from the temple," the double expression denoting not simply his removal for the time being, but his complete and final departure: then, "The glory of Jehovah went up from the midst of the city and stood upon the mountain, which is on the east side of the city," namely, the Mount of Olives.
The declaration, that the house should be left desolate, occasions the disciples to call Messiah's attention to its worldly magnificence, and to the size of the stones with which it was constructed. "The temple of the Lord, (thought they,) the temple of the Lord are these." His mind occupied with the miseries which the nation would bring upon themselves, rather than even with the intense sufferings which he would shortly have himself to undergo; Jesus appears gently to have reproved the individual who addressed him, for his carnal thoughts of worldly grandeur, by saying, "Are these the things that ye look upon?" Then calling the attention of all the disciples, he says, "See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left here a stone upon a stone that shall not be thrown down."—"I have forsaken mine house, I have left mine heritage, I have given the dearly beloved of my soul into the hand of her enemies."

The size of the stones used for the foundation of the temple were so large that it would make it improbable that these expressions of our Lord should be literally accomplished; the prophet Haggai expresses the building of the temple by "a stone laid upon a stone," and so it might be said that the blessed Lord made use of a proverbial expression, or adopted language similar to that of the prophets, in order simply to denote a very complete overthrow of the temple, but that they were not to be taken to the very letter: if, however, latitude of expression be here allowed, so may it be also in other denunciations of our Lord in the context; but if this has been literally fulfilled, it is, at least, presumptive that the remainder may be accomplished in like manner.

It is, therefore, not unimportant to learn that upon the destruction of Jerusalem, Titus commanded his soldiers to pluck up the very foundations of the city, and then to tear
up the ground with a plough. The Talmudic chronicles record, that thus the denunciation of a more figurative part of scripture—in language having much more the appearance of illustration—had a most literal fulfilment: "Zion shall be plowed as a field." Afterwards, in the reign of Adrian, the Jews rebelled under the conduct of Barchochab, and the Emperor caused all the remaining traces of the city and temple to be demolished. Subsequently, when Julian attempted to rebuild the city, an earthquake threw out of their places those stones of the foundation, which might hitherto have been unmoved. Thus, even more was done than the words of our Lord, precisely considered, would necessarily have conveyed, for they did not imply the removal of the lowest course of stones.

So far, then, our Lord's expressions are to be taken literally and in their full force; this should be a guide for us in considering the remainder of the prophecy.

"And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives," the temple, Matt. xxiv. 3, with snowy splendour, in full prospect,* "the disciples, Peter and James and John and Andrew, came unto him privately, and they asked him privately," for, indeed, it was dangerous publicly to mention the temple, "Saying, Master, tell us, See Matt. xxvi. 61, Acts vi. 14., but when shall these things be? and what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" or "age?"

Such are the questions, as recorded by St. Matthew; the circumstances which originated them will shew that they must be understood in their plain and literal meaning. The first question was occasioned by our Lord announcing that the temple should be destroyed, they therefore demand as to when it should be destroyed—"But when shall these things be?"

The immediate occasion of the second question, "What [shall be] the sign of thy coming?'' appears plainly to have

* The wall was low upon this side, purposely, in order that the High Priest, when slaying the red heifer, might see the temple.
been the declaration of our Lord, "Thou that killest the prophets . . . ye shall not see me henceforth till ye can say, 'Blessed [is] the coming one in [the] name of the Lord.'" They asked, therefore, what should be the sign of that coming of Jesus when he should be seen and greeted with blessings by the Jews.

Moreover, three out of the four disciples who put this question, had been "eye witnesses of his majesty" when they were "with him in the holy mount," in order that they might know the nature of his "power and coming;" we may therefore conclude assuredly that when they asked for the sign of his coming they meant the bodily presence of that "same Jesus."

The sign of the bodily appearing of the Lord being the subject upon which the disciples required information, and "the faithful and true witness" proceeding to answer those questions without in any way implying that they were improper, by saying, "What is that to thee?" or, "It is not your business to know." Do not those who say that our Lord in his answer gives signs, not of his personal coming, but of a providential judgment upon the Jewish nation—do they not, I say, charge the Lord with ambiguity and evasion?

The origin of the third question, respecting "the end of the age," appears to have been the information which Jesus had shortly before given the Sadducees respecting "that age" which would succeed upon this, when marriage would cease, and the children of God would be similar to angels. On this subject the minds of the disciples, we must suppose, were intent, our Lord having held out the period of the regeneration as the time when their hopes of glory would be consummated. But this being the case, it would be doing similar violence to the character of our Lord, to say that by "the end of the age" he intended the end of the Jewish polity and worship.—Oh, we must not so learn Christ, "who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth."
We have now learned two material points: the subjects respecting which the disciples sought information; and the mode in which we must expect the Lord to respond to their queries.

By the manner in which the three questions were united by the apostles—"Tell us, when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world, when all these things shall be fulfilled,"—it appears evident that the destruction of Jerusalem, of which our Lord was speaking, was connected, in their minds, with his return in glory. This is not to be wondered at, because they appear to have warrant from the prophets for concluding that a destruction of Jerusalem shall take place at the season of Messiah’s second advent, they, therefore, naturally enough, connected this destruction announced by our Lord, with that which will occur immediately previous to the return in glory, of which he had also been speaking a few minutes before. But it is clear that if our Lord’s followers expected that his coming would synchronize with the destruction which he had just foretold, the disciples would be exposed to deception from the false Christs which would appear at that time, as, in fact, was the case with the infatuated Jews; their expectation of a miraculous deliverance, through the appearance of their Messiah, at the time of the siege, tended greatly to continue their calamities.

Some suppose that our Lord interweaves and blends his answers to the three questions put by the disciples, but it is evident, that, had he done so, he would have further confused the interrogators, and confirmed instead of corrected their errors. If the manner in which the queries were put indicated that the apostles expected a synchronous accomplishment of all three, the most lucid mode of reply would be, in the first instance to warn against, and to remove the mistake implied in the interrogation, and then to answer each question in detail. Thus, in fact, does our blessed Lord commence:
"Take heed that no man deceive you." The necessity of this precaution is proved by the fulfilment of the prediction which follows respecting the causes of deception, "for many shall come in my name, saying 'I am the Christ, and the time draweth nigh,' and shall deceive many, go ye not therefore after them." "Impostors of this stamp," we are told, "were so frequent, that some were taken and killed almost every day;" and the Jewish historian makes use of almost the very words of our Lord, when speaking of Theudas, "who said he was a prophet, and persuaded a great multitude to follow him." Josephus adds, "he deceived many;" but as our Lord had warned his disciples, they went not after them.

Jesus appears in the next place to caution his disciples against being deceived by the traditions of the Jews, respecting the signs of Messiah's advent, and the end of the age. The Rabbins speak of a week of years, in which there will be wars and famines, "In the seventh year," say they, "will be wars: and in the going out, or at the close, of the seventh year, the Son of David will come."

The "wars" prognosticated by our Lord, might have been between the Jews and Romans, which were common at that time, and the "commotions" may have been the intestine broils between the seditious and the zealots.

Our Lord's charge to the disciples, not to be "troubled," is, I think, a warning against that confusion and un settle-ment of mind which would result from supposing that the day of Christ was actually being ushered in, the same word is used in that connexion in 2 Thess. ii. 2, "for," says he, "all these things must needs come to pass, but the end is not yet."

So far the signs may have been connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, what follows, from the manner of its introduction, seems necessarily to embrace a much more extended period, "the end is not yet, for nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." Nation
against nation may portend that the Jews and people of other nations dwelling in the same cities should kill one another, but the expression "kingdom against kingdom" designates, I conceive, open wars between kingdoms.*

"All these are the beginnings of sorrows." The Jews Matt. xxiv. 8. expect that great sorrows and distresses will be connected with the advent of Messiah, and use a very similar expression with relation to it. "The sorrows of the Messiah;" the word signifies the sorrows of a woman in travail, and in the Syriac version of this place, we find the same word as is thus used by the Jews.

Many of the signs, however, which belong to "the beginning of sorrows" transpired either at or after the destruction of the temple; let us hear what is said upon this subject by one not wishing to support this view. "During the burning of the temple itself, A.D. 70, a false prophet seduced about 6,000 persons to go up on the portico of the temple, promising that God would send them signs of deliverance." This cannot be classed under the signs of false Christs mentioned in the twenty-third verse of Matt. xxiv., as those are to be after the times of the Gentiles, which are not yet concluded; but then this event must be included among "the beginnings of sorrows," and if so, the destruction of the temple at the same time must also be included in "the beginning of sorrows." Take another example from the same authority. "The last and most mischievous of these false Christs, or impostors, was the noted Barchochab, Son of a Star! a title which he assumed as fulfilling Balaam's Num. xxiv. 17. famous prophecy. He was patronised by the celebrated Rabbi Akaba. His bloody rebellion, in which he and his abettors were destroyed by Adrian, brought about the deso-

* There is similar language in the prophets respecting Egypt, (Isa. xix. 2,) "kingdom against kingdom, which, however, the Sept. translates "province against province," Egypt being divided into provinces. — Bishop Newton, p. 185.
lation of Judea, and the total expulsion of the Jews, A.D. 135,"—long after the destruction of the temple; and yet it was but the first pains, for the Lord says, "All these are the beginning of sorrows." *

I conceive that in the order of narration the words from the 12th to the 16th verses in Luke xxii., together with the corresponding passage in Mark xiii. 9—11, come between the 8th and 9th verses in Matt. xxiv.; however, from the words, "But before all these things," &c., we learn that in the order of time these events were to take place before the sorrows of Jerusalem.

"But take heed to yourselves; for before all these things they shall lay their hands on you and persecute [you]," &c. Our Lord here, I apprehend, turns from the predictions for the use of the Church at large, to warnings to the apostles respecting their individual fate; perhaps we may suppose with Hammond that Jesus refers to what He had before told the apostles. It appears to relate to them personally, not only from the expression, "take heed to yourselves," in Mark, but also from the promise of the Spirit who should speak directly in them when brought before governors and kings.† All this was exactly accomplished: for Peter and John were called before the Sanhedrim, James and Peter before Herod, and Paul before Nero the emperor, as well as before the Roman governors Gallio, Felix, and Festus; and the "mouth and wisdom" was eminently exemplified in Stephen; "they were not able to resist the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake."

The 9th verse of Matthew xxiv., at which we have now arrived, seems to me strongly to mark a transition in the prophecy; "All these are the beginning of sorrows: then

* To the birth-pains, or time of "breaking forth of children," I attribute such passages as Jer. xxx. 6—8; Hos. xiii. 13, 14.
† But the Church sympathised with the apostles, so that then was fulfilled Heb. x. 33, 34.
APPENDIX.

shall they deliver you up to be afflicted and shall kill you;” “then” being a note of time, that is, after the beginning of sorrows. This seems to be different from the sufferings to which the apostles individually would be exposed, and seems to me to belong generally to the Church, and the fulfilment must, I suppose, be dated after Heb. xii. 4: “Ye have not yet resisted unto blood striving against sin,” i. e. the sin of apostacy.

The very general hatred to which Christians would be subjected, mentioned by all three of the evangelists, was not to be momentary and transient; it is a characteristic feature of this dispensation. The enmity may have greater intensity at one time than at another; but even upon that ground we could not confine it to the time before the destruction of Jerusalem. Matthew mentions that “all the nations” would display this enmity; this must have been after the truth had been pretty generally proclaimed.

This exposition causes us to understand the 10th verse of Matthew xxiv. to refer to the state of the Church during the times of the Gentiles: “And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another.” Here we have another mark of time, “then shall many be offended,” that is the effect of Christians being hated of all nations; this had commenced when John wrote 1 John ii. 10. his first epistle, but must be extended at least to the times of the pagan persecutions. And surely the hatred and betrayal of one another could not characterise the conduct of the many, until after the early ages, that is, until after they had ceased to “love one another.” In this case I should be led to include the Arian heresy, as well as the Roman apostacy, among the “many false prophets” who were to deceive the many; for the deceiving here appears to be of the professors of Christianity. Moreover fear that the love of the many waxing cold, must embrace the state of religion amongst the whole Gentile Church, from
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the ages commencing very shortly after the apostles' days until now. "Behold we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren;" but so far from that, we give grudgingly of our superfluity even to supply others' necessity; yet much of this is owing to the abounding iniquity through which suspicion closes the bowels of compassion.

It appears to me that the 13th verse of Matthew xxiv. brings us down to the close of the general summary,—"But he that shall endure to the end, the same shall be saved." The whole of this dispensation, even to "the end," is embraced, and endurance to the end is the practical and solemn consideration urged upon us all. Do thou, O God, uphold us, that our footsteps slip not! We know by our wretched weakness that it is only by having been made partakers of Christ that we can "hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end."

If I mistake not, this arrangement of the harmony may be strengthened by the internal evidence from St. Luke's gospel. There appears something like an inconsistency between the 16th and 18th verses of Luke xxi. "Some of you they shall cause to be put to death . . . but there shall not a hair of your head perish." In order to avoid this apparent discrepancy, some commentators explain the latter expression as only denoting a particular providence, but not a promise of security, just similar to that other expression of our Lord's, "Every hair of your head is numbered;" but I think the proverb is used in Scripture rather to denote absolute and entire freedom from bodily harm. The first place in which it occurs is 1 Sam. xiv. 45. "Shall Jonathan die? . . . God forbid, as the Lord liveth there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground." But then it cannot be said in the same breath to the same persons, Ye shall be put to death, and ye shall not receive the slightest bodily harm; hence the promise seems to me limited to immunity from the calamities connected with the
destruction of Jerusalem; not a hair of their heads should perish by any of the means of destruction brought upon Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. "There shall be wrath upon this people, (the Jews,) but see that ye be not troubled, for I will give you a sign, by the heeding of which not a hair of your heads shall perish;" but before that event the apostles were to suffer persecution, and after that calamity there would be a general persecution of the Church. This verse therefore marks a break in the order of narration, a transition from the general summary to answers to each particular question. I therefore suppose that the 18th verse of Matt. xxiv. comes between the 16th and 18th verses of Luke xxii., and closes the general summary. "But he that shall endure to the end the same shall be saved."

Our Lord having, I conceive, so far disabused his disciples with respect to their preconceptions on the questions which they had propounded, and having comforted them with the promise that they should escape the national visitation, now reverts to the first question, and gives, as is recorded in St. Luke, a distinct sign respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, which heeding, the Christians "fled as doves to the mountains," and were, in accordance with his promise, in a state of security. "But there shall not a hair of your head perish, (in your patience possess ye your souls,) and when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh; then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains," &c.

We may also observe, that in addition to the warning to escape from the destruction of Jerusalem, our Lord further cautions his disciples not to enter into it, because these be the days of vengeance, "that all things which are written may be fulfilled;" it seems, then, to be implied that there would be an inhabitation of Jerusalem, after the destruction, while a time of suffering would still be continued. "The
days of vengeance," therefore, I apprehend, commenced only at the sign of the destruction of Jerusalem, which was exhibited by Cestius Gallus, and they embrace the whole of this subsequent period, during which any judgment denounced against the Jewish nation shall remain unaccomplished, or whilst any shall still be in the course of fulfilment, that "all things which are written may be fulfilled;" in other words, it must include the whole times of the Gentiles, during which Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot. This indeed appears evident by a comparison of Mark xiii. 24 with Luke xxi. 25.

But "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." St. Luke here, apparently in allusion to Dan. viii. 13, intimates when the days of vengeance shall cease. I have, in another work, offered a conjecture as to when Jerusalem will cease to be trodden down of the Gentiles; it will follow, from the declaration of our Lord, that from the same data we learn the close of the times of the Gentiles. How solemn is the thought that the day of grace is drawing so very near to a close!

Our Lord, it appears to me, refers specially to that germinating prophecy in Deut. xxviii. 49—59, and the plagues of long continuance, contingent upon the disobedience of the Jews, there threatened.

"And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." This is Messiah's answer to the question, "What [shall be] the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" By which interrogation they, as we have already seen, intended Messiah's personal return at the end of the age. The universal dissemination of the good news of Messiah's kingdom, now in progress, is the prognostic of the end which He himself gives; must we not then say, "The Lord is at hand?" Let us not deceive
ourselves by supposing that the Gospel of the kingdom shall convert the world; doubtless many, very many souls, may be added to the Church; but the promise is, that the Gospel shall be preached for a witness unto all nations,* " AND THEN SHALL THE END COME."

"But when ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation† spoken of by Daniel the prophet," &c. We have now, I apprehend, arrived at a point of some difficulty, for our Lord himself appears to give us a caution, "Whoso readeth (i.e. the prophet Daniel) let him understand;" and, if I mistake not, the misunderstanding of this clause has been a fruitful source of error. Many commentators have supposed that the expression in the ninth chapter of that prophet was intended, and that it was synonymous with "Jerusalem encompassed with armies" in Luke; but I have attempted to show that the connexion of the ninth of Daniel with the prophecy of the eighth chapter established the following interpretation:—"The cutting off of Messiah was the transgression of the Jewish people, which procured the desolation of Jerusalem;" it therefore evidently appears that the Roman armies cannot be intended by "the transgression of desolation," seeing that that expression denotes the sin of the Jews. Nor could our Lord give his death, which was to happen in a day or two, as the sign for departure from Jerusalem twenty or thirty years afterwards; for after this they were bidden to tarry in Jerusalem, and the saints were still in Jerusalem when St. Paul wrote to Corinth. Calvin indeed asserts that the original obliges us 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

* "The Gospel shall be preached," &c. This must not be understood as done by the apostles; for there are many barbarous nations in Africa amongst whom the Gospel was never yet preached.—Augustine.
"Origen is of the same mind."—Mayer.
† "The abomination of desolation." The prophet spake this of Anti-Christ's time.—Hilary in Mayer.
to refer to the eleventh and twelfth of Daniel, as the prophecy to which our Lord refers.

But if the prophecy in Daniel xi. and xii. be that to which reference is made by our Lord, seeing that "the time of the end" is a period probably of only 1290 or 1335 literal days, ending with the general resurrection, it follows that the setting up of the abomination of desolation is yet future. The connexion in Matthew's gospel, indeed, seems to force us to this conclusion. Our Lord having declared what must take place previously to the end, continues, "And then shall the end come, when ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet." The preaching of the Gospel is the sign which precedes "the end," and the "therefore" seems to note that the abomination of desolation does not precede the end, but belongs to the end; "the time of the end" will then have actually arrived, the crisis will have come; therefore "let him that is on the housetop not go down into the house to take anything out of his house, and let not him who shall be in the field return back to take his mantle."

The woe of the Jewish females which St. Luke's gospel connects with "the days of vengeance" in general, the other two gospels seem to refer more particularly to the close of those days, when we must forbode the climax of suffering; this seems to follow from St. Luke, in this part of his gospel, not entering so minutely into the signs respecting Christ's second advent. But that would be true respecting the whole time of the Gentiles, which will be specially applicable to the close of the days of vengeance. Whilst the Jews in their unbelief will be looking for the birth of Messiah, the females, each hoping to be "highly favoured among women." Our Lord says, on the contrary, "Woe unto them that are with child and give suck in those days."
APPENDIX.

"But pray that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath, for there shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be."

Matt. xxiv. 20.

Clearly there cannot be more than one tribulation which can truly be designated the most severe that ever was or ever shall be; the verity of Scripture therefore requires, that if the same language be elsewhere used, it must refer to the same tribulation; this passage is therefore parallel with that prophecy of Daniel to which we before supposed our Lord had referred us: "And there shall be a time of trouble, Dan. xii. 1.
such as never was since there was a nation [even] to that same time; and at that time thy people (the Jews) shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book, (the elect for whose sake the days shall be shortened,) and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake," &c. This intensity of trouble is therefore connected with the times of the Jews' deliverance, and the resurrection from the dead.

In accordance with this interpretation, the two prophecies mutually confirm each other; our Lord says that when the abomination of desolation shall stand in the holy place, that then will be the time of intense trouble, so does Daniel; our Lord connects it with the close of the times of the Gentiles, Daniel says it will be at "the time of the end." Whereas the interpretation which would fix and confine the intense trouble predicted by our Lord to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, not only implies discrepancy between the well-beloved Son, and the man greatly beloved, but the consequent interpretation of the other clauses of our Lord's prophecy appears quite unequal to the awfulness of the surrounding language. "Pray that you may not have to violate your prejudices respecting the Jewish Sabbath and Sabbath-day's journey, or be subject to the inconvenience to which the Jews would put you in travelling upon that
day;" * when, at the same time, this interpretation would of necessity affirm that the Jews were persecuting and killing parents and children. It moreover supposes the disciples to have more than pharisaic fastidiousness, as, in the peril of their life, the Jews generally held that they might go farther than a Sabbath-day's journey. Lastly, there were many hundred week-days for the Christians to have fled, between the first and second encompassing of Jerusalem.

If it be yet future, the events themselves will only develope the real necessity for the warning. I will only revert to what I have already mentioned, viz. the Sabbath of years and the sufferings of that period previous to the coming of Messiah. To this possibly our Lord may now refer: "Pray that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath, for then," in the Sabbatical year, "shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to that time, no, nor ever shall be; and except those days should be shortened no flesh should be saved." The expression, "those days," applies, apparently, to the time of the Sabbath, and if so it confirms the supposition that the Sabbath intended is not a Sabbath-day. And when He says, "Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath," He may mark a distinction between the flight after the retreat of Cestius, and the flight which will be necessary upon the exhibition of the abomination of desolation.

I said that I did not fix and confine the intense trouble to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; I would not, on the other hand, exclude the sufferings of those days altogether from the great tribulation. Our Lord styles them "the beginnings of sorrows;" "the beginnings of sorrows" implies subsequent sorrows, not altogether distinct and separate, but yet pointing to a crisis, even to the travail

* "As their own scruples, or the obstruction thrown in their way by the Jews, might . . . retard their course and endanger their lives." —Scott in loc.
pangs. To that period such passages as Jer. xxx. 6, 7, refer: "Ask ye now and see whether a man doth travail with child? . . . 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,"—a passage closely parallel Jer. xxx. 6, 7. with Dan. xii. 1, for both equally describe the day of unparalleled trouble, and yet of the deliverance of the Jews. It is to this crisis that our Lord in St. Matthew's gospel specially points us; St. Luke has preserved one or two expressions which shew that the former sorrows were part and parcel of the same suffering; long in duration, with intervals of rest, but paroxysms of anguish, of which the last will be the most intense.

"And except those days should be shortened no flesh should be saved, but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

"No flesh" cannot, I conceive, in this connexion be limited to the Jews alone, which would be the necessary interpretation, were the prophecy confined to the former destruction of Jerusalem; for here it means all flesh except the elect.

But whom are we to understand by the elect? Not the Christians; for they, by believing our Lord's sign, escape the troubles; not the heathen armies, for those who refer the passage to the siege by Titus cannot shew that there was such a fearful waste of life among the Romans; and those (with whom I coincide) who are looking to the future for the fulfilment, believe that the assailants will be the very reverse of elect. Then who can they be? Reference is made two or three times in this prophecy to "the elect;" Mat. xxiv. 22, 24, 31. once as above; again, the false Christs would deceive, if possible, even "the very elect;" and "the elect" shall be gathered from the four winds. We must interpret these expressions in a consistent manner; and I think we should try whether they may not be understood in the sense which
the disciples themselves at that time would have derived from their own scriptures. "Israel," says Mr. Duffield, "are called the Elect of God from the beginning, as a people whom God had chosen to be a peculiar people unto himself above all the nations that are upon the earth." In proof of which he quotes Deut. vii. 6, 7; xiv. 2; Isa. xlv. 4; lxv. 9, 22; Rom. xi. 28. The two passages quoted from Isaiah I conceive to be directly to the point, inasmuch as they manifestly refer to the same period; the elect, therefore, in each prophecy, being the same people, the disciples would necessarily have inferred that the elect were the elect of Israel; indeed, at that time they knew nothing of an elect from amongst the Gentiles. I will, therefore, see how this idea suits the passages. "For the elect's sake those days shall be shortened," so says our Lord; "At that time," says the angel to Daniel, "thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." With which I will compare Isaiah iv. 3: ["He that is] left in Zion and [he that] remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy, [even] every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem."

Again, with respect to the elect who will be well-nigh deceived, it appears more probably to refer to the Jews who will be looking for Messiah than to the elect Christians, who know so much of the nature of the second advent as not to be deceived by false Christs. And as to the last passage, it clearly refers to the period when "the times of the Gentiles shall have been fulfilled," therefore, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have been brought in, and not only brought in, but translated; for the gathering of the elect mentioned in the 31st verse will be after the second advent of Christ; but we now know that the mystical body will be caught up to meet Christ in the air.—I say now, because the mystery of the rapture of the saints was shewn to the Church after this prophecy was delivered by our Lord.
"And then if any man shall say to you, Lo! here [is] Christ, or, Lo! there—believe [it] not." This note of time refers, I apprehend, to the conclusion of the times of the Gentiles, "then," at that time of unequalled trouble, even when the coming of the Lord draweth near, no report respecting the appearance of Messiah is to be believed; the reason follows in the form of a parallelism.

"If they shall say unto you, 'Behold! he is in the desert,' go not forth; for wheresoever the carcasse is there will the eagles be gathered together. If they shall say, 'Behold! he is in the secret chambers,' believe it not; for as the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

Go not forth to the desert, for as truly as the eagle is directed by instinct to the carcasse, so surely will the Lord's people be attracted to Him; think not that Messiah will reveal himself to some small congregation of worshippers, for his appearing will be universal, "every eye shall see Him."

It is commonly supposed that there is a reference to the Roman standards collected round the dead carcasse of the Jewish polity; but though that may be considered an apt allusion, I think it rather narrow and private, inconsequent, and a mixture of literal application with symbolical allusion. The saying appears to be proverbial, and taken originally from Job xxxix. 30; where the Lord, in recounting the various wonders of creation, mentions, amongst others, the certainty with which the eagle finds the slain. The same Lord who has provided her with these powers, or senses, will secure the gathering of his people to himself. There is a similar use of the expression in Luke xvii. 37: "In that day" [in which the Son of man shall be revealed] "one shall be taken" . . . the disciples ask, "Where, Lord?" and He answers, "Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." So to the place of Christ's
manifestation will the Church "mount up as with eagle's wings."*

"But," says our Lord, in opposition to the signs and wonders shown by the false prophets, "in those days," "immediately after the tribulation of those days . . . the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light."

"Those days" of St. Mark I apprehend to be the days in which the false Christs shall appear; "the tribulation of those days," I think, must be the great tribulation which concludes the times of the Gentiles.

"The sun shall be darkened." "That is," says Rabanus Maurus, "in a literal sense, as it was at Christ's passion." To this I assent, for as we have seen, the language of the prophecy has hitherto been quite literal; I do not see how, without the most urgent necessity, we can adopt a spiritual or figurative mode of exposition. The stars of heaven falling from heaven may be considered as establishing this necessity, but Bloomfield says, "this passage is inadequately represented by all translators," and he renders it, "The stars in heaven shall be waning." Were, however, the authorised rendering to be retained, I should not see the necessity of adopting a figurative interpretation, any more than it might be called figurative to say that the sun stood still, or that the sun rises and sets. St. Peter speaks of the heavens passing away with a great noise, which we do not

* Hilary says, that the eagles are the saints, so called from the swift coming together of their bodies to the place of Christ's sufferings; for well we expect his coming in glory, where He purchased for us by his passion, eternal glory. Hieron. says, that Christians are likened unto eagles because their youth is renewed as eagles. The Fathers seem generally to have understood this expression as denoting the gathering to Christ,—some made it, of all souls in the day of judgment, e. g. Chrysostom, Hilary, Ferus, Aretius, Stella, Maldonat. Others confined it to the saints ascending to Christ, as August. Gregor. and Musculus in Meyer, who is of the same mind.
understand to be figurative, though it may denote the altered position of our earth with respect to the universe, or perhaps it may only signify some irregularity in the earth’s orbit which would give the appearance of the stars falling, as the regular motion of the earth gives the appearance of the sun’s rising and setting.

The words added in St. Luke’s gospel seem to fix a literal interpretation upon the former clause: “And upon earth distress of nations with perplexity,” &c. Thus there are the signs in heaven and the signs upon earth; the first sign upon earth is political “distress of nations,” possibly we may refer Jer. xxv. 30—33 to this time. The next sign is physical: “the sea and the waves roaring.” The signs in heaven may perhaps also be considered both political and physical, the darkening of the sun and moon, &c., being physical, but the shaking of the powers of the heavens political.* Thus the signs in heaven with the signs upon earth, political and physical, will shew the heaving and throes of universal nature in the travail pangs of the Messiah. Men’s hearts will consequently be “failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the world.”† To me it seems strange that such expressions as “nations,” “the world,” “heavens,” “earth,” “sea,” so large, so general, and so particular, could have

* If the powers of heaven that shall be shaken be not what are called the powers of nature, but, as I suppose, the powers of intellectual beings, may it not mean the dispossessing from the heavens, the principalities, the dominions, the rulers of the darkness of this world, the spiritual wickednesses or wicked spirits, against which the Church is called to war? Eph. vi. 12.

† Our Lord apparently refers to Hag. ii. 6, 7, where a similar concussion of heaven and earth, sea and dry land, as well as the political concussion of nations, is mentioned. The apostle’s comment (Heb. xii. 26) appears to mark that it is yet future, for it is still a promise, that everything not immutable shall be removed, in order that the eternal kingdom may be established.
been confined by interpreters to the destruction of Jerusalem.

"And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the land mourn."

I understand this to indicate, not a sign in heaven of the Son of man, but the sign of the Son of man in the heavens; a manifestation of the manhood in the glory of the Father, somewhat similar to what was subsequently vouchsafed to the proto-martyr, and corresponding with what our Lord told the chief priests, and which they considered blasphemy:

"Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right-hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," the same, perhaps, as Zech. ix. 14: "Jehovah shall be seen over them," and parallel with Zech. xii. 8: "In that day shall Jehovah defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem," and then will be the conversion of the tribes of the land: "And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced; and they shall mourn for Him." The same is connected with the second advent in Rev. i. 7; "Lo, He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they who pierced Him, and all the tribes of the land shall mourn because of Him."

The mourning is that of intense affectionate sorrow, like the mourning for a first-born, accompanied with a spirit of grace and supplication; then the time will have arrived when they will be able to say, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

These mourners are, I conceive, the elect left in the land, those for whose sakes the days of tribulation will be shortened. At the end, as at the beginning, there will be an outward and visible manifestation of "the purpose of God according to election." Two-thirds of the nation will be cut off, and then the remaining third will be converted to the Lord in truth.

I pause at this point of the prophecy to ask upon what legitimate principle of interpretation the advent of our
blessed Lord, of which He himself speaks, can be understood figuratively? "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

1. That our Lord himself will personally return, some time or other, our opponents themselves, not only believe, but they feel that they are aggrieved if we fall into any misconception on this point. (Brown, p. 18.) There is nothing, therefore, in the nature of the subject which prevents our understanding the language literally.

2. I have, I trust, shewn that from the whole tenor of the discourse, there is nothing in the nature of the language which would countenance our understanding the language figuratively.

3. I have never heard any one maintain that, when the disciples asked the sign of our Lord's advent, they spoke of a figurative coming; on the contrary, our opponents attempt to account for such language respecting the advent and kingdom, upon the supposition that they erroneously understood these things literally. If, then, we say that our Lord in his reply spake of a figurative advent, do we not charge Him with having spoken evasively? As, moreover, all parties will admit that in the same discourse (Matt. xxv. 6, 31) our Lord does speak of his personal advent, (I say it with reverence,) He not only evaded their question, but his language must have had a direct tendency to deceive them. The principle of homogeneity, therefore, requires us to believe that the advent spoken of shall be literal.

But another question now forces itself upon us: Why should this advent not be understood literally? I believe the only answer to be, that, if taken literally, it is fatal to the theory of a post-millennial advent. This has been well expressed by Mr. Lillingston in the last Bloomsbury Lectures:—"When," says he, "our blessed Lord gives a dis-
distinct and comprehensive answer to a definite question, with reference to this very point, (‘What shall be the sign of thy coming, and the end of the world?’) we do not find any allusion to such a state of things, though certainly we might have expected it, had any period like that of a thousand years of righteousness marked its approach, especially since our Lord in one gospel, that of St. Mark, declares, ‘Behold, I have foretold you all things.’ But it is just the reverse; for we find nothing but wars, and rumours of wars, up to the very time of his appearing. From the absence, then, of any hint even of the millennium period amongst the signs given of our Lord’s coming, we conclude also, that his advent will be pre-millennial.”

“Then,” after the coming of the Son of man, “He will send his angels,” “with the sound of a trumpet,” to gather the outcasts of Israel and the dispersed of Judah; the ten tribes from the four quarters of the earth, as also any of the two tribes not already in the land. This will be in accordance with the promise made by Moses: “If [any] of thine be driven out unto the utmost [parts] of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee.” The sounding of the trumpet may perhaps be similar to that on Mount Sinai upon the delivery of the law.

From among the Israelites when gathered into the wilderness there will be a purging, similar to the sifting of the rebels in the land: “I 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. 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, (to mark those which are the Lord’s, Lev. xxvii. 32,) 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 of their sojournings, but they” (i.e. the rebels) “shall not enter into the land of Israel.” Then will the people left of the sword find grace in the wilderness, even “Israel marching to his rest.”

“And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your head, for your redemption draweth nigh.”

Our Lord gave this prophecy to the apostles, not for their sakes alone, but doubtless for the benefit of the whole Church, each generation acting upon the cautions and predictions, as the circumstances should arise. The generation which was alive when the destruction of Jerusalem drew nigh observed the sign, “When ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed with armies,” and applied the “ye” to themselves; in the same way, the generation of the Church which shall see the darkening of the sun and the other signs, they must take this word of comfort, “Lift up your heads,” and apply it personally to themselves. Thus the Church is called upon to watch the signs of the times; she would thus from the beginning draw from the word the portion of “meat in due season,” yet without knowing beforehand the long and dreary time of her widowhood. The “ye” and “your” belong to the disciples, as the “they” belongs to the national Israel. “Then shall they” (i.e. the tribes of the land) “see the Son of man coming in a cloud,” &c. “Your redemption,” on the other hand, relates not to the national Israel but to the disciples of the Lord; their redemption will draw nigh “when these things begin to come to pass,” i.e. the darkening of the sun, &c. immediately after the times of the Gentiles shall have terminated.

The redemption here spoken of cannot be that of the soul, but those who have received the first-fruits of the
Spirit are waiting for the redemption of the body. But as the Saviour himself is styled not only the Saviour but the salvation of his people, so also is He not only the Redeemer but He is “made unto us . . . redemption.” But whichever view we take, the time is the same, for our bodies of humiliation will be changed into bodies of glory at his appearing. And this event will be nigh at hand when the times of the Gentiles shall have been fulfilled. It behoves us all to inquire whether, in the convulsions of nature and the wreck of nations, we shall be among those whose hearts will be failing them for fear, or whether, having that perfect love which casteth out fear, we shall lift up our heads and rejoice at the signs of the appearing of the Lord Jesus to the judgment and to his kingdom.

The parable of the fig-tree may refer to “the elect” just before mentioned, and it has been pretty generally interpreted of the Jewish nation; thus Hilary, “The fig-tree is mystically the synagogue,” and Remigius, “When the fig-tree buddeth, that is, when the synagogue of the incredulous Jews shall be converted by the preaching of Enoch and Elias.”

If the fig-tree do denote the Jews, that for which we should anxiously look, is the first sign of tenderness in the tribes of the land, then we may know that the kingdom of God is even “at the doors.”

I, however, think that the rapidity with which these events shall follow each other is the principal idea intended to be conveyed, “When her branch is yet tender . . . ye know that summer is near,” so the first symptom denotes the near approach of the kingdom of God.

“Verily I say unto you that this generation shall not pass away till all these things be accomplished.”

When our Lord said, “When ye shall see all these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh,” we cannot understand the individual apostles to be the
"ye;" but, as I have already observed, it must be that generation of the Church then alive, which shall see these things begin to come to pass, and so rapid will be their fulfilment, that "this generation" which sees the commencement "shall not pass away until all be accomplished."

"Heaven and earth shall pass away," at that time; not, however, by abolition, but by mutation.

"But of that day and hour knoweth no [one]." This seems to me a strong confirmation of what I have advanced in the body of the work, that the time of Christ's advent is not revealed absolutely, but only as it will occur in the order of events; hence the necessity of our watching the signs of the times. And here I must observe, in conclusion, how very differently our Lord answers the two questions of his disciples with regard to his return. When they ask, What shall be the sign of thy coming? He gives them in reply a long and minute prophecy; but when they inquire as to the time, He says, "It is not for you to know. Act 1:7. the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." We are to observe the signs of the times, rather than the series of years.
C.

ON 2 THESSALONIANS, CHAPTER II.

Our Lord's prophecy in the xxivth of Matthew, as interpreted in the preceding pages, gives a gloomy view of the state of Christianity from the time shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem even until his coming again. One part of her trust the Church will fulfil before the second advent; the gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout all the world; but with that exception, we read only of mutual hatred, much error, abounding iniquity, ending with the development of the abomination of desolation.

From the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians we learn more particularly respecting the stream of corruption, from the days of the apostle even until the revelation of that power which will be destroyed by the Lord at his second advent.

Though our Lord himself had warned the Church, still the Thessalonians were in that unsettled state of mind which arose from their conceiving that the day of Christ had actually commenced. The conversations which the apostle had had with them upon the subject, together with the letter which he had written, leading them to expect that their rapture was at hand, were apparently made use of by some one professing to have the Spirit, to impress upon them that the persecutions which they were enduring betokened the commencement of the tribulations of the last days.
“Now we beseech you, brethren, concerning the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ and our congregating to Him, that ye be not soon shaken in* [your] mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ had arrived." Let no man deceive you by any means, because, unless there shall have come an apostacy first, and the man of sin, the son of destruction shall have been revealed. He who opposeth himself and exalteth himself above every one that is called god, or is an object of worship, so as himself to sit at the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God [the day of Christ shall not have come].”† “Remember ye not that whilst I was with you I told you these things?”

The apostle, in urging that the excitement and perturbation were groundless and contrary to that patient waiting for Christ which he supplicates for them, takes occasion to shew the different developements of evil, from the time that he wrote, up to the period of the second advent.

In the apostle’s days, the mystery of lawlessness was already working; there was also the withholding cause co-existing with the mystery of lawlessness; and upon the withholder being taken out of the way the lawless one shall be revealed. It was, however, also necessary that there should “come an apostacy first, and the man of sin be revealed,” &c.

The existence of the apostacy and the revelation of the man of sin, it has generally been supposed, were to be con-

* Or “from.”
† So Mr. Bonar renders it; Pen to the same effect, “had already come.”

† Mr. Vaughan supplies these words, and in this position. I think the scope of 2 Thess. ii. 1–8, is a little obscured by the italics in our version, both as regards their matter and position; the words supplied should express exactly that idea which is expressed in verse 2, and which they are intended to repeat. Their position should be, I conceive, after the 4th verse, the apostle there making the abrupt transition which is the cause of the sense not being perfected.
temporaneous, which has given rise to two very different interpretations: the more ancient, which supposes that the man of sin will be an individual, who will appear immediately before the second advent, the result of which is to limit the apostacy also, to the days immediately preceding the second advent. This view, which arose before the development of the apostacy, the supporters of the apostacy have found very convenient to perpetuate.

The other view which saw the apostacy in the Church of Rome, destroyed the individuality of the lawless one, and placed the man of sin in the chair of St. Peter.

But there seem fatal objections to both these views; the advocates of the former must suppose that there has not been an apostacy, those of the latter must concede that we have been some 1200 or 1300 years in the day of Christ, and we have not been aware of the existence of that, the contemplation of which caused such perturbation of mind to the Thessalonians.

I noticed, in my observations upon Matt. xxiv., that our Lord signified the placing of the abomination of desolation in the holy place as betokening that the end had arrived; now in this passage the apostle says that the Thessalonians were not to be in a troubled or excited state of mind as if the day of Christ were present, because that cannot be until the man of sin shall have been revealed. Is it not, therefore, necessarily implied that when the man of sin shall be revealed, that then the day of Christ will have arrived? It is similar to the "therefore" of our Lord in Matt. xxiv. 15 . . . "Then shall the end come, when ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation," &c.

There is yet one other mode of viewing the current of evil: Why is it necessary to suppose that the revelation of the man of sin was to be contemporaneous and concurrent with the development of the apostacy? The apostle seems to me to say that there must have been "the apostacy first," before the day of Christ could come, and that then there
was to be the revelation of the man of sin, which would indicate that the day of Christ had arrived.

The two views which I oppose must suppose these combinations of evil:

1. The working of the mystery of lawlessness together with the withholding cause;

2. The apostacy and the revelation of the man of sin; which two will alike be terminated by,

3. The revelation of Jesus Christ.

The view which I venture to advocate supposes these developments and combinations of evil:

1. The working of the mystery and the withholding cause;

2. The apostacy and the withholding cause;

3. The revelation of the man of sin, indicating that the day of Christ has arrived.

The terms of the prophecy seem to me to have the following requirements:

The co-existence of the withholding cause with the apostacy during the whole time of the development of the apostacy, for it was in operation before, (verse 7,) and will conterminate with it. (verses 8, 8.)

Still there is the same reason for affirming that "he who withholdeth" (ver. 7) is an individual, as for saying that "the man of sin, the son of perdition," is an individual; the language in either case can only properly refer to an individual.

Although the mystery of lawlessness was already working, still the apostacy was a necessary antecedent to the revelation of him who is withheld. (ver. 3.)

Upon the withholder being taken out of the way, there will be upon this earth a fearful display of Satanic influence; (ver. 9;) an event of which the apostle speaks in a manner which betokens that the Thessalonians were already aware.
In order to the correct solution of this problem, all these phenomena must be accounted for. Towards deciding upon the principal difficulty, which is, who it is that withholdeth, I must inquire first into, who or what is withheld, and who shall be revealed (ver. 6) when the withholder shall be withdrawn, and consequently as to where the withholding cause is in operation.

We must bear in mind that the great subject of discourse, both in this and in the former epistle, is "the revelation of Jesus Christ." And as I have already noticed, the announcement that the believers should be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, was that which probably had in great measure brought the Thessalonians to that excited state of impatient waiting for Christ which the apostle is warning against.

I have already shewn that the italics necessary to complete the sense should not be supplied in the middle of verse 3, but after verse 4, for it is in verse 5 that we have the abrupt transition which shews why the sense was not completed. It will follow from these two considerations, viz. the revelation of the Lord being the great subject in hand, and also it being the immediate antecedent in the apostle's mind that He who shall be revealed in his time (ver. 6 ;) is not the man of sin, but the Messiah himself: it is his coming, and the congregating of the saints to Him, which possessed the minds, alike of the apostle and the Thessalonians.

1 Thess. iv. 17. St. Paul told the Thessalonians that they should be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. Now, when he speaks of the coming of our Lord, and our congregating to him, he must mean our congregating to him in the air; and the revelation of the Lord, of which he speaks, will also be in the air; but the cause of hindrance must also be in the place where the Lord is to be revealed, that is, not on the earth, but in the air. Now, bearing in mind that the
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individual withholding in the apostle's days, will withhold until the revelation of the lawless one; that the place of hindrance is the place of Satan's present power, namely, the air; that when the withholders is removed from his present place of hindrance, the revelation of the lawless one upon this earth will be according to the power of Satan, I think we have arrived at the conclusion, that as He who shall be revealed is the Lord, so he who now withholdeth is Satan, the Prince of the power of the air.

In confirmation I would only refer to Rev. xii. 10—12; Rev. xii. 10, 12.

"Now is come the kingdom of our God and the power of his Christ;" "Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down to you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time."

There are two more points necessary to be noticed:

1. In what manner the apostacy is necessary to the development of the lawless one; and yet,

2. That the mystery of lawlessness was working in the days of the apostle.

Paganism in the apostles' days had created the mystery of lawlessness. The heathen superstitions had nearly worn out the religious feelings of man, when Christianity arose upon the benighted Gentiles. But the God of this world meets the light of divine truth with those idolatries from which the Thessalonians had turned, reviving them in Papal Rome, and calling that system Christianity. Thus the principle of faith in man is again oppressed with the same incubus of Pagan superstition under the name of Christianity, and thus without discrimination, the precious is rejected together with the vile. There is in Romanism so large a demand upon credulity, that, so to speak, the ground is over cropped, and the land becomes sterile. The admixture of truth in Popery has preserved it from decay, but it will exist only till the whole mass is thoroughly leavened. The Christianity which is in the system, like a band of iron
and brass, has kept it together the longer, but when it does burst assunder the explosion will be the more violent. Romanism, by corrupting the sublimest revelation of God to man, and making it subservient to the grossest of superstitions, has so burdened all belief, that in the end, like the suicidal reptile, she will destroy herself with her own venom, and man will be ready to receive him who opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is an object of worship.
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Aaron, office of, considered as typical of our Lord's, 293—296
Abraham, promise to, concerning the land, 94; the blessing of, means the possession of the land, 95; promised land not appropriated by, nor by his seed, 99, 100; promises made to, yet to be fulfilled, 102; the God of, implies resurrection (Acts iii. 10, and Matt. xxii. 32), 122; and Sarah and Hagar, allegory of their history, Gal. iii. considered, 211, 212
Adam, how created in the image of God, 64, 65; a type of Christ in three particulars, 65
Advent, second, an article of the creeds, 3; not limited to a moment—embraces several events, 15, 16; Christ assumes his kingdom at, 60; is the coming referred to in Heb. i. 6, 61; first and second closely connected in the prophets, and why, 174; on what legitimate principle can it be interpreted figuratively, 383; when disciples inquired of our Lord, they meant a literal, 383; our Lord in his answer could not have meant a figurative, 383; post millennial theory of, overturned by taking it as literal, 383 (See Coming, Christ, Messiah). Amyraud's views accord with author's on 1 Cor. xv. 26, (note,) 50.
Apocalypse, Epistle to Corinthians not to be supposed interpreted by, 48; parenthesis in three last chapters determined, 203—207; first clause in chap. xx. 5 omitted in best MSS. and editions, 233
Apostacy must precede the coming of the Lord, 389; supposed contemporaneous with revelation of man of sin, 389; limited by some to days immediately preceding second advent, 390; was to come first, apostle says—then man of sin revealed, 390; place of, in combinations of evil, in two systems, 391; how necessary to development of lawless one, 393
Apostolical epistles applicable to all this dispensation, 18
Athanasiian Creed, millennarians opposed to, 45
Atonement, great day of, reviewed as typical of this dispensation, 223—296
Baruch, rebellion of, and consequences of the same, 383; pretended to fulfil Balaam's prophecy, 387; as false Christ caused ruin of Jews, 388
Bickersteth's Signs of the Times quoted; 289; quotations from Mr. Brown, 296; remarks on, in note by author, 296-7
Binding and loosing (Matt. xvi. 19), Lightfoot's sense of, 77
Boothroyd, opinion of, as to the creation of Adam, 65
British Magazine for February, 1847, quoted, 7
Brown, Mr., good remarks of, on spiritual, as opposed to material, 8; dangerous error of, that prophets and apostles use expressions in different senses, 8; has overlooked important distinction in sacrifices of Ezekiel from those in other prophecies, 289 note; examination of work on second advent, appendix 273; hypothesis of Lord's present throne and throne of David as one, 273; thinks will be 1000 years of blessedness—Lord remaining there, 273; thinks after this will come to judgment, 273; earth then to be purified by fire, and place of Christ's glory, 273; author chiefly differs from, as to present and future reign of Messiah, 273; principles of interpretation, latitudinarian, 274; certain misconceptions alleged by, noticed, 274; cannot expect that which on his theory cannot be for 1000 years, 274; distinguishes between personal advent and coming, 274; sets up very erroneous canon of interpretation, 275; error of, in speaking of "providential" or "gra-
cion coming,” 275; considers the word “coming” to have no determinate sense, 276; inconsistency of, in admitting that “the earth abideth for ever,” 276; objects the watchfulness imposed on early Church, 277; causes confusion in introducing chronological element, 277; argument against expecting advent strengthens as advent approaches, 277; cannot but believe 1000 years to elapse before advent, 278; believes not that it may be but must be far off, 278; error of, as to meaning of 2 Thess. ii. 1—8, 278; not justified in asserting from text day of Christ not at hand, 279; contrasts expressions “at hand” without consulting Greek, 280; error of, in not distinguishing between “Christ” and “day of Christ,” 281; maintains millennial glory prior to that of second advent, 281; as represented to God and to mankind, 282; all his saints complete, 282, 283; texts quoted by, prove this examined, 282—285; error of, in testing theories by presumed absurdity, 286; seems to think all dispensations much the same, 286, 287; erroneous statement of what pre-millennialists believe, 286, 287; statements of, concerning millennial church confounded, 288; charges removed by removing his own unscriptural doctrines, 288; doctrines of, concerning mediatorial offices of Christ, 288; several errors of, in these pointed out, 289; opinions of, as to word and ordinances at Christ’s coming, 290; futility of arguments considered and shown, 290, 291; use of the Scriptures in millennial reio, 291, 292; opinions of, on interchange of Christ, considered, 292, 293; misconceptions passage in Horae Hebraicace, 223; discourse of, on Christ coming in relation to his kingly office, 296; remarks on quotations of, from his opponents, 296—299; opinion on Christ’s proper kingdom, errors of, 299; errors of, in reference to Dan. ii. considered, 300; opinion of, on scope and meaning of, how erroneous, 301; confounds the ten kingdoms with the four monarchies, the toes with the arms, 301; error of, as to the advance of Christ’s kingdom, 302; important truth in some of his assertions on this, 302; a great error of, as to ruling of the Church, how to be gained, 303; stakes given to Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, 303; opinions of, as to ten king lions and little Horn considered, 304, 305; omission of, in quotation from Acts xii. of St. Peter’s address, 306, 307; states promise of Messiah’s sitting on David’s throne fulfilled, 307; confounds reign of Christ on David’s throne with exaltation on Father’s throne, 308; calls his throne in heaven “the seat of rule over Israel of God,” answered, 309; uses term Israel of God spiritually, answered, 310; his argument on the nature of our Lord’s rule answered, 310, 311; his argument on his first exercise of regal power from throne of Israel answered, 311, 312; understands throne of David in a spiritual sense, incorrectly, 312, 313; considers the house of David in the church, answered, 313; erroneous application of the terms “Prince of life” to the case, 314; makes a similar anachronism in application of Psalm ii, 314; is not exact in speaking of the “proper throne of Christ,” 315; reign and enemies of Christ, statements on, considered, 316; description of kingdoms of Christ by, beautiful and true, 318; correct in it, if applied to the throne of David, 318; correct in applying Psalm ii. 9 to pre-millennial judgments, 319; adopts very erroneous canon of interpretation of same passage, 320; not guided by Epistle to Hebrews in interpreting xiv. Psalm, 321; error of, in interpreting xviii. Psalm, 321; remarks of, on principles of interpretation, answered, 322; considers Old Testament prophecy “unchronological and discursive,” 322; difficulties of, caused by his principles of interpretation, 322; assertion of, as to chronological synopsis of Daniel and Apocalypse, 323; supposed meaning of, as to Jewish events adumbrating Christian events, 323; apprehended sense of, as to “Catholic fulness, amplitude, and pregnancy of spirit,” 323; an unintended truth in his interpretation of Isaiah ii, 324; objection of, against literal interpretation of, 324; interpretation of, involves the ploughing of his spiritual Zion, 324; difficulties in “scientific justification,” of his interpretation of Isaiah xxxv., 325; same, in his interpretation of “swearing up of death in victory,” 327; charges indirectly apostle Paul with misinterpretation, 327; makes Paul materialize and John etherialize Isaiah, 327; cannot go through with his interpretations, which are therefore useless, 328; erroneous interpretation by, of Joel’s prophecy, 328; Jews agreed with, in this interpretation, and therefore persisted, 328; singular interpretations by, of prophet Malachi, 330, 331; makes Malachi as he represents all, “unchronological and discursive,” 331; exemplifies his principle of analogical interpretation
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397

concerning, still unappropriated, 101; is the inheritance spoken of Gal. iii. 16—18, 103; illustrates the lapsed promise in Ezekiel, 257, 258

Catechism of Edward VI. supports personal reign of Messiah, 45

Cestius, siege of Jerusalem by, 357, 358

Christ all in all now, reason of, 53; must reign till all enemies put under his feet, 53; how to become subject, 53; when comes, kingdom of God the Father established, 57; receives for himself a kingdom, where and what it is, 62, 63; creator of Adam and of all things, 64; creation of Adam and all things by, includes God the Father, 64; glorified humanity in the person of, primary design of God, 66; receives the dominion when becomes a pattern of order, (compare Psalm viii., and 1 Cor. xv. 28); when the realm of a coordinate kingdom, assumes subordinate at second advent, 69; different ideas concerning, in Judea, what and why, 73; the anointed, in what sense applied to, 74; why enjoined silence as to who He was, 77, 78; why called the \"Holy One,\" and \"the Just One,\" 123, 124; co-ordination and subordination of, considered, (note) 146, 147, 315; mystery of, and of the Father, when finished, 147; to sit for ever on throne of David, why objected to, 148; judgment of guilty by, executed before He reigns the kingdom, 160; difficulty as to his surrendering the kingdom answered, 160; advent of, contingent, in what sense and on what event, 163—167; why said not to reign kingdom till close of millennium, 264; errors concerning person and office of, involved in millennial views, 266; human nature of, how derived from Adam's, note, 266; person of, errors concerning, involved in millennial views, 267; considered in coordinate and subordinate relation to the Father, 268; must ever remain immutably Head of his Church, 268; both Lord and Christ, why both titles given (Acts ii.), 307; Lordship of, to be distinguished from Messianic rule on David's throne, 310; reign of, on Father's and on David's throne, both divine, 310, 311; was Prince of life from first to last, 314; sits on his Father's throne as David's Lord, 315; sits as David, as Jesus the Christ, 315; co-ordinate rule of, an assumed relation as to his humanity, 315; subordination of, an assumed relation as the Word, 316; power delegated to, in coordinate relation, 318; power of, everlasting in subordinate,
318; breaking of enemies in pieces means persons not systems, 519; to appear when the man of sin has been developed, 386; no acts of sin permitted in his kingdom, 387; no feigned obedience in subjects of, then, 387; answers of, to three questions of disciples, 364; cautions given by, to his disciples, as to false Christ, 366; given to them as to being deceived by Jewish traditions, 366; warnings as to persecutions of disciples fulfilled, 368; gave prophecy on Mount for benefit of whole Church, 385

Christ, false, deceived the Jews, 365; seduced 6000 persons while temple was burning, 367; last and most mischievous was Barchochab, 367; was destroyed by Adrian, 367

Church of England, all members of, profess their belief in unfulfilled prophecy, 3

Church of Christ consists of an election out of world, during this Dispensation, 22; who are hated by world, and why not persecuted, 22, 23; expectation of, what, 29, 70; taught by grace to look for the glorious appearing of the Lord, 29, 70; early, warmly influenced by this blessed hope, 34

Church, each generation of, taught to watch signs of the times, 386; thus taught from the first, to draw from Word her portion of meat, 385; saved from knowing before, the long time of her widowhood, 385; lamentable picture of, in our Lord's prophecy on Mount, 388; at Thessalonica expected that the day of the Lord was at hand, 388

Chrysostom, his interpretation of the promise of vision of kingdom, 85

Clinton, chronology of, in siege of Jerusalem, followed by author, 367

Cloud of glory and cloudy pillar, differences between, 193—135; antitype of what, 135

Coming of the Lord defined and illustrated, 13, 14; supposed to embrace a series of events, 15; cannot be expected by those who deny pre-millennial advent, 10, 17; is the expectation of a seeady, expectant, 16, 17; church taught to look for, as well as to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, 29; expectation of has a purifying efficacy on the believer, 30; is a means to mortification of sin, 31; urged by the apostle as motive to holy works. (Phil. iii.), 31; is a great spiritual attainment —a strengthening of patience, etc., 32; supports under bereavement, (1 Thess. iv. 13—18), 33; produced an impressive influence on early believers, 38; is a joyful anticipation of saints in glory, 34; evil effects of not expecting and waiting for, 34—37; to look for, taught expressly in Nicene Creed, 36; Church ought to be looking for, (2nd conclusion), 37; contingent in what sense, and why so, 163, 164; question of disciples on—one of those things, and cause of, 363; answer of our Lord on, distinct and explicit, 363, 364; sign of, given by our Lord to his disciples, 372; will be a visible manifestation of Jesus in the heavens, 382

Co-ordination of Christ with his Father in his kingdom, proved, 42; mystic of a glory of, 43; and subordination of our Lord considered, (note.) 146, 147, 315

Covenant, how ratified, 104; symbolical representation of in Gen. xv. what, 105

Cox's, Mr., opinion of, on second coming of the Lord, 193; on limitation of judgment by fire, 195

Creeds of Church of England contain all doctrines of unfulfilled prophecy, 2; ten subjects of unfulfilled prophecy contained in, 3; Nicene, teaches expressly to look for coming of Christ, 36; Athanasian opposed to millenarianism, 45

Cross, to take up, and follow Christ, what it is, 81, 82

Dallas' prophecy on the Mount, 358

David, throne of, Christ shall reign on for ever, 259; (see Christ, Messiah, throne;) arguments of Mr. Brown considered, 307, et alibi passim

Dead, resurrection and judgment of, Rev. xx. considered, 289; who they are that shall stand before the great white throne, 289

Death when swallowed up in victory, 154; objection as to their being no more, considered, 164; how supposed to exist in millennium, 165

Desolate, "your house shall be left unto you," meaning of, 361

Desolation, abomination of, (Matt. xxiv. 15,) what is meant by, 356; of Jerusalem (Luke xxi. 20) distinct from this, 356; abomination of desolation, prophetic; a fruitful source of error, 373; supposed synonymous with Jerusalem encompassed with armies, 373; referred by our Lord to time of the end, (note,) 373; Roman armies cannot be intended by, 373; transgression of, denotes sin of the Jews, 373; abomination of, yet future, 374

Destruction predicted by St. Peter (2 Pet. iii.) considered, 182—187; is the period of the ungodly at the coming of the Lord, 187; cannot be post-millen-
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nial, 187; not a universal destruction of earth by fire, 192, 195; recapitulation of arguments on, 196; upon old earth co-extensive with blessing in new, 198

Difficulties occurring in applying quotations from Old Testament in New, 168; in considering the destruction predicted by St. Peter, (2 Pet. iii.,) 182; arising from Rev. xx. 5 considered, 252, 258

Dispensation, present, is a spiritual millennium consistent with, 17; character of, first inquiry of author, 18; true nature of, evil, and saints delivered out of it, 21; must cease to be evil if world were progressively improved and spiritualized, 21; no scriptural warrant for gradual amelioration of, 22; proved not to be the time of reigning, (by 1 Cor. iv. 8—16,) 23, 24; nature of, illustrated by types, parables, and prophecies, 25—27; universal spread of Gospel incompatible with characteristics of, 28; at the close of Christ assumes his subordinate kingdom, 70; of the Spirit precedes the reign of Christ, 119; close of this, will be defined by great and dreadful day of Lord, 120; present, that of expectation—future, that of consummation, 146; order of present and future shown (Acts xv.), 178; hatred of Christians a characteristic feature of this, 389; whole of this, embraced in our Lord's prophecy on the Mount, 370

Duffield on prophecy distinguishes clearly between literal and spiritual sense, (note,) 7; translation of 2 Thess. ii. 2, and remarks on same, 279; good remark of on how to promote christian decision, (note,) 247; shows Jews to be the elect for whose sake days of tribulation shortened, 371

"Eagles there will be gathered together," refers to our Lord's coming, 379; understood by the fathers generally of saints gathered to Christ, (note,) 380

Earth abideth for ever, 141; whether there will be death in new, 154; blessed state of future, as described by Mr. Vaughan, 158

Elect, for whose sake the days of tribulation shall be shortened, 377; not the Christians—why, 377; refer to Israel, reasons why from Mr. Duffield, 378; corroborated by comparing Dan. xii. 1 with Isa. iv. 5, 378; who will be well deceived, refers to Jews, 378

Elias, coming of, considered, 175; why disciples of our Lord asked the question concerning, 175; explicit promise of his coming, and at what time, 176; coming of, in connexion with our Lord's declaration as to the Baptist, 177—179; his coming considered certain by many authorities, (note,) 180

End, the, spoken of, (1 Cor. xv. 24,) what it means, 50, 54, 55, 59; the expectation of, influences that of all preceding events, 248

Expectation of coming of the Lord, blessings of, 88—93 (See "Coming")

Fairbairn, Mr., arguments for ultimate possession of Canaan, 276; agrees in some measure with author, 276

Fire, nature and extent of, predicted to take place on earth, 193, 194; quotations from Scripture as to its limitation, 194, 195

"Generation, this, shall not pass," (Matt. xxiv. 34,) what it means, 387

Gentiles, church of, an election out of the world, in this dispensation, 22, 173; court of, what this is supposed to mean, 163; decision of the apostles concerning (Acts xv.) considered, 169, 170; calling of, only brought to light, after Jews rejected Christ, 178; times of, in Luke xxii. 24, when brought to a close, 372; shall be fulfilled before Jews shall be deceived by false Christ, 378

Gibbon, blasphemous assertion of, 168

Gillon, his opinion on the coming of the Lord, (note,) 129

God the Father "all in all," when to be, and meaning of, 59; kingdom of, subject of Lord's prayer, 56, 57; kingdom of, established at same time with Christ's, 57; commences his kingdom at beginning of thousand years, 59, 144; place of his rest, where, 136—138; takes his kingdom on sounding of seventh trumpet, 144; manifestation of his glory, 148—161; dwelling with his people, 151

Gospel preached in all the world for a witness,—what question this answers, 372; shall not be for conversion of the world, 373; given by our Lord as sign of the end, 373

Hall, Bishop, his interpretation of Mark ix., 1

Hare's, Archdeacon, mission of the Comforter, 389 (note)

Heaven and earth, new, same in Isa. lxv., lvi, as in 2 Pet. iii., 209; will be established at beginning of one thousand years, 209; in Rev. xxii. 1 parallel with Isaiah and Peter, 210
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Henderson, Dr., quotation from, as to literal sense of Scripture, 9
Henry, Matthew, his opinion of the promised vision of the kingdom, 86
Hilary, as quoted by Bishop Hall on the transfiguration, 86

Jerusalem shall be called the throne of Jehovah—why, 138; called the city of the great King—why, 139—150; must be on this earth—why, 150; New, supposition concerning nature of, 152; New, the descent of, when it shall occur, 204, 214; New, parallel passages concerning, 123, 214, 216; siege of, following dates of Clinton, 357, 358; our Lord's command to flee from twofold, 358; utter destruction and demolition of, 362; attempt of Julian to rebuild, sense, 363; signs of destruction of by our Lord, 371; all evils pronounced against, embraced in our Lord's words, 372; trodden down of the Gentiles till their time be fulfilled, 372

Jews, a remnant saved during this dispensation, 22; all shall be called in when the Lord shall come, 22; outcasts of Israel, and dispersed of gathered from all the earth, 384; gathering of after coming of Son of man, proved from Scripture, 316; and pre-millennialists how far agreed on (Isa. ii.), 324

Infants and irresponsible persons perhaps found in Book of Life, (note,) 240
Interpretation of prophecy, literal, symbolic, or figurative, 4; also called literal and spiritual, 7; spiritual, this term why improperly applied, 7, 8

Interpretation, sound principles of, to be deduced from Scripture, 322; several specimens of erroneous, 322; of Mr. Brown, some specimens of, 324; of Isaiah xxv. 5, and lxv. 17, 18, by apostles, only sound ones, 328

John the Baptist considered in comparison with Elias, 177—181 (see Elias)

Israel of God, applied by Mr. Brown to the whole Church, 310; proper sense of the term as applied (Gal. vi.), 310; seat of Christ's rule over, as described by Mr. Brown, answereed, 310; throne of, Mr. Brown says Christ sent down the Spirit from, 313; considered by Mr. Brown in a symbolical sense, improperly, 315

Judge, unjust, parable of, application of it to second advent, 166, 167

Judgment of dead and reward of saints synchronous, 145; exercised at second coming of Messiah, what, 220; first act of, will be while on his Father's throne, 220; of both righteous and wicked takes place at our Lord's advent, 221; will be conducted by Messiah in presence of Father, 338; evils of theory, which defers, of wicked to end of Messiah's reign, 242

Keys, how used by Peter, 75

Kingdom, Kingdoms, what that is, which Messiah shall reign, 49; shall not be that of David, but his present co-ordinate kingdom, 59, 58, 5; time of resignation of, defined by three marks, 53, 54; for what we pray in Lord's prayer—what? 56; of God the Father, when established, 57, 144; of God the Father and of Christ contemporaneous, 57, 59, 146; of God the Father commences at beginning of thousand year, 29; of Christ, one co-ordinate with that of Father, 69, 70, 146; of Christ, one subordinate subsequent to this, and commencing at second advent, 69, 70, 146; of this and the next dispensation expressed by the stone and the mountain, 76, 77; vision of, promised (Mark ix. 1) how interpreted, 84; of Israel, question of disciples as to (Acts i. 6) what it implied, 112, 113; what sort the disciples expected of Christ on throne of David, 130; "whose, shall have no end," 143; of this world become kingdoms of Jehovah when, 144; of saints with Christ shall last for ever and ever, 235; why Christ said not to resign till his enemy be subdued, 264; this argument concerning disproves itself, 264

Language of prophecy one of its difficulties, 1; is literal, symbolical, or figurative, 4; these distinctions of, explained and illustrated, 4—6; of prophecy and history, why not different from each other, 6; rule of Vitringa for deciding between literal and figurative, (note,) 7

Law, moral and ceremonial, distinction between, and uses of, 107, 108

Lillingston, Mr., proves our Lord's advent literal and pre-millennial, 383, 384

LITERAL AND SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY, NOT A CORRECT DISTINCTION, 8

LITERAL INTERPRETATION AS OPPOSED TO SPIRITUAL, 251; Interpreters answers of, to objectors, 251, 252; interpretation of Ezekiel's temple chief difficulty, 252, 253; interpretation of, may be adopted without opposition to analogy of faith 256 (See Spiritual temple)

Lord, our, coming, expectation of, (See Coming, Christ, Messiah, Advent)
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Man of sin not the withholder, but provoking cause of the advent, 279; must be revealed before the Lord’s coming, 389; two interpretations of, more ancient suppose him an individual, 389; this view of, arose before the development of the apostacy, 390; the other view of, placed him in chair of Peter, 389; objections to both views of, what they are, 390; when is revealed, day of Christ shall have arrived, 390; apostacy comes before, then man of sin at day of Christ, 390; two views of, include each certain combinations of evil, 391; prophecy concerning, have certain requirements, and what, 391; chief difficulty concerning, is who is it that withholdeth, 391; questions concerning necessary to be determined, 391, 392; not, but Messiah shall be revealed when withholder is withdrawn, 392; revelation, not of Jesus, but Messiah, 392; revelation of, will be according to power of Satan, 393; how apostacy was necessary to development of, 394

Mattthei omits 1st clause (Rev. xx. 5) in 2nd edition of N. T., 233

Mede on prophecies as to first and second advent, 174

Messiah, kingdom of, said by some to be of little practical importance, 25; coming of, denial of, is a sign of last day (2 Pet. iii. 3, 4), 36; present position of, 37; exaltation of, on the Father’s throne, 39—48; reign of, whether personal and limited to one thousand years, inquiry into, 46; what kingdom he is to surrender settles millennialist question, 49; why he holds the power which he will surrender, 50; is to surrender not kingdom of David, but co-ordinate kingdom, 51, 284; becomes subject on resignation of kingdom, 52; not subject while on his Father’s throne, 52; kingdom of, contemporaneous with that of God the Father, 57—59; kingdom of, nature of considered, 72; coming to be watched for, 200 (See Advent, Christ, Coming)

Millennialism, term improperly applied, how, 44

Millenarians opposed to Athanasian Creed, 46; suppose three distant periods, and what they are, 46; objection, first against, on construction of 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, 47; whole question with depends on what kingdom Christ shall reign, 49; suppose the kingdom of Christ and the Father to be in succession, 145; in opposition to, the author maintains they are synchronous, 145

Millenarians, spiritual—three modes in which their object can be alone accomplished, 246; vain expectations of in these, 246; ideas of, on subject not strictly defined, 246; to be feared have erroneous notions of Satan, 246; vain expectations of, from missionary efforts, 247; blind men as to perils of last days, 247; doctrine of, tends to lower standard of holiness, 247; to induce desire for change, and other evils, 247; to lower life of saints and mix them with the world, 247; to dilute the Gospel to generalize but deteriorate Christianity, 248; this theory makes Scripture inapplicable and inconsistent, 248; leaves no defined point of transition, 248; no time when Scripture suitable to this dispensation shall cease to be applicable, 248; oppose plain testimonies of Scripture, 248; pervert or neglect its predictions, misappropriates its promises, dilute its precepts, 249

Millenarians, literal, inconsistent with themselves, 264; inconsistency of, as to reason of resignation of kingdom by our Lord, 264; inconsistency of, as to interpretation of measure of time, 265; error of, as to duration of glory of saints and eternal punishment, 265; hold that reign of Christ on throne of David limited to one thousand years, 266; the error of, subverts important truths as to person and offices of Messiah, 266

Millennium, opposite opinions of those who expect it, 11, 12; spiritual implies a gradual amelioration of world, 19, 245, 248; this idea of, quite opposed to Scripture, 19, 245, 248; spiritual cannot exist under any part of this dispensation, 28; spiritual, belief of, opposed to waiting for coming of Lord, 35—37; notion of, whence originated, 36; blessedness of, invaded by sin, wonderful, answered, 158; tenet of, avoided by our reformers, 263; view of, what it is, as opposed to reformers, 264; view of, inconsistent, in what points, 264

Missionary exertions, vain expectations of, by spiritual millenarians, 246, 247; will gather God’s elect, 247; but will also spread nominal Christianity, 247; therefore not to be supposed will convert mankind, 247

Moses, tabernacle of, typical of world to come, 152, 153

Mystery of iniquity working in days of apostle, 391—393

Nations, supposed condition of, in future dispensation, 156; shall walk in the

D D
light of the New Jerusalem, 168; deceived at end of millennium, who supposed to be, 157

Old Testament, quotations from, in New, difficulties of, 168; blasphemous opinion of modern rationalists concerning denounced, 345

Ohlhausen, quotation from, on work of the Holy Spirit, (note,) 259

Parables all indicate simultaneous judgment of righteous and wicked, 223
Parenthesis in three last chapters of Apocalypse considered, 203; position of, how exactly determined, 206, 207, 232

Patriarchs were strangers in land of promise, 97; promises not yet appropriated by, nor by their descendants, 98

Peter, in what sense a rock, 77; error of, what, and why rebuked by our Lord, 79; why called Satan, and meaning of that term, 80; refers to transfiguration to confirm faith of Church, 92

Popery oppresses man with same incubus of superstition as paganism, 389; calls its system of pagan superstition Christianity, 393; the admixture of truth in, has kept it from decay, 393; has corrupted the revelation of God to man, 393; has made it subserve the grossest superstition, 394; has overburthened all belief in the mind of man, 394; like the suicidal reptile will destroy herself with her own venom, 394

Promise made to Abraham as yet to be fulfilled to Church, 102, 109; on which apostolic reasons, (Gal. iii. 15—17,) was of Canaan, 103; proved to be that of Canaan by three considerations, 104; made to Virgin, (Luke i. 32,) as to throne of David considered, 111; of Ezekiel’s vision of the temple and sacrifice a lapsed promise, 257; (see Temple;) illustrated by case of land of Canaan, 258

Promises to the victors fulfilled all at second coming of Lord, 218; half fulfilled then, and half at end of thousand years, according to millenniumarians, 218

Prophecy, interpretation of, difficult as to subject and language, why, 1, 2, 4; unfulfilled, embraces all the future dispensation, and current events of this, 2, 11; unfulfilled, all doctrine of, contained in creeds, 3; subjects of, not well defined or considered, 3, 4; development of end of, should be first studied, why, 11; of Joel, quoted (Acts ii.) by St. Peter, how to be understood, 114; must be interpreted

with reference to the point of vision o the prophet, 201; guides for interpreting that in Rev. xx., 201; on the Mount, by our Lord, harmonised, 350—354; consideration of, importance of, 355; various interpretation of, and cause of this, 355; hindrance to real solution of, what, 355

Prophecy on the Mount continued, 355; error in interpreting, from identifying, Matt. xxiv. 15 with Luke xxi. 20, 356; this interpretation rectified by making the distinction between, 356; author’s process in investigation of, 354—356; difference in, between Matthew and other gospels, what, 360; given by our Lord for benefit of whole Church, 385

Prophets, many false, whom supposed to include, 389

Proselytes of the gate, who they were, 109; of the covenant, distinction between them, 169

Psalm viii., considered in comparison with Heb. ii. 8, and 1 Cor. xv. 28, 66—69; ii. considered in reference to present dispensation and future reign of Christ. 69—71

Questions, three, by our Lord’s disciples. (Matt. xxiv.,) 363; occasion, object, and answers to these considered, 363—387; naked on events which apostles expected simultaneously, 385

Rabanus Maurus thinks, “the sun shall be darkened,” will be literal, 380

Rationalists, modern, their blasphemous notion of New Testament writers in quotations from Old Testament denounced, 345

“Redemption, your, draweth nigh,” not of the soul, 385; saints of Christ waiting for, of the body, 386; Christ made unto us, of soul and body, 386

Reign of Christ extends over dominion of first Adam, 110; is to be after resurrection of, and dispensation of the Spirit, 119; is to be for ever and ever, 142, 143, 148. (See Christ, Kingdom, Throne.)

Refreshing, times of, considered, 121—131

Remigius, his interpretation of promise (Mark ix. 1), 85; interprets the fig-tree in prophecy on the Mount, of Synagogue, 386

“Restitution of all things,” how to be considered, 191; not a completed act, but a process of acts ending in completion, 335

Resurrection of Christ to sit on throne of
INDEX.

David (Psalm xvi.), 116; considered in connexion with gift of tongues, 117; figurative, erroneous doctrine of Mr. Brown on, 344, 345.

Rock on which the Church is built, what, 75.

Sacrifices of Ezekiel’s temple literal but not future, 253, 254. (See Temple.) Jews will be offering, at time of Lord’s return, 254; mentioned Isaiah i. 10, comp. with Rom. ix. 20 and Psalm l., 255; Jews reproved for not offering spiritual, 255; of Ezekiel’s temple may be taken literally, how, 256; in vision of Ezekiel different from other prophecies, 259; those fulfilled in Christ could not be reiterated, 259; denote many things figuratively in Scripture, 260; prove too much if taken literally, 260; spiritual, offered up by all believers, 260; figurative interpretation not arbitrary nor indeterminate, 261.

Saints, the glory of, exhibited in the transfiguration, 87; and faithful brethren, distinction between, what, 149; camp of, refers especially to Jewish Church, 149, 152; waiting for redemption of body promised by our Lord, 386.

Salvian, opinion of, on denying self, 81.

Satan being in subjection, and subsequently loosed, considered, 160, 161, 241, 242; present power and influence of, according to Mr. Brown, answered, 359; supposed power of, during millennium by same, answered, 340; is withholding power that Messiah shall not be revealed, 392; when removed from present position of hindrance, Messiah shall be revealed, 398; revelation of man of sin will be according to the power of, 398; woe to inhabitants of earth, when, comes down to you, 398.

Schofield, Professor, his rendering of 2 Thess. ii. 1—5, 389.

Signs of the Son of man in heaven, a manifestation of Jesus in the heavens, 382; similar to that vouchsafed to Stephen, 382.

Signs in heaven and earth of days of tribulation, 381; physical and political, affecting the nations, 381; too great and universal to be limited to Jews, 381; of the times, Church instructed always to observe, 280, 385; rather to be observed than the series of years, 387.

Sin, objection as to its re-entrance after millennium considered, 158; future, after millennial blessedness wonderful, 158; analogous cases of, already existing, 158.

Societies, religious, have fostered notions of spiritual millennium, 36.

Son of man, (See Messiah, Christ, Coming.)

Spiritual, and literal interpretation of prophecy, differences between, 7; sense multiforum, and why, 8; interpretation, so called, mystifies plain language of Scripture, 244; illustrated by various quotations from Mr. Brown, (note.) 244; such interpreters, do they really believe divine revelation, 245; make consistent exposition of prophecies impossible, 245; millennium, notion of, injures practical parts of Scripture, 245; anticipated modification of world, in what, false, and why, 246, 247; evil effects of, on faith and conduct of Christians, 247; interpretation, system of, leads to opposite extreme, 261; objections of, vain as opposed to literal examples of, 252; most difficult, is re-institution of sacrifices, 252; this objection of, based on literal view of Ezekiel’s temple, 252.

“Stars of heaven shall fall,” by Bloomfield, translated “Stars shall be waning,” 380; probable appearance of, produced by irregularity in orbit of earth, 381.

Stone cut out of mountain, the kingdom of the elect, 303; cannot become a mountain in this dispensation, 205.

“Sun, the, shall be darkened,” author thinks will be literally fulfilled, 380.

Temple, Ezekiel’s, description of, literally minute, 253; why not real as well as patterns shown to Moses or David, 253; if literal, evidently never yet fulfilled, 253; evidently not suitable to any time after first advent, 253; sacrifices of, those declared to Hebrews to be abolished, 253; shown to be severely fulfilled in Christ, 254; could not be commemorative, 254; could not be prophetic of will-worship, (note,) 255; can be taken literally, yet consistently with the faith, 256; promise conditional, proved by the prophet, 256; prophet himself was to establish it, 257; promise of, has lapsed, but part reiterated, 257.

Temple, grandeur and desolation of, spoken of, by our Lord, 382; utter subversion of, in fulfilment of same, 363; wall of, low on one side of Mount of Olives, reason of, 363 note.

Thrones, the two (Rev. iii. 21), 39; session of Christ on his Father’s, 39; sitting on, equivalent to reigning, 39, 41; Christ’s session on his Father’s, proves actual dominion, 41; where Christ now
INDEX.

reigns not subject, 52; that Christ is to reign, is that of the Father, 52; to be resigned that God may be all in all, 52; of David, promise on, to Virgin Mary, considered, 111; of glory, and hereditary, given to Lord Jesus, 111; of David given to Christ, in what sense and extent, 111; promise of, to Christ yet unfulfilled, 112; Christ raised from the dead to sit on, 116, 117; great white, (Rev. xx. 11,) not that of Messiah, but of the Father, 237; of David will be that of Messiah on the renovated earth, 237; Messiah shall reign for ever and ever, 269

Thomas Aquinas', opinion of the efficacy of God's will, 164

Tillock, opinion of, as to creation of Adam, 65, 66

Tongues, cessation of gift of, considered, 115

Transfiguration, object of, to instruct disciples as to nature of Christ's kingdom, 72; to understand, three points to be considered, what, 72; fulfilment of, promised vision of the kingdom, 86—89; Peter's proposal of making tabernacles at, what it meant, 88; nature of Messiah's kingdom to be learned from, 93

Tribulation, great, can be but one such as described by our Lord, (Matt. xxiv. 20, 375; that spoken of by Daniel xii. 1, must be the same, mentioned by our Lord, 375; connected with the time of the Jews' deliverance, 375; also with the resurrection from the dead, 375; prophecy of Daniel and our Lord on, corroborate each other, 375; evil consequences of connecting, with destruction of Jerusalem, 375; of last days, expected by Church at Thessalonica, 388

Trumpet, seventh, sounding of, results from, 146, 146; mystery, how finished, at the sounding of, 269

Vaughan, Mr., quotation from, 157, 158

Villiers, Mr., his sermon alluded to by Mr. Brown, 274 note; felt right to press the fact of second advent on hearers, 274

Watchfulness, exhortations to, founded on the coming of the Lord, 35; spirit of, necessarily implies the expectation of his coming, 36; for Christ's advent urged on primitive Church, objection, 162, 163

Wheat and tares, parable of, objected by Mr. Brown, 387; explained and answered, 387

Wicked one, objection as to destruction of, answered, 159

World, definition of, in I John ii., iii. &c., 19, 20; love of, wholly inconsistent with love of God, 20; scriptural exhortations concerning, inconsistent with gradual improvement of, 20, 21; hope of such improvement of, not warranted by scripture, 22; Church, an election out of, during this dispensation, 22

Years, 430, mentioned (Gal. iii. 16, 17), whence dated, 105

THE END.
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Page 5, line 4, after Herod, insert This is symbolical.
- 11, line 10, read in the efforts of, &c.
- 22, line 30, for came, read come.
- 39, line 9 margin, read attainment.
- 46, line 19, after periods, insert of the resurrection.
- 49, line 23, for a point or an interval, read the longer or the shorter interval.
- 85, line 10, for one thinks, read methinks.
- 126, line 21, for fathers, read Father.
- 157, line 7, for Lord, read Land.
- 143, line 14, omit two.
- 169 note, line 9 from bottom, for fourth, read first.
- 168, line 34, for God, read Goel.
- 297, last line, read the renovated earth.
- 355, line 23, for Ps. iv., read Ps. l.
- 355, line 4, for Isaiah xxi., read Isaiah xxv.
- 367, line 31, his first exercise of regal authority from the throne of Israel, should be in italics.
- 314, line 6, Isaiah iv., should not be in brackets.
- 332, line 15, after Church, insert a note of interrogation.
- 332, line 15, for sinks, read links.
- 399, line 7, after is, insert as
- line 8, for never-closing, read never-ceasing.
- line 14, an inseparable part of the fallen system and reign of sin, should be in italics.
- 544, line 24, after if literal, insert a comma.
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