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Never since the ascension of our Lord to heaven has so much been said and written respecting his return as during the past fifty years. Some* of the most learned, pious, and influential of the ministry in various sections of the world and of the church are even engaged in directing the attention of Christians to the Saviour's second coming, as an event particularly nigh at hand! Long, long has the bride been waiting in eager and joyous expectation for the bridegroom. Through ages of darkness and bitter affliction her faith has not faltered and her hope has not wavered. She has believed without a doubt that that same Jesus which

* Reference is here made to such men in our own country as Pres. Lord, of Dartmouth College, Rev. Dr. Tyng, Bishop Henshaw, Dr. Duffield; and in England, Hugh McNeile, D. D., Dr. Cummings, Rev. T. R. Birks, Rev. John. Cox, Hon. and Rev. Gerard Noel, Rev. Mr. Cunningham, and others.
was taken up into heaven, in the presence of the men of Galilee, shall so come in like manner as he was seen to go into heaven. (Acts i. 11.) It is a most deeply interesting question to every disciple of Jesus, Has this expectation a firm basis? May it really be, that Christians are believing, and ministers are preaching, and attaching the most sacred importance to an event as yet future, which is already in the past; an event which has transpired without their knowledge, and which, of course, is never to be realized in the manner supposed by the church for eighteen hundred years? Must they be told that that in which is bound their entire hope as Christians, is all a chimera? Must they believe, while their hearts are burning with the expectation of ere long welcoming their glorified Redeemer to earth, that they are surely doomed to disappointment, that he will never come again literally, bodily, personally? The melancholy fact that some, professing more than a mediocrity of learning and piety, are endeavoring to demonstrate that the Christian world have been, and are, egregiously mistaken with reference to the manner and nature of the coming of Christ and its associate events, ought to awaken within the hearts of all Christians the most pious horror, and draw from them the most solemn protestations. If they will so suffer the truth of God to be perverted, and assaulted in her most vital part, they are not worthy the name which they bear as private members of the church of Christ, or the station which they occupy
as public teachers of his holy religion. This is not a ques-
tion touching the time for the accomplishment of predicted
events, on which there might be a variety of opinions among
the best and most sincere Christians and expositors of the
Bible. It is a question back of this, and of more import-
ance than this. Individuals may assume whatever position
they please in regard to the time of the consummation; but,
when they seek to undermine the foundation of the Chris-
tian's hope, then every lover of the truth should arise and
speak distinctly and boldly. It will not do to say merely
that the doctrine of Christ's second coming is a settled doc-
trine of the church, that it is most clearly taught in the
Scriptures. It will not do to meet what is deemed to be
error with silent contempt, with a simple sneer, with cutting
satire, with open abuse. The propagators of false doctrine
are sometimes as sincere, as conscientious, as intelligent,
and perhaps as pious, as many of the staunchest maintain-
ers of the truth; and they ought, not only for the sake of
their own souls, but for the good of those over whom they
exert an influence, to be dealt with as though they were, at
least, well-meaning men.

But it is not only for the class of open and bold advoca-
tes of error that it is necessary to write and to speak on
some fundamental points of the Christian faith. The
present is a time of upheaving, both in state and church.
The long quiet of the world, socially and religiously, is
broken. The members of the Romish and of the Anglican
1*
Churches are marching and countermarching from their respective altars where they have been born and bred. The veneration heretofore inspired by ancient opinions, forms and usages, is not now sufficient, in all cases, to bind men to this or that religious body, however great its claim to antiquity. Theological revolutions in other quarters, where forms are subordinate to tenets, may be attended with less noise, but not with less injury to the cause of truth and the welfare of souls. We must express our fears that a cloud overhangs other portions of the religious community besides those just alluded to, betokening a change, if not a revolution. We notice with alarm a growing inclination on the part of some, heretofore regarded as sound in the faith, to attach a spiritual or mystical signification to numerous texts of Scripture to which the great bulk of Christians in ages gone by have given a literal and grammatical import. We do not know how long these old seeds of Origenism have been in embryo among us, but certain it is, that since the agitation in this country of the "second advent," there have been exhibited symptoms of misgiving, in some quite respectable quarters, touching the literal coming of Christ, and its associate events. More: We know not how to express our regret, that some of our standard commentators, and also prominent living teachers of our evangelical faith, should ever have given such expositions to many texts of Scripture, as the advocates of gross error can use in support of their corrupt theories.
our humble judgment, these honored men have unintentionally yielded ground to the enemies of truth, in some instances, which they might and ought to have retained. We shall be understood, when we say, that Mr. Crosby devotes about one half of his book to an appendix, consisting of extracts from the writings of such eminent scholars as Profs. Woods, Stuart, Park, Robinson, Stowe, and from such distinguished commentators as Lightfoot, Gill, McKnight, Scott, Clarke, and Barnes, for the purpose of giving additional weight to his interpretation of certain Scripture texts and terms on which he makes the whole question in dispute turn. For ourselves, we do not see how a man can endorse such expositions of some portions of the Bible as these good men have put forth, without meeting with a great deal of difficulty in fair contest with our author and all of like stamp. Nay, we see not how such a man can long preserve his consistency. He is in danger of sliding ultimately into the same abyss with Prof. Crosby, Prof. Bush, E. Swedenborg, of modern times, and Hymeneus and Philetus of earlier times. We tremble for the fate of many around us, who are evidently nearing the edge of a precipice! It is idle to say that we cleave to the great doctrines of the Word of God with such pertinacity as did our fathers. A partial change has come over us. Texts and portions of the Bible which in our boyhood we distinctly recollect were applied by the most eminent of the ministry to the second coming of Christ, the Judgment,
and the end of the world, are now applied, in numerous instances, to some minor events in the past, and this, too, without any tenable ground, as we think. Those who have been diligently laboring and eagerly watching for such concessions on our part, as have been hinted at, well know that they have been made by persons assuming the appellation of orthodox believers. Said one of the oldest and ablest of Universalist ministers in this country, on the occasion of a recent gathering of the ministers and friends of his denomination—"I have, within my remembrance, lived to witness great reforms in the religious views of some of the sects, and in their interpretation of the Scriptures." We have no doubt of the truth of this declaration. Men may quietly modify their religious opinions, and be corrected by the suggestions of such men as they would scorn to strike their flag to, and join with hand to hand. And thus, to some extent, it has been in this case. We are pained to believe it, and therefore desire to sound the note of alarm; to supplicate all to hold fast to the form of sound words; to review narrowly the ground over which, unexpectedly, we have been called to pass; to be more wary for the future; and to fight valiantly for the plain, simple declaration of inspiration on which are suspended our most deeply cherished hopes for eternity.

But to come without farther preface to a consideration of our author and his book. Mr. Crosby has been, as we are informed, until lately, Professor of Languages in Dart-
nor a msr EVENT. 9

mouth College, Hanover, N. H. He is the author of the Greek Grammar which is said to be the textbook in Dartmouth and some of our principal colleges. He is the author also of several of the best and the most popular editions of the Greek Classics, and of other important college text books. He has written a book which, the publishers inform us, has had a good sale. The object of this book, which is given to the public in accordance with the expressed wish of "friends," is to prove that the second advent of Christ, together with its associate events, is in the past. Unlike Prof. Bush, who treats of the Resurrection, in its connection with the Judgment, as a passing event, and attempts to sustain his theory mainly by arguments drawn from philosophy and philology, Prof. Crosby treats of the second coming, in its connection with the Judgment, &c., as an event that is actually in the past, and endeavors to maintain his position from Scripture alone, without calling to his aid the doctrines of philosophy or the rules of philology; adducing to this end a great array of texts, and altogether presenting the strongest and ablest defence of his view with which we are familiar. He discusses his subject with candor, and with an apparent consciousness that it is a "great question." His spirit is generally conciliatory towards those from whom he dissents. He makes no particular display of learning, finds no very great fault with the "translation," as some have done who have had a difficult theory to uphold, is generally satisfied with our own excellent
English version of the sacred Scriptures, and but seldom makes a criticism upon the original text. We believe that Mr. Crosby was formerly connected with the Congregational Church. We do not know with what religious body he now wishes to be ranked. If, however, his present views suit any one class of professing Christians particularly, we suppose that they are most in harmony with those of the Universalist. This we conclude, not only from the work before us, but from his "Earnest Appeal to the American Tract Society in regard to the character of its publications," published some little time prior to his present work. We should place Mr. Crosby among Universalists of the most ultra stamp; for, while some of that denomination would endorse, in toto, his theological opinions as set forth in these two books, others, while contending that the judgment is in a state of progress, very inconsistently hold that the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead are yet to be literally realized. But it is not important to know of whose opinions Mr. Crosby is the exponent. We have already intimated our serious conviction that his understanding of the nature and manner of the advent of Christ, of the resurrection, of the judgment, and of the end of the world, together with his application of many texts of Scripture to events in the past, have already been anticipated, imbibed, and proclaimed, by too many orthodox believers, so reputed, throughout the church.

It shall be our aim in this article to present the reader
with a full outline of Prof. Crosby's theory. But, instead of endeavoring to show, without much regard to his work, that the events which he puts in the *past*, are, and must be in the future; or, instead of singling out one or more of his fundamental errors, we will attempt to follow him throughout his whole course of reasoning, agreeing with him as far as we can, and disagreeing with him wherever we must.

He plants his defence upon the six following propositions.

I. "*The Scriptures often speak of a second, but never of a third coming of Christ.*"

Our author sustains this proposition throughout, by quoting the usual proof texts found in the New Testament, from which, by the way, he prefers making his quotations, as being more explicit and abundant than those that might be drawn from the Old Testament: such as Matt. xvi. 27; xxiv. 37; xxv. 31; Mark xiii. 26; Luke ix. 26; xii. 40; xvii. 30; xviii. 8, &c. Nor does he fail to refer to that remarkable passage in Acts i. 10, though he finds it a perfect poser to his past advent. He must, accordingly, suggest a criticism upon the phrase δν τρόπον; the force of which, as in the English version, he tries to weaken by stating that it has no necessary reference to the particular *manner* in which a thing is done, but should have the force simply, as in some other instances of translation in the New Testament, of "as," or "even as," and consequently should be understood as if it were translated — "As ye have seen
him go into heaven, so likewise shall he come again." This is one of the most palpable quibbles of which Mr. Crosby may be charged throughout his book.

The phrase here criticized occurs in the New Testament about a dozen times, and in most instances is rendered by our translators simply, "as," or "even as." The occurrence of the phrase in Jude, ver. 7, is another exception to his statement. Allowing now that the phrase in all these instances is correctly translated "as," or "even as," we ask Mr. Crosby, or any candid reader of the Bible, if the mere English phrase "as," or "even as," does not oftentimes involve and suggest the idea of manner? Take the passage in 2 Tim. iii. 8, where the phrase in dispute is found. "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." Can a person read these words for the first time without associating manner with them, and at once supposing that a comparison was intended to be taught between a class of past and present corrupt and impious men? So that, though the phrase διʼ τοῦτον is not here translated "in like manner," yet it is signified in the English word "as." Take the passage in Matt. xxiii. 37—"Even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings." And here manner must be intended; the figure used demands it. A substitution of the sense which Mr. Crosby would have us attach to διʼ τοῦτον would, in this case, destroy the touching beauty of the figure used by our Lord, and render the passage almost meaningless. It is surprising
that the Prof. gives δν ῥήματον the force of a conjunction. He
neither undertakes to prove that this phrase should never be rendered as our translators have given it to us; nor has he told us what words he would use if he wished to express likeness of manner. And more than all, he seems to have overlooked the words Οὗτος ἐπὶ Ἰησοῦς and ὑπὲρ 
 which stand in immediate connection with the above phrase, and which when allowed their full force render it absolutely necessary that the expression as in our version, "in like manner," should stand as it is. Words stronger and more decisive of the manner in which the advent shall occur, cannot be framed, than are contained in this passage. And the words of Christ and of the apostles are in perfect harmony with this passage, when they speak on the same sub-
ject. Matt. xxvi. 64,—"Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."—CHRIST. 1 Thess. iv. 16—
"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 together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord."—PAUL.
Now, what strange infatuation has overtaken men, when they undertake to rob these words of their plain and literal import! The Scriptures do not fail to inform us, in the most unequivocal language, of the manner of the Ασ-
cension, with its peculiar circumstances; of the manner of the Descension, when it shall occur, and of the ascension of the saints when it shall occur, with all their peculiar circumstances; and throughout all these narrations we observe a most particular coincidence of manner and circumstances avowed. The Lord himself is to descend from heaven, and the saints are to be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.

Mr. Crosby adds, that "the apostles oftenspeak of this coming, as of a single event, and one familiar to their thoughts and expectations." This also he sustains with nearly two pages of bare texts of Scripture, such as Heb. ix. 28; Tit. ii. 13; Col. iii. 4, &c. Their frequent use of the word "day" to denote the time of his coming, or of events associated with it, is illustrative of the same point as 1 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. v. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 7, &c. He concludes this, his first proposition, by remarking that the frequent use of the terms Ἀποκάλυψης, (revelation,) Ἐπιφάνεια, (appearing) and Ἡμέρας, (coming) with reference to the second advent, is particularly significant, occurring, as they do, more than a score of times in the Gospels and Epistles, as in 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7, &c. "Significant," truly. But this significance the Prof.'s eye is not keen enough to penetrate, or he would not be found afterwards attaching so in-significant a sense to these terms.

However, according to our judgment, the citations made by our author confirm his first proposition. We
have no idea that the Scriptures, even in a solitary instance, by figure or by accommodation, speak of more than two comings of Christ. Would that those who hold to a future coming of Christ could see that this is the scriptural and of course the only tenable ground to occupy in order consistently and effectively to repel the arguments of such men as our author. We are aware that some may think that Mr. Crosby's fundamental error lies in this his very first proposition; but this is far from being our impression. We believe that the terms Παρούσια, (coming) Ἐπιφάνεια, (appearing) and Ἀποκάλυψις, (revelation) are always used in the New Testament in a specific and not in a generic designation. The association of the definite article with these terms would seem to point to a definite coming. (See 1 Cor. xv; 1 Thess. iv; Matt. xxiv; 2 Thess. ii. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4; James v. 7, 8; 1 John ii. 28.) The description of events connected with this coming is uniformly the same; and the very evident fact that the disciples themselves in all their inquiries in relation to this coming seemed to think and to speak of but a single coming, is sufficient to satisfy us that there can be no third or fourth or fifth coming as some would intimate. True, no coming of Christ is designated as his "second coming," with a single exception in Heb. ix. 28; but is not this one example enough to satisfy any candid inquirer after the truth that the apostle intended to teach a limited number of such comings? If any, however, are
disposed to destroy the force of ἐκ δευτέρου, (the second time) in this passage, by asserting that it does not necessarily mean the "second time," that it may have the sense of "again," we shall only reply that it is easy enough to offer philological criticisms on words that stand in the way of the support of a particular speculation, but not so easy to show their consistency. There is just as good reason for supposing that ἐκ δευτέρου, (the second time) in Heb. ix. 28, should be rendered as our translators have done, as to suppose that the same phrase, recorded in Mark xiv. 72, is correctly translated, and that the cock crew twice on the occasion of Peter's denying his master, according to the prediction "before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice."

Let us now pass to a consideration of our author's next proposition, which is:

II. "That with the second coming of Christ the Scriptures associate the end of the world, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment."

Agreed, agreed, we say, let the issue be what it may. This proposition is fully sustained by numerous and appropriate references from Scripture. Thus in Matt. xxiv. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 3, the second advent is associated with the end of the world. In John v. 28; 1 Thess. iv. 15; Phil. iii. 20, the second advent is associated with the resurrection of the dead, and a corresponding change of the living. In Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31, 2 Thess. i. 6, the second advent
is associated with the judgment and its awards. In John vi. 39, 40, xi. 24, the end of the world is associated with the resurrection. In Matt. xiii. 49, the end of the world is associated with the judgment. In John v. 28, 29; Rev. xx. 13, the resurrection is associated with the judgment. We leave it to those who dissent from this position, to show its falsity, being satisfied ourselves of its soundness, and therefore are willing to allow, that if it can be proved that the coming of Christ the judgment or any of their associated events are in the past, then all are in the past. On the other hand, if it can be shown that one of these events is in the future, then it must be confessed that they are all in the future; and we hope that the sum of our reasoning will contribute towards the conviction that one and all of them are yet to come.

Thus far now, in the main, we have kept side by side with the Professor, and heartily responded aye to his first two propositions, because we have believed them to be in strict accordance with Scripture; but we must now part company, for he has become unscriptural, as will appear from his next proposition, which is:

III. "That our Saviour both variously intimates and even expressly declared that his second coming (with its associate events) would take place before the death of some who were then living."

We have looked the discussion of this proposition through several times, in order to ascertain whether the Prof. at-
tempts to show that Christ ever seemed to allude to the occurrence of any other event than that of his coming during the lifetime of some to whom he then spake; but we can find no such attempt. His insertion therefore in his proposition of the phrase "with its associate events," which he puts in a parenthesis, is only the inference from what he connects with that coming. Supposing that Christ taught his second coming before the death of some who were then living, he takes it for granted that if Christ did so come, then the events with which the Scriptures associate that coming did thus transpire. We admit that it is a fair inference drawn from our author's last proposition, that if Christ did come, as supposed, then those events did, in like manner, take place in connection with that coming; though great strength would be added to the theory of a past advent, could it be shown by reasoning independent of that which respects the coming of Christ, that these "associate events" did also occur at the same time. We do not like to peril the issue of those highly important "associate events" upon the Prof.'s argumentation respecting a single event. We suggest whether he is not bound to take broader ground, and to prove by reasoning upon each event separately considered, that they have one and all transpired. If it be easy to prove that the main event has occurred, it is just as easy to prove that they have one by one occurred. It is presumptive evidence to our minds, that our Lord meant to teach no such thing as Mr. Crosby supposes from
the language "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," (Matt. xvi. 28,) from the fact that he makes no allusion, as generally himself and his disciples do in such cases, to any associate events of this coming. We do not believe that our Lord meant to teach by these words that he would come again during the lifetime of some of those who heard them. The probabilities are decidedly against such a supposition. He had only once or twice before hinted, and that in the most casual and obscure manner, of ever leaving them. They had, up to this time, no conception of what awaited him. In a word, it was not until after his being taken up from them, that they looked for his return in any sense. Nor do we think that by the above words he meant to say that either himself or his kingdom should come spiritually within the space alluded to; for this reason, if for no other, that if his kingdom be a spiritual one only, then why had not that kingdom as much come ages before his own advent, during the lifetime of multitudes of holy prophets and righteous men,—yea, while he himself speaking, and the deaf were hearing, the lame were walking, the dead were rising, the poor were having the gospel preached unto them, and thousands upon thousands were listening with admiration to his own and the communications of his apostles? How may it be said that his kingdom came at his crucifixion, at the destruction of Jerusalem and the abrogation of the Mosaic dispensation, or at
the day of Pentecost, in a sense any more perfect than it may be said that it came at any prior destruction of the Jewish temple, or prior calamity of the Jewish people;—at any subsequent period of the overthrow of anti-Christian powers,—in the event of the Reformation under Luther, or in the signal effusion of the Holy Spirit in modern times? With such an understanding of the coming of Christ, it would be difficult to decide when Christ began to come, or when he would cease to come, or to determine what is not a coming of Christ. We think that the Saviour speaks of two kingdoms, and makes a distinction between the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory. This is too evident, perhaps, to argue. It is to this latter kingdom that he refers in the above passage, and of this kingdom he did give his disciples a miniature exhibition some six or eight days afterwards, as the Evangelist immediately relates, as if in apprehension of misconception on the part of the reader, when, taking Peter and James and John, he went up into a mountain and was transfigured before them, and his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can whiten them; and there appeared unto them Moses with Elias, and they were talking with Jesus. (Matt. xvii. 1,—.) This manifestation of Christ, and of Moses and Elias, did beautifully and powerfully represent the visible kingdom of Christ, as it shall be when it shall actually come. And now let us see how these disciples themselves regarded this transaction. By a reference to
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2 Pet. i. 16—18, it appears that this apostle afterwards spoke of this scene on the mount as "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," and of which he had himself been an "eye-witness" when "with him in the holy mount." And as our author has not invalidated the received chronology of the Book of Revelation, we suppose that since John, another of the number to whom the Saviour addressed the aforesaid language, often speaks of a coming of Christ as yet future, even after Jerusalem's overthrow, that neither himself nor his fellow, Peter, had ever seen such a coming of Christ in his kingdom as they expected from the frequent representation of prophets and of their Master.

At all events, if these disciples expected the coming of Christ in their day, it is certain, from Peter's language just quoted, that he regarded that coming as having occurred, not when and where Mr. Crosby imagines, but at the time of the transfiguration, and on the mount.

Again, Mr. Crosby considers the remark of our Saviour to Peter, in respect to John, (John xxi. 22,) "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" as an intimation that John would not die before Christ's second coming; and he regards the fact of John's having lived (perhaps alone of all the disciples) to see the destruction of Jerusalem and the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, as proof that Christ did so come. Now it is by the most remote implication possible that such an inference may be drawn from these words of the Saviour. The Prof. has
fallen into the same mistake that the disciples made; they inferred from this language that John was not to die, but was to live to see his Lord come; and Prof. Crosby infers from it that this disciple did live to witness this event; whereas the Evangelist, as if in anticipation of Mr. Crosby's error, and certainly with the knowledge that the hearers of our Lord on this occasion had formed a wrong judgment respecting the destiny of John, plainly and positively declares that "Jesus said not unto him 'He shall not die,' but, IF I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" A very hypothetical case indeed, and our Lord intended to make it so, for the very purpose of reflecting severely upon the curious and meddlesome disposition of Peter.

Another particular in our Saviour's discourses in this connection, says our author, is that of the association of his coming, with events which were manifestly fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. By this we presume the Prof. means to argue, that since Christ, in Matt. xxiv. 1—3, refers to the overthrow of Jerusalem, and to the signs of his coming and of the end of the world, that therefore he meant to be understood as teaching that these two last events would take place simultaneously with that of the first mentioned event. The disciples, he states, so understood that these events would be cotemporaneous. Now how plain it is, that since the disciples connected these events together in their inquiries, that therefore our Lord could not do
otherwise than answer those inquiries in the order of their proposal; and it is illogical hence to conclude that the Saviour would intimate that all these events were to occur at the same time. The disciples "expected" that they would so occur; they associated "these events together," &c., "and the Saviour never corrected this impression if it were false!" And so they expected and associated events and cherished many false impressions which our Lord never undertook to remove. It was not until after the resurrection of our Saviour that his disciples understood any of the allusions which he had made to them respecting his death and burial. This, therefore, though it were proved that the disciples did expect the coming of Christ at the time of Jerusalem's overthrow, by no means proves that Christ taught his coming at that time. There would be some plausibility for this view, if Christ in any other instance, and the apostles in any instance, refer to these events in connection. It was perfectly natural for the disciples to associate these events together. When Christ predicted the destruction of the city, it is not probable that they supposed that Jerusalem was to be overthrown by a special judgment, or that it was to fall before the world's final catastrophe!

Again, Mr. Crosby considers the general character of the replies of Christ to questions proposed by his disciples, and of other statements respecting the time of his coming and kingdom, as proof that this, his second coming, did occur as aforesaid. The principal texts which he refers to are the
following, which he says imply at least, that though his coming was not immediately at hand, yet it was not afar off: Matt. x. 23, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come." But we respectfully ask Mr. Crosby's attention to the words ἐως ἄν ἐλθῃ ὁ νῦν ἁγιασμοῦ, (until the Son of Man be come,)—terms signifying progress, as in a journey. Now it is very surprising if the Saviour meant by this that he would come in his kingdom or make his glorious manifestation; for, up to this hour, Christ had not intimated one word to his disciples respecting his departure from them, with the exception of a hint, which certainly they did not comprehend, recorded in Matt. ix. 15, "The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." The context shows that our Lord was now speaking to his disciples about going forth to preach the gospel, not to the "Gentiles," or "Samaritans," but to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" in doing which he forewarns them that they shall meet with persecution; but counsels them how to conduct under their afflictions, and encourages them to patience and perseverance, from the fact that ere they should have passed over their prescribed circuit, the Son of Man should follow them,—should overtake them in the execution of the same mission. And hence the pertinency of what follows,—"The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord," &c., as though he had said, our trials will be
mutual; you will experience no affliction in the discharge of your duties which will not, in like manner, befall me. Such was the method by which Christ made known his gospel. John the Baptist was his forerunner, and the apostles and the seventy were sent before him to stir up public attention, and to prepare the minds of the people to hear him when he should appear among them. (See Matt. x. 1—; Luke x. 1—.) But more, the Prof. will not say that Christ came in the sense which he himself intends, before the gospel was preached, not throughout all the cities of Israel, much less throughout the world, as Christ declared in Matt. xxiv. 14, that it should be, before the end. His argument here, therefore, proves too much, and hence falls to the ground.

And as to the parable in Luke xix. 11, which our Lord spake because his disciples thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear, why, we ask, if it was as near at that time as Mr. Crosby supposes, did our Lord deem it his duty, not only to speak a parable, but also immediately prior to his ascension, to speak without a parable, in the plainest possible manner, for the purpose of correcting this expectation of his speedy coming, and assuring his disciples that the time for the restitution of the kingdom was no concern of theirs. The parable is couched in language that is designed to correct their anticipations. He spoke a parable, "because they thought," as they beheld him riding in triumph into Jerusalem, and supposed, perhaps, that this
was now the appointed season for the coming of the kingdom, or for his inauguration as king, that the kingdom of God should immediately appear,—" he said, therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. * * And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom," &c. It is clear from this parable that the kingdom of glory was not to be introduced until Christ's return, and that Christ was not to return until he had been into a "far country," and until a "long time" had elapsed. Can it be, then, that the Saviour would on this, and still on another occasion, have checked a hope which at all events was to occur within the period of about two score years? If his coming was to take place within this space of time, was it not immediately at hand? Should we not all so regard it, and so speak of it, if we were persuaded that it were at this moment but forty years in the future?

Our author concludes his third proposition with the bold avowal that "Christ expressly declared that the generation then upon earth would not pass away before the fulfilment of certain great events, of which his second coming was one." This, indeed, is one of the main hinges on which the Prof. works his whole theory. We readily allow, that when our Lord said "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," he had been speaking of the overthrow of the Temple, of the signs of his second advent, and of the end of the world; for in vain shall we search...
for a passage in proof of his second coming if it be not found in Matt. xxiv. 30. Mr. Crosby disposes very summarily of the various expositions which commentators have given of the text just quoted, and repudiates the renderings which such men as Cunningham, Bush, and others have given of the phrase ἐως ἄν πάντα τὰντὰ γένηται, viz: are fulfilling, or begin to be fulfilled, and prefers to understand by ἡ γένεα αὐτή not as some lexicographers have translated it, "the same generation," i.e. the same generation witnessing the last of the signs enumerated, but the race of people living in the time of Christ. However great a difficulty this text of Scripture may seem to some, to our theory or exposition of Matt. xxiv., it presents a greater difficulty still as understood by Mr. Crosby, to his theory. He cannot reconcile his understanding of this text with the general drift of the chapter. If it be easy to interpret the text as Mr. Crosby does, it is harder yet to harmonize many other verses in this chapter with this text, as taught by him. We suggest, that when the Saviour used the phrase, "all these things," he might have been understood by some tone or gesture, which of course cannot be made to appear in the sacred record, to refer exclusively to the overthrow of the Temple? Jesus had first directed their attention to what they saw around them, and he begins his discourse with these significant words,—"See ye not "all these things?" the very phrase that occurs in the passage now under consideration; and the next that we
hear is, the disciples inquiring of him, "Tell us, when shall 'these things' be?" meaning by "these things" the overthrow of the Temple, a question distinct from those which follow, at least in the mind of Christ,—"And what shall be the sign of thy coming—and of the end of the world?"

Consequently, when the Saviour says "This generation," &c., it appears to us that the disciples were prepared to give the explication which their Master intended to his words, viz:—to the destruction of the Temple or city only. Be this as it may, we feel that some other construction must be placed upon this text than that which Mr. Crosby gives it; not because his interpretation, we hope, spoils our theory, but because it is more consistent with the rules of hermeneutics and common sense, to interpret a single text of Scripture by many texts, than to interpret many passages by a single passage. Now Prof. Crosby takes it for granted that he has the correct understanding of the 34th verse of Matt. xxiv., and that the language "this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled," refers to each of the previously mentioned events; and from this concludes that Christ did come, and the end of the world did occur at that time. Here, now, is a skeptic, or a Jew, a hater of Christ, who gravely asserts that Christ predicted many things that never came to pass, among others that of his second advent before the death of some who were then living. Would it now satisfy an unbelieving Jew, or any other unbeliever, to assert that since Christ said that he
should come during the lifetime of some then living, that, therefore, he must have so come. Nay, he would indignantly reply, I demand proof that he did come as he foretold, and that he came—the "signs" of his predicted coming having each and all in their order been witnessed, and the circumstances one and all in their order having been just as he predicted. And now, though we have unbounded confidence in our Lord's veracity, yet we must demand other proof that Christ did come as supposed. If this can be furnished, and Mr. Crosby or any body else can show that all the events of Matt. xxiv. had their fulfilment during the lifetime of the men of that generation, then, of course, the point is gained, and we are in a sad state of error. But unfortunately for Mr. Crosby, he nowhere attempts to show, as we shall see, except in the most vague and general manner, that Christ did so come as he himself had represented that he would come, that the end of the world did occur, and the judgment did take place, during that generation. We are, therefore, still justified in looking for Christ, and for the fulfilment of all the signs and circumstances under which he promised his disciples that he would come; saying again, that it is more rational to suppose that Mr. Crosby misinterprets Matt. xxiv. 34, than to suppose that all the preceding verses have had a fulfilment.

We come now to the Professor's next, and as we hold it, in fact, last proposition, which is:

IV. "The apostles evidently expected that the second
coming of Christ, with its associate events, would take place before the death of some who were then living.”

This, however, if it were proved, which it is not by any means, at least in the work before us, argues nothing. But our author means to intimate that they so taught! This is a vital question, affecting, as we conceive, their pretensions to inspiration; for, prove to us that they so taught, and with our understanding of other portions of the Scriptures, and of the past, we should be forced to renounce our confidence in them as inspired men; for, convict the apostles of a misstatement in a single instance, and doubt and suspicion will at once gather around all their declarations. But we feel no apprehension of such a result; nor do we for a moment imagine that they taught as our author asserts. Let us see.

He says that there are passages directly asserting or implying that some of the apostles, or some of those whom they addressed, would survive until these “events.” Here he quotes, as in point, such texts as the following: 1 Cor. xv. 51, — “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.” Also 1 Thess. iv. 15,—“We who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.” This particular and emphatic style of the sacred writer, using, as he does, the first person plural, Mr. Crosby contends, is equivalent to saying that those whom he then addressed should not die, but should live to see the Lord come at the resurrection. But we contend that Paul meant to convey no such impression, from
the fact that those to whom he wrote did die; and that since they died, Christ could not have come in their day. But let us hear him through. He asks, "If a pastor using such expressions as these to his people from his pulpit or by letter,—'We shall not all die,' &c., would not be understood as believing in the speedy coming of Christ." We answer, not necessarily. This language is and has been used from the pulpit, and in the chamber of mourning, a thousand times, without its either having been intended or received as having an immediate personal bearing; and it might with propriety, and in quite an emphatic manner, be used by one who knew not when the time is for the resurrection, and who is addressing those who are in like manner ignorant, and suppose that this event may occur at any hour, as it is most probable that the Corinthian and Thessalonian brethren conjectured until their opinions were corrected. With our understanding of the Scriptures, and with our anticipations, the language of the apostles in these examples, is just what we do use, and what every believing pastor should use. But the case of an inspired apostle and of an uninspired preacher is not analogous. When the latter preaches or writes, it is for the particular benefit of a single congregation; but when the former speaks or writes, it is for the benefit of the entire church throughout the world during all time to come. Mr. Crosby mistakes when he supposes that the Scriptures were intended to apply solely to those whose names they bear. We know, at least, that
the Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Colossians were intended for others than the Thessalonians and the Colossians. See 1 Thess. v. 27, Col. iv. 16. And from the nature of the case we infer that all Scripture was designed for the church and the world throughout all time. We must so suppose, or the Bible has no application to us. It is an antiquated, obsolete book, whose light was created for and expired with people that have long since perished from the earth. Rob the Bible of one class of truths, say its doctrines and the hopes which it furnishes were intended exclusively for a past generation, and consistency requires that you take from it also all its promises, laws and precepts, which it is just as evident were never spoken or written primarily for us; and then what becomes of all who have lived for eighteen hundred years, having believed that the Bible was God's book to them, and have governed their conduct and cherished their hopes accordingly. Poor deluded beings! they have been consulting and praying over an old legend in which they should not have taken one particle of personal interest. And as for ourselves, where is our position in the word of God; since it was all addressed either to nations, cities, churches, or individuals long since extinct, and of whom, of course, we formed no part. We find no letter in it addressed to the church of New York, or Boston—to no individual called Alpheus Crosby, or to any other person of modern times—a curious old chronicle of the lives of old patriarchs and saints.
What a curious old book that must be under the eye of Mr. Crosby, if he keeps it in any corner of his library. When he looks into the Old Testament, there peers up, first and foremost, before his mental vision, the venerable, dark-visaged form of some descendant of Abraham, with the blessing or curse of God enstamped upon his forehead. And when he opens the new Testament, lo, and behold, the Jewish capitol, the Jewish capitol, the Jewish capitol, in every record of the Evangelists, and in every epistle of the apostles, the Jewish capitol, in all its magnificence and splendor. Start not! It is about to be laid in ruins! And hence Christ came to earth, and hence the commission of the twelve and of the seventy, and hence all this wonderful ado made by the Christians living in those times!! Wonderful event! How grateful we ought to be for the Bible, which contains such a full and accurate record concerning this extraordinary people — the Jews — now so hated and abhorred by all nations; and of that glorious city, Jerusalem, now trodden down by the foot of the impious followers of the Arabian prophet! All honor and gratitude to ye, ye ancient scribes and seers, Moses, Job, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, Jonah, Joel, Amos, Micah, Hosea, Nahum, Isaiah, Zephaniah, Habakuk, Jeremiah, Obadiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi, and ye, too, illustrious apostles of later times, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter, and Jude, for well have ye performed your parts, faithfully
sketching and preserving for us the history of the Jews, and signally verifying all your dark sayings, in the capture and overthrow of their city!! Soberly, such is the import of our author's explications of the Word of God. And what a limited, insignificant view it affords of all the "burdens" of the Word of the Lord communicated by prophets, and the discourses and epistles of apostles. What an extravagant expense it exhibits of the treasures of heaven and earth, bestowed upon a single nation, or a few scattered congregations of Christian believers in and about Palestine eighteen hundred years ago. What a total unmindfulness it is, to accuse Jehovah of,—that he raised up and multiplied prophets and apostles for ages and ages, and never bethought himself of the millions of unborn sons and daughters destined to love his name and obey his laws! Surely we are without hope or consolation, for ourselves or for others, if our author be right. But he is not right. The Bible, the blessed Bible is our book, and the book of our children, written for us and for them, and it shall be our counsellor, our comforter, our day-star.

It was not the design of Paul, as it appears in his epistle either to the Corinthians or to the Thessalonians, to show the time so much as the certainty of the resurrection, as a matter of consolation to the Thessalonians, who "mourned the loss of their departed friends as though the grave would hold them for ever, and Christ would forget them when he came to change the living saints and to receive them to him-
This is evident, particularly in relation to the Thessalonian letter. Among other things, from the fact that he felt himself called upon to correct an impression which the Thessalonians had received either from his first epistle or from some epistle that had been ascribed to him, that "the day of the Lord was at hand." Indeed, the apostle had attempted to guard the minds of these brethren against imbibing this erroneous conviction, before concluding his first epistle to them, by using this very language, — "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you." 1 Thess. v. 1. And then he writes them a second epistle, for the purpose of completely banishing from their minds every expectation of a speedy coming of Christ; and to this end enumerates certain great events which were to transpire before the coming of Christ and the resurrection. Again we ask, would it have been natural for Paul so to have written? — would he have hastened to correct the error of the Thessalonians in this respect, providing he supposed or taught that Christ would come during the lifetime of the then disciples of Christ? — would we deem it an error of such serious importance as to require immediate correction, if any to whom we minister were entertaining a belief which we knew to be true, that Christ would come, not to-morrow, perhaps, or five years hence, but some time within the natural period of the lives of our hearers? I think not. And yet, although our Lord and Paul again and again caution their hearers against a prema-
ture anticipation of the end of the world, or the second coming of the Son of Man, the former, both some time before and immediately prior to his ascension, and the latter some twenty years afterwards, some there are who will insist upon it, that both Christ and his apostles taught that the second advent and its kindred events were to and did take place during the lifetime of the men of that generation. Stranger still, that when Christ had said to his disciples,—“Ye know not when the time is,” and “of that day and hour knoweth no man,” or maketh known, if this be liked better, that Mr. Crosby should teach that the apostles did know, and did make known the time of the consummation. No: When Paul spake, he spake in the language of men,—as men speak when fired with their theme;—he spake to men whose hopes were bright and glowing, and to whom the sleep of death would be but as a brief and gentle dream before the desired morning should come. Let others have anticipated as they might, it is certain that Paul expected to be laid in the tomb; for well is it known that it was the whole ambition of his life to attain unto the resurrection of the dead. See Phil. iii. 11. And others, if they believed Paul, had no ground to expect anything less than death for themselves; for Paul had said to them—“And to you who are troubled, rest with us,” &c. : 2 Thess. i. 7, —language almost amounting to a declaration that himself and the Thessalonians would all die. And as to the “emphatic pronoun” of the Prof., it proves nothing, since the same
pronoun is expressed in some instances, as for example in 1st Corinthians, xv. 52, 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17; but in other places where the language is equally as emphatic, it is not used. Compare, for example, 1 Cor. ii. 1, 3, with verse 2d of the same chapter: indeed, compare 1 Cor. xv. 51 with verse 52 of the same chapter, and it will be observed that the pronoun ἡμεῖς (we) is expressed in the 52d verse, but not expressed in verse 51. And so it will be found that Paul adheres to no usage in relation to the "emphatic pronoun."

We are indebted to another for this exposure of one of the Prof.'s weak points. More: the pronoun "we" would include Paul as well as those to whom he wrote; and therefore, according to Mr. Crosby's reasoning, Paul meant to say by the language, "We shall not all sleep," that he himself should not die; but it is positively certain, from other language, that he did expect to die, and to have a part in the resurrection of the dead. See Phil. iii. 11. Hence our friend puts altogether too much stress upon the emphatic pronoun.

Our author again refers, in proof of his position, to passages expressing continuance until these events, such as 1 Tim vi. 14, — "That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." But the apostle could not have used different phraseology, if he were writing for the ministry in future ages as well as for the benefit of his son Timothy. Our Lord kept his disciples measurably in the dark respect-
ing his second advent, with the exception of such light as might be drawn by them from certain "signs" which he enumerated; and he made it their duty to "watch" for his re-appearing, as though it might occur in their day. His reason for so doing we shall shortly see. Paul, of course, must imitate his Master in this respect. He did so. He spake of events which were to intervene, and to indicate the return of Christ to earth, while at the same time he enjoined the duty of watchfulness with relation to this event. Besides, the second coming of Christ was the apostle's terminus of every thing. He did not suppose that the entire hopes of the faithful were to be consummated at death. He must have often felt as though he were addressing those who were soon to sleep in death; and yet he never draws from death a motive to watchfulness, diligence, patience, or any other grace. With him there was one great, all-inspiring truth by which he sought to move and arouse to diligence, zeal, fidelity — it was the return of Christ to earth, when he himself and all the devoted followers of Christ should receive their crowns of life. See 2 Tim. iv. 8, and 1 Pet. v. 4. And the preaching and the motives used by every minister of Christ, at the present day, in order to originate like fruits, ought to be of a similar stamp. "Being confident that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. i. 6. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole
spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.’” 1 Thess. v. 23. We love this language—we can feel the force of it—we pray that the work of Christ may go on in us, and that our entire man, spirit, soul, and body, may be preserved (τηνθανάτον) Mr. Crosby, not kept alive, as you intimate, but watched over, kept, guarded, though the body become a prisoner of the grave, unto the coming of our glorious Deliverer to present us to God the Father, “without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.” And who can tell but the work of God is continued in the soul of the believer in the interim of the sleep of the dead and the resurrection morning? Who can tell! Aye, who doubts that the saint does progress in holiness and knowledge unto the day when he puts on his glorified body, and is perfect, entire, wanting nothing; and is presented by the Son to the Father, with exceeding great joy, so as to render the language of “confidence” expressed by Paul relative to “the work of God until the day of Jesus Christ,” full of propriety and significance.

The Prof. refers again to passages in which the apostles speak of their own times as the last days, and finds in them the predicted signs of these days. Such, for example, as the special outpouring of the Spirit predicted by Joel, and applied by Peter to the day of Pentecost; also the appearance of false teachers, prophesied by our Saviour in Matt. xxiv. 24, by Paul in 1 Tim. iv. 1, and by John in 1 John ii. 18, &c. It is admitted that some of the signs
predicted in this connection did begin to manifest themselves in the days of Christ and of his apostles; but the Prof. would find it difficult to show that they had all appeared as foretold in their days. The fulfilment of Joel's prophecy on the day of Pentecost, was the fulfilment of but a single prophecy; nor was there but a single item of his prophecy which was fulfilled on this occasion, viz.: the outpouring of the Spirit. But one of the events predicted by Paul, as recorded in 2 Thess. ii., had begun to manifest itself in his day. Supposing, however, that all these "signs" did appear during the lifetime of the apostles, or of the disciples, let our author show that they were not still manifest after their time — after Jerusalem's overthrow — that they have not just as fully, yea, more vividly, been exhibited repeatedly since, — that they are not now, at this very moment, glaring in our eyes! The event connected with the Pentecost was but a beginning of Joel's prophecy. The Spirit is yet outpoured upon all flesh. Paul's "man of sin," "mystery of iniquity," has acquired a venerable age, and is yet in our midst. His victims of seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, who speak lies in hypocrisy, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, are here, and there, and every where. The New Testament mirrored them forth eighteen hundred years ago; and the Prof., as he is not an inattentive observer of men and things, must have often been reminded of the faithfulness of the delineation. And as to John's "antichrist," or "antichrists,"
that had appeared in his day, denying "that Jesus is the Christ," and denying "the Father and the Son," we would like to ask, if "even now" there are not "many anti-
christ?" So that, though Mr. Crosby puts the end of the world at the desolation of Jerusalem, these characters, which were to mark the end, still survive in spite of him, and are more rampant than ever. And our author himself is proof that the last times are not yet out, as he may see by turning to 1 Thess. v. 8, to Matt. xxiv. 48, and particularly to 2 John 7v., where inspiration seems to have had a special eye on him, if the criticism be a just one, which Rev. Messrs. Cunningham, Brooks, Imbrie and others have made upon ἑχθροιν ἐν σαρκί, not ἔληλυθεν, "has come," as in 1 John iv. 2, but the coming one in the flesh, a present participle, requiring the sense of a participle in the future tense. This criticism would require the text to be read thus: "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is coming in the flesh." These deceivers made their appearance about A.D. 90, if Archbishop Usher's chronology is to be relied upon, and of course many years after Mr. Crosby's end of the world. Alas, we have too many sad evidences, daily and hourly, that the "last days," the "last times," are not yet out. We dispute not that the apostles use these chronological terms as though they had a solemn reference to themselves; but so they used every thing — every word of Christ and of his prophets had to them an awful significance.
as they will have on the mind of every honest and pious man. But, we say again, neither Christ, nor prophets, nor apostles, wrote or taught for the church of their day alone, and much that they spake they must have foreseen would be as applicable to future generations as to the men of their generation. Some of the evils or signs to which they allude in proof of or as peculiar to the last times, may refer more particularly to the period in which they wrote or spoke; while others may have a more special allusion to periods which were to come in the history of the world and of the church. But we are not hastily to conclude that all these predicted indications of the "last times" came and vanished during the lifetime of the disciples of Christ. If we turn to 2 Tim. iii. 1, we shall find the apostle, notifying Timothy of certain "perilous times" in connection with the "last days." Only about four years, according to the received chronology, were now intervening to the desolation of Jerusalem. Now let the whole of this description of Paul be carefully read; and let it be particularly observed, that almost all the characteristics of the "last days" are associated with professions of piety. We affirm that such moral characteristics as are here defined, could not then generally, nor immediately after Jerusalem's overthrow, apply to professing Christians; though some had already begun to betray a spirit which was in danger of conducting them to such stages of wickedness as this language of Paul depicts. And we suppose that Paul was warning Timothy of what was to occur among
those who were the professed disciples of Christ, and for whom Timothy labored in word and doctrine. James, too, exhorts to patience under the crushing oppression of the avaricious who had "heaped treasures together for the 'last days,'" drawing his motive to patience from the fact that "the Judge standeth before the door," &c. But did he intend, or rather, did the Holy Ghost intend this epistle solely for the strangers scattered abroad throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia? If so, why the exhortation to "long patience?" Why this allusion to Job's patience, as though their afflictions were to be both extreme and protracted? Ah, the oppressions of those "strangers" were but the beginning of sorrows which other pilgrims and strangers have experienced for nearly two thousand years.

And what, too, was the fact in the case? Did the disciples who survived unto Jerusalem's overthrow, receive crowns of righteousness, as Paul expected he and his brethren would at the coming of Christ? Did believers have bestowed upon them eternal life, as Christ promised all believers at his coming? or did the Christians find relief from under the hands of their oppressors? It is notorious that this event was the occasion of much suffering to them, and that they were the objects of Roman persecution for more than two centuries afterwards; which fact is proof sufficient to our minds that the Saviour did not then come, as supposed by some. Nor did the Holy Ghost design
the epistle of James for those only whose superscription it bears. And thus we might go on descanting upon the terms "the last days," "the last times," and show that they do not necessarily mark a time near or remote, but simply a future time. They are not, therefore, to be applied exclusively to the apostolic times, nor to the extremity of the times of Christianity; but they are designed to cover all the interval of time between the first and the second advents; though in some instances they doubtless refer more especially to the very last of the times of this world's history; as in 1 Pet. i. 5, we have the peculiar expression ἐν τελευταίας ἡμέρας. i. e. in the last time; and in 2 Pet. iii. 3, ἐν τελευταίας ἡμέρας, i. e. the last of the days, or, as Dr. McKnight thinks, "perhaps the last part of the world's duration." If now it be thought strange that the apostles should speak of their days as being the "last days," or of its being but a "little while and he that shall come will come," (Heb. x. 37) all we have to say is, that it was not more singular that Paul should use this language, than that the prophet Isaiah should say, with reference to an event which was at least seven hundred years in the future, if indeed he did not refer to the glorious millennial reign, "Is it not a very little while, and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest," (Isa. xxix. 17;) and Haggai, "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth * * and the
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desire of all nations shall come," (Hag. ii. 6, 7,) — an event which did not occur till the expiration of more than five hundred years. Our idea is, then, from this investigation, that the signs which were to mark the "last days" were to appear as foretold, and to increase in vividness and distinctness until these days should fully end.

In further proof that the coming of Christ was to take place before the death of some who were then living, Mr. Crosby cites the texts which speak of "waiting" and "looking" for this event. And here we will inform the reader that we intentionally omitted to notice the first particular under the third proposition, thinking that it could more appropriately and conveniently be noticed in this connection, viz: that the Saviour's repeated warnings to his disciples, to be constantly watching and ready for his coming, was equivalent to a declaration that he would so come before the death of some who were then living. We grant, of course, that the early disciples were thus admonished; but our inference from this fact differs materially from that of Prof. Crosby. Our Lord taught watchfulness; but he gave his hearers signs which they were to observe as indications of that coming. He did not mean to teach them that he would come before such signs had been seen; they were to watch for the signs and to regulate their hopes accordingly. Does not the Prof. well understand? We will not ask the question, for he gives us ample evidence of the fact, yea, he seems to enter into the very pith of the
terms signifying to "look" and "wait" for Christ; he is aware that the terms relate both to the mind and to the heart — that they relate more to hope than they do to faith — that they involve and literally signify longing desire; "looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life," i. e., waiting to receive kindly, as a man waits to receive his guest, with kindly and joyous feelings: as Nicodemus waited for the kingdom of God: and as Simeon waited for the consolation of Israel. "From whence, also, we look έπειδὴ κράτει θέλειν for the Saviour," i. e., wait for, or expect, with desire. "And to wait for his son from heaven," a word significant of the same idea. This, then, is the kind of looking and waiting for that Christ and his apostles taught; not a looking that necessarily implies a belief in his immediate coming; but a looking which involves a desire for the occurrence of the event; a spirit that is prepared to welcome his arrival; a longing for the advent, such as Job, and Daniel, and Paul, cherished, and such as every real disciple of Christ ought to have burning in his heart like live coals of fire, until the glorious object of his hope is present to his vision. Because a man may see, as he supposes, events yet to occur before the Lord's re-appearing, it does not follow that he may not be in the very attitude specified by Christ and his apostles. Who was ever a more enthusiastic lover of the Lord's coming than was Paul; and yet he foresaw that certain other events must first ensue, and that he must first sleep in
death before he should welcome his Lord to earth. At the present day the hearts of thousands bound with delight at the very thought of once more seeing their Lord, who do not expect to see him in their day; but hope is on fire; faith is lively and all-conquering; it annihilates space; and taking its observation from any point on the great current of time, it looks along down through the dark vista of ages to the coming of Christ as an event nigh at hand. The faith of the early disciples and apostles would affect us, if entertained, as it affected them, filling us with unspeakable joy in prospect of the glory to be revealed. And if any of us know what it is, by a blessed experience, to "wait" and to "watch" for the return of our Lord from heaven, it is no longer a matter of surprise to us that it was made the duty both of the early disciples and of all their successors to "look" for Christ.

The remarks which have thus far been made, may equally apply to the remaining particulars of our author's fourth proposition. That the disciples' expectation of the coming of Christ before the death of some who were then living is further evidenced "In precepts, exhortations, consolations, founded upon the nearness of those events: in passages warning against or exposing certain errors, all implying a general expectation of this kind, in such an indifference to worldly interests, to civil and social institutions, and to outward religious forms, as an expectation of this time would naturally inspire; as in the remarkable prominence
given to motives drawn from the nearness of these events; so, even more strikingly, in the no less remarkable absence of motives (now so familiar) drawn from the shortness and uncertainty of life and the approach of death." "Now so familiar!" Yes, lamentably familiar! and familiar because so many, it is to be feared, are occupying the same standpoint of Mr. Crosby; familiar in the mouths of those who no longer heed admonitions designed by the Holy Spirit for them and their hearers, and who find themselves under the necessity of fabricating "motives" in lieu of such as they have been bold enough to cast behind their backs. True, the apostles do not refer to death as a motive to diligence, patience, and the like. And wherefore? Not because the disciples to whom they spake and wrote were to live till the coming of the Lord, or were never to die, for they did die, but because death is an event of minor importance to the coming of Christ. While death has the power of terrifying, the coming of Christ is adapted to stimulate the soul to duty by the joy that it is calculated to create. Death is suggestive of but a single idea. The advent of Christ throws open before us the whole horizon of the world to come, and affords the panting soul a sweet pre-libation of its reserved glories. Had the New Testament writers made death a motive to fidelity, it might have been at the sacrifice of the motive from the consummation. Well do we know, from painful experience, and from a sadder observation, the proneness of men to enslave themselves to the fear of
NOT A PAST EVENT.

death. At the present time, though the Scriptures cannot be regarded as justifying it, some ministers preach and some Christians talk as though "death" were the all-controlling motive-power of Heaven's appointment for maintaining spiritual life and activity. What then might have been the case, yet more generally, had the Holy Spirit not selected the truth for the end proposed? Had the advent of Christ and its associate events, with their corresponding exhortations, been any less prominent in the Scriptures, it is not improbable that the church at this late day would be entirely ignorant of any such future events. And finally, is it the duty of Christians to be any less engaged in the service of their Redeemer, and any less indifferent to worldly interests, because they may not, perchance, expect the consummation of all things in their day? No; when Christians are living as they should, when they realize the shortness of time at the longest, the worth of the soul, and the solemn account that all must render to God for every thought and word and action, we presume that none can feel otherwise than the awful persuasiveness of every injunction of God's word to live a life of sobriety, temperance, chastity, prayer, and holy effort. If anything is calculated to check mirth, subdue pride, melt the heart toward perishing sinners, and arouse all the powers of body and soul in behalf of the cause of God, it is the persuasion of a day of judgment, however remote.
We are now brought to the Professor's fifth proposition, and a most important one it is:

V. "The second coming of Christ, with its associate events—the end of the world, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment—must have already taken place; and all expectation of these events as still future is forbidden by the Scriptures."

As great a proposition as this is, Mr. Crosby disposes of it with a little more than a dozen lines. He calls it a proposition, but he treats it like an inference. Hear him: "The question of time determined, that of mode succeeds!" This is surely a short way to truth! We humbly trust that we have shown that his exposition of time is fallacious; yet upon this fallacy he is about to construct an argument that is of great importance to us. But let this pass. It is as much his duty to show the mode as the time of the fulfilment of these events. Could he show the mode in which they have been fulfilled, his manner of harmonizing the time with the mode might appear plausible. As it is, it is very convenient for him to answer our anxious inquiries, "How have these events taken place?" "In what has consisted the fulfilment of the predictions relating to them?" by coolly replying, "These are questions alike interesting and important; but they open a new and broad field of inquiry into which we cannot now enter. (1) Let it here suffice to ascertain in what direction this field lies. It is needless to say that we
shall search in vain all the volumes of history to find anything like a literal and outward fulfilment of these predictions. Even the predictions of the end of the world or age, which, in its proper sense, has literally come to pass, are too much involved in imagery to be made an exception."!! We are astonished at this language, and yet we ought not to be; we should have expected nothing better; it was necessity that originated it. But while we confess our astonishment at this conclusion of the Prof., many, we will venture to assert, who have read his work, and followed him along to this point with a growing conviction of the tenableness of his positions, will here halt disappointed. They will go with him no further; they will not endorse his notions of time without some fuller and better expose of the mode of the fulfilment of these events. This is not the least interesting feature in this whole discussion. It is easier to persuade men that Christ has come and the judgment is past, than it is to satisfy their understandings and consciences, if they are candid, how these events have taken place. Mr. Crosby’s work is labor lost—his book is radically imperfect, while it lacks the how. A few dashes of his pen will not clear up the difficulty that lies in the way; let him go as minutely and carefully into the other branch of this great question, even if, by so doing, he shall swell his book to thrice its present size; this will be a service which we shall all prize, and which will per-
haps earn him laurels that he has failed to secure by the work as it is. We enter our protest against being left here in the wilderness; we want the sight of something to make us feel at home; we want to feel that we have entered under a roof that will afford some protection for our heads, if the winds should begin to rise and howl, and we should be threatened with remediless desolation; we want to feel, by an exposition of such sublime and momentous passages as the Prof. has recalled in the course of his work, that he has introduced us into the very society of venerable prophets and honored apostles, and that we have conversed with them, as it were, face to face; that we have caught the spirit that glowed in their bosoms as they proclaimed and wrote, and that the soul hitherto agitated and convulsed is now quietly, contentedly, and joyfully responding, "That is it; that is it!" But our author has no farther pity for us. When most we need some man to direct us in the way, when we are bewildered and lost, we look for our faithful friend who has led us along through many a dark ravine, and over many a frightful precipice, with the readiness and boldness of an old Alpine guide, and lo, he has vanished from our sight, leaving us with the consolatory valediction,—"We cannot now enter this new and broad field of inquiry!" No, Mr. Crosby, for the very good reason that you cannot do it now, or at another time, without affording palpable evidence of a defeat. You have conducted us to the regions of mist and night. We are
satisfied that you have not the ability to shed the pure light of truth upon our pathway, even should we proceed farther on the tour with you, that is, were you disposed to extend the invitation. Our way back to our old home is more easily made, than would be a journey alone to that fair abode which you say is somewhere ahead; we therefore bid you a most respectful adieu, intending ourselves a return to the broad, open, luminous field of consistency, common sense, and Holy Writ. Before we do this, however, we will repeat your sixth and last proposition.

VI. "The predictions in the Scriptures of the second coming of Christ, the end of the world, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment, with its awards, must be explained in a figurative or spiritual, rather than a literal sense, and in such a sense as admits an application to what has already taken place."

Another bold inference produced as a proposition, and just about as summarily disposed of as his preceding proposition! Here is the whole gist of his argument in a mustard seed, though we have thought it best to follow him through all his perambulations. Christ and his apostles taught his second coming before the death of some who were then living: therefore, Christ did come; but as it is evident that he did not come literally, he must have come spiritually. And here, too, we are left with our author’s usual balm of consolation,—"Any attempt to determine the precise nature and character of this sense * * * must
involve a careful study of the teachings of the Scriptures in respect to the nature and characteristics of the Messianic dispensation,—that new and glorious kingdom which forms the great subject of the New Testament, and to which the events above named were to constitute the introduction."

Now this is a virtual admission; nay, more, it is a positive assertion that what was spoken and written very plainly and boldly, arousing and electrifying multitudes by its plainness and boldness, and sublimity, was fulfilled in such a manner that we, at least, must look up our very best helps to discern it,—that we must bring our microscopic glasses with lenses of unwonted power to make the discovery; and that the majority of unfortunate readers, of course, who have not the means for a "careful study of the teachings of the Scriptures with respect to the nature and character of the Messianic dispensation," must be content to remain in darkness as to what, in the Messianic dispensation, is to be regarded as the fulfilment of all prophecy! The events of the New Testament, the subject of so much prophecy by Christ, his apostles, and the prophets, constitute the introduction of the Messiah's glorious kingdom, according to our author. Well, it may be owing to some strange obtuseness on our part; but since by straining our eyes very hard we cannot perceive the events at all, it must not be thought surprising if we should fail to find the kingdom any where. The "introduction" is more stirring than the body of the discourse; the porch is more imposing than the edifice; the
prelude is more thrilling than the catastrophe, if Mr. Crosby be correct in his views. But he is so involved in "the drapery," and so hallucinated in the rainbow colors of the "Oriental imagery," that he mistakes shadows for substance. If we had never read such kind of things before, we should be inclined to think that our author was jesting, when we notice him "commending this sort of investigation for the truth to the 'studious,' the 'thinking,' and 'devout,' as presenting most directly the great peculiar problems of Christianity!" Pray tell us, what any one can find in all this to make him devout? We have known many a man to entertain like views who was far from being devout. If the Prof. was ever a devout man, we seriously question whether his new views have added aught to his devoutness. And as to the views which he has not broached, and which we are inclined to guess have no very clear outlines in his own mind, we cannot imagine how they can make a man at all devout, unless the more vague, unintelligible, and mystical a man's views are, the more devout he must be. We want to be devout; but we believe that God has made ample provision for such devoutness in his Word of Truth; and that he who with the most child-like simplicity listens to the Word of God, without qualification, emendation, or subtraction, must become devout. Mr. Crosby may well commend his theory to the consideration of the "thinking" and the "studious." These are the very individuals at whose feet it ought to fall powerless. If the common
reader of the Bible receives this theory it will be on trust. We feel confident that the unsophisticated minds to whom the prophecies were originally directed, never thought of giving them such a construction. We are bold to avow our belief that, in multitudes of instances, where such expositions are given of the Holy Scriptures as our author has adopted, the wish is father to the thought. Men prevaricate, evade, twist, and wrest the plain declarations of God's Word, as they would like to have them stand on the sacred page. Alas! little do they think of the audacity of their work, and of the curse to which thereby they expose their souls.

We have extended this review much beyond our original limits, and here we would stop if we could: but we must proceed a little farther, in order to show the absurdity of our author's principles of interpretation by applying them to some of the principal events in question. We will sit quietly down, and read, in the first place, the second epistle of Peter, and notice him arguing as he does, for the doctrine of the earth's final desolation by fire, in opposition to the assumption of scoffers. This is unquestionably the subject of this epistle. Now Mr. Crosby says that the events of this epistle have been realized. But if this be true, Peter stands convicted of not knowing how to reason, or at least he betrays a great lack of argumentative skill in this case. His object in writing this second epistle to his brethren was to re-affirm, in opposition to mockers who denied, the literal coming of Christ and the destruction of the
earth by fire; and, reasoning from analogy, the apostle shows them that there is good ground to expect such a catastrophe as the world's destruction by fire, by referring to what was perfectly familiar to all their minds, viz.: the overflow and ruin of the old world by water. And then he proceeds minutely to detail the manner in which this thing shall occur:—"The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Pet. iii. 10.) This is the language, not of Isaiah, but of plain Peter, the fisherman, addressed to plain unlettered men like its author, and we protest against the notion that the apostle is speaking in parables or metaphors in answer to scoffers who used no such style of speaking themselves. Scoffers and mockers do not speak metaphorically. What! metaphors answered by metaphors! The only escape from this dilemma is, to deny that the world ever "perished," and then all reasoning any farther ceases.

Next, let us come to the event of the judgment; this, too, is in the past. The general judgment in the past, and the world has not so supposed since it occurred, do not now so suppose, and multitudes of Christians the wide world over are yet expecting it! This is certainly presumptive proof against the idea of a judgment in our rear. But "it is in the past," it is resolutely held. Then what is to be done with the self-evident fact, that justice is not meted
out here, either by God or man, according to equity? and with that other fact, "the instinctive apprehension in the bosoms of all men of a future, literal, visible judgment, which consciousness has exerted more or less influence in the organization of the various forms of religion in every habitable part of the earth?" But especially, what is to be done with that greater fact, so often reiterated in the Bible, and so venerable for its age? Why, we must consider that the prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, in relation to the coming of the Lord with "ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all," was intended to apply to a comparatively few miserable Jews, who were judged and executed at the destruction of Jerusalem, and all the rest is prophetic "coloring!" In the same ludicrous manner we must dispose of what Jude says respecting the fallen angels "being reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day;" meaning by this, perhaps, some conspicuous persons among the Jews, who were blinded by ignorance and hardened by wickedness, and who, in some way, dead or alive, should be punished at the day of Jerusalem's overthrow; or, really it might mean that then their ignorance would be taken away, their hearts changed, and they would become the inheritors of temporal or spiritual glory! What fruitful imaginations some men have, and how convenient such a gift sometimes is for an expositor of the Scriptures. And thus when Paul stands on Mars' Hill and preaches to the men of Athens
about the worship of false gods, and the approach of the
day of judgment, in attestation of which God hath raised
up his Son and appointed him to be the Judge of the
wicked, and that no persevering idolater shall escape this
judgment; and when he writes to the Romans and enumer-
ates the abominable vices of which even the most noted of
the philosophers and great men of the Gentile world were
guilty, and asserts that God is angry with all manner of
sin, that its perpetrators cannot escape his wrath, that they
will certainly be judged in the day when God shall judge
the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, and that no Pagan
shall be excepted in this judgment,—why, Paul meant to
destroy idolatry among the Athenians, and to root up vice
among the Romans, by a terrific picture of Jerusalem’s
overthrow by and by; or, if you please, by a graphic reci-
tation of the natural or providential consequences attendant
on a life of superstition and debauchery! And our Lord,
when he depicts the judgment with such minuteness and in
such a style of awful grandeur, in Matt. xxiv. and xxv.,
must be understood as meaning by “all nations” and “all
tribes of the earth,” a portion of the Jewish nation; and by
his “elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to
the other,” a few Christians who were either residing in
Jerusalem, or who happened to be there at its overthrow,
and were saved from the calamity incidental to its siege and
conquest! The Son of Man upon the throne of his glory
was the Roman army long held in abeyance by the heroism
of the Jews, and longer still defied but for civil dissensions among the besieged themselves.

And in this peurile way of disposing of God's Word, we are brought to the conclusion that the judgment is in the past; that the great day of punishment to which Christ and his apostles directed the minds of the ungodly Jew and Gentile, has come and gone; and the glad and glorious day unto which the toiling, afflicted and persecuted disciples of Christ were to wait with patience, and watch and pray, did truly come to them, and they did, then and there, receive crowns of righteousness—a rest from all their toils and woes! Blessed and glorious Jerusalem, the goal to which self-denying and patient disciples did run—the terminus of all their hopes and desires—the centre of all their joys for time and eternity! Envied ones, with what renown are your toils and sufferings crowned! Who would not have been a Christian to share in your glory; and who would not, for the sake of inheriting like renown and blessedness, wander in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth; be destitute, afflicted, tormented, stoned, sawn asunder, imprisoned, scourged, be made the food of lions, the prey of the sword, and the victim of the stake!! Hallelujah! for God hath judged the secrets of all men by Jesus Christ; he hath brought every man to an account for every idle word that he has spoken; he hath avenged the blood of his saints; he hath judged both the quick and the dead!!!
NOT A PAST EVENT.

In the third place, as awkward as it may be, and as irreconcilable with the plain grammatical use of words, yet as Christ declared that he would come during the lifetime of the men of that generation, we must force a spiritual interpretation upon every passage in the Old Testament and the New Testament relating to the resurrection. We must have Christ come at the destruction of Jerusalem, though every text referring to the resurrection be distorted and erased from the Scriptures. Yes, the resurrection “is in the past,” though Daniel tells us that at the time of the end, “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt,” (Dan. xii. 2;) though David expected at that time to be satisfied when he awakened in the likeness of his Lord, (Ps. xvii. 15;,) though the old and afflicted Job desired to make the very rocks eternally proclaim the assurance that his Redeemer shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though worms should destroy his body, yet in his flesh should he see God, whom he should see for himself and not for another, though his reins should be consumed within him, (Job xix. 27;) and though our Lord denominated himself the “resurrection and the life,” and promised to reward faith in him with the resurrection to life at the last day, declaring that the time would come when all in the graves should hear his voice and come forth; and to prove that such authority had been delegated to him, did actually raise the dead to life in the presence of wondering
beholders; yea, did himself burst the bars of death asunder and triumph over the grave; was handled and associated with by hundreds of his familiar friends for forty days, after which, in the presence of witnesses, he ascended up to heaven;—still, we are either to discredit the sacred historians, doubt the resurrection of our Lord, or convert all this language into poetic imagery. And as to Paul, we are to conclude that he was not a Pharisee, his profession to the contrary notwithstanding. Nay, he was a Sadducee as well as his Master, believing in no resurrection of the body, in no angel or spirit, though maltreated and hunted down like a wolf for supposing to teach the opposite. And when he wrote that noted epistle to the Thessalonians, he must have failed to administer any sort of consolation to them when he taught them that their departed friends would actually rise again from their graves, that death would not for ever sway his iron sceptre over them. He must have taught them nothing less than an absolute falsehood when he assured them that Christ would bring with him their departed friends, (1 Thess. iv. 14;) for it cannot be shown that Christ brought these or any others with him at Jerusalem's overthrow or at any subsequent period, whether the language of Paul is to be understood literally or figuratively. And the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians is the most wonderful enigma that was ever invented. How idle the attempt to show the nature and order of the resurrection in answer to the inquiry, "With what body do they (the dead) come
forth?" What a singularly unfortunate selection of terms and references to well-known facts, if a spiritual resurrection was intended to be taught, — "Christ the 'first-fruits,' and afterwards them that are Christ's at his coming." What a strange application of the words of Hosea, which Paul puts into the mouths of the saints, to be shouted in triumph on the morn of the resurrection, over death and the grave for ever vanquished, — "O death, where is thy sting, O grave, where is thy victory!" How literal, how carnal, how wild and fanatical his representation to the Romans, to the Philippians and others, when he tells them about "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body," and of having "our conversation in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." O, how can all this be understood metaphorically? We ask Mr. Crosby to say, in the honesty of his heart, if he does not believe that Paul and his Master equally taught the doctrine of a literal resurrection of the bodies of the dead. He cannot say, "No." Then we call upon him to hold to the words of these heaven-commissioned teachers, to forsake them not for a single moment, to rather conclude that he has misunderstood other portions of the Word of God, than these which are set forth with so much minuteness, and which, with our views of them, are alone intelligible, significant, and calculated to meet the ends for which they were communicated.
And again, with our author's manner of interpretation, any and every idea may be attached to the phrase "second coming of Christ;" his proteststo the contrary notwithstanding, we are at liberty to understand "death" as this coming. Surely so, if Christ came at the destruction of Jerusalem, he particularly brought death with him. Death and destruction were the main features in that scene; and death, we have the highest guarantee of it, is to be regarded as the second coming of Christ. There is no authorized standard by which to settle the meaning of the expression, second coming of Christ, with this figurative mode of interpreting Scripture. Swedenborgianism is right; Christ never did literally and bodily arise from the grave after his burial, and much less will he ever appear again on earth. Shakerism is as likely to be true as any thing else, and Christ may have come again in the person of Ann Lee; and Quakerism is no heresy at all, for it is quite consistent that Christ comes again in his people, or in a series of events. More; the conclusion is not wide of the mark, which was not long since arrived at by a large convention of Jews, assembled somewhere in Germany, from all parts of Europe, viz.: that their Messiah had at last come, as is manifest in the present toleration and comfort which are everywhere beginning to be experienced by them as a people. Aye, it is just as consistent to suppose, with some of the most learned and influential of the French Israelites, that the French Revolution was the coming of Christ, bring-
ing first, judgment, and then liberty and peace. According to this method of exegesis, we may run the rule back and spiritualize every recorded event of the Bible and construe allegorically every narrative law and precept of this good book; and consequently will find ourselves in urgent need of other Daniels to decipher for us those dark and mysterious writings on a clear and correct knowledge of which hang the destiny of our precious souls. No: it cannot be maintained with any degree of consistency that Christ was ever literally on this earth. The Jew with the Old Testament can as fairly prove that his Messiah was never to come literally and to be born of a virgin, as Mr. Crosby can prove with the New Testament in hand, that Christ is never to appear again on the earth literally and bodily. But it is the opinion of Mr. Crosby that our Lord was once a sojourner here in the flesh; and in a controversy with the unbelieving Jew he would prove that all the predictions relating to the first advent have had a literal fulfilment; though we can imagine how the blood would mantle his cheek, when this same Jew should turn to him, having previously understood his method of interpreting such texts as relate to the second advent, and responding as did a Jew to a Christian minister, under like circumstances:—

"We shall not believe you. How can you expect it, when you take as much as is convenient for yourself and maintain it to be literal, and escape from the rest by maintaining that it is spiritual!"
And lastly, the reasoning of Prof. Crosby, if carried out, would abrogate the ordinances of the Christian Church. Baptism is figurative of the death and resurrection of Christ, as is taught by Paul in Col. ii. 12, Rom. vi. 4, &c. Baptism was literally administered in the days of Christ and onward, as a symbol of his death and resurrection, and of the death and resurrection of the saints in "his likeness." (Rom. vi. 5.) A literal baptism implies a literal resurrection. Is the Lord's Supper an ordinance of the church to be observed "till He come?" but if Christ has long since come we have no authority for the farther use of this rite. No church is justified in continuing the type after the antitype. No minister can aid, with impunity, in preserving the institution of the Supper. By so doing he virtually contradicts the solemn Word of God. We know not where this system of interpretation would be likely to land us, if followed. It would revolutionize the entire theology of the day; it would dissolve the institutions of the Sabbath and the ministry; it would represent that the millennium, now so devoutly and ardently prayed for, has long, long since dawned upon us, and that eternity more than a thousand years ago began to shroud us in its awful folds. It would leave no hereafter for the sinner to dread, and no life eternal for the saint to enjoy. And this is, probably, the broad position of Mr. Crosby.

But we must cease our long and hot pursuit after our respected friend. We lament that he can so pervert the
plain language of Scripture as to make it mean any thing that is agreeable to an idle fancy. His book, if read, is calculated to do immense mischief among the worldly-wise, the un-thinking, and the un-devout. These will be its warmest admirers. These it will tend to prepare for a sudden surprise which shall overwhelm them in ruin, when they shall be saying,—"peace and safety;" "My Lord delayeth his coming;" "Where is the promise of his coming?" It will sadden the hearts of the righteous, but not in the least shake their faith or their hopes. With an earnestness and vehemence as never before, they will continue to cry day and night, "Thy kingdom come!" "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!" until the long silence of the grave is broken, and the spontaneous shouts of patriarchs, prophets, apostles and disciples, commingled with those of the living saints, are heard reverberating through earth's wide domain—"Lo, this is our God: we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him; we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation."