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INTRODUCTION.

The work of Rev. Dr. Litch, meeting and answering the arguments of "Parousia," by Rev. Dr. Warren, we regard as timely and valuable. It is not a discussion relating to a single book, or to the views of a single man. The theory presented in "Parousia" is undoubtedly gaining a wide currency; and this work, with all respect to its author, may be said to be a result rather than a cause. To it belongs the honor of having condensed and crystallized views that are held in solution by a multitude of minds. Doubt is always restless till it has formulated itself into a creed. Incredulity must put its denials into a theological affirmation before it can be easy; negations must become assertions if one's orthodoxy is to be preserved. And we regard "Parousia" as a clever exposition of the latest current doubt upon the subject of Christ's Second Advent. The grip of modern faith is inadequate to hold this doctrine as it is taught by Christ and his apostles. The stupendous facts of a future, literal advent of the Lord from heaven; of a veritable resurrection of mortal bodies at the sound of the last trumpet, and of the rapture of the church into the air to meet the descending King, are such as require a very stalwart belief to hold them fast. Of course the Liberal and Broad Church theology has long since let go of such hard literalisms. And now the most orthodox theology is following in the same course. We find in the church a very widespread revolt against the doctrine of a literal second advent of Christ and a literal resurrection of the body. There is an awful definiteness, a vivid realness, an intense literalness about these truths that frightens a timid and sentimental faith.
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The craving is for something more vague and nebulous, something about which men can dream deliciously, without being startled with the possible appearance of the literal, personal Christ, or the literal risen body. "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him," is, say what we will, an awful declaration to many Christians, as well as to unbelievers. But tell men that this is not the prediction of a literal fact—tell them that this event has already taken place; assuage the terror of the scene by obscuring it in the dust and tumult of the siege of Titus, and drown the sound of the last trumpet in the crash of the falling city of Jerusalem, and a fearful strain of dread and expectation has been lifted from the mind. We do not charge the author of "Parousia" with catering to men's skepticism and aversion on this matter. We only say that his theory is one after which multitudes will "run greedily," since it so happily puts behind them what they so dreaded as before them.

But this is not the gravest objection to the book. We regard it as utterly untenable exegetically. It has confounded the "ages" of which the New Testament speaks, taking the end of the Jewish age for the end of the Christian age. It is a style of exegesis which has no eye for perspective. It has huddled distant events and near events all into the foreground, and given us a Chinese picture of the facts of eschatology, instead of conforming the sketch to the rules of Christian art. There is "the end of the age" which came at the destruction of Jerusalem—the termination of the Jewish economy; and there is "the end of the age" which is the harvest, when "the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend," etc.—the termination of the Christian economy. It seems to us that these are so clearly distinguished and so distinctly separated, that it is utterly impossible to confound them. All our ordinances, all our commissions, all our endowments as the Church of Christ, are timed and terminated by the end of the age and the return of our Lord. If the end of the age has come, and if Christ's advent has really taken place, then these commissions have run out, and these endowments are outlawed.
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We were commanded to celebrate the Lord's Supper "till he come." If he has come, we are as much at fault in keeping up this commemoration as the Jewish Christian was in holding on to circumcision after the age of Judaism had terminated.

We have the Spirit given to the church as the third person of the Trinity, the invisible manifestation of Christ among his people, with the promise that he should abide with us "forever." "For the age," or "unto the end of the age," is the language of Scripture. If the age has terminated, and Christ has come, we cannot see what right we have to claim that the dispensation of the Spirit is still continued. Indeed, there is nothing simpler than the Scripture presentation of the ages or dispensations. These open out of each other like the successive lengths of the barrel of a telescope; and looking through them we get a clear sight of "the bright and morning Star." The work which we are criticising "telescopes" the ages, shuts them all together, and looking through them now we can see nothing definite or clearly defined in the future—we cannot fix our place in history because we have lost sight of the "day star."

But it was not our purpose to criticise "Parousia," but to write a few lines of introduction to the able review of the work herein presented by Dr. Litch. The critic we believe has the best scholarship of the ages on his side. He is simply defending the historic faith of the church.

When Dr. Whitby, the Arian, had published his "new hypothesis," as he named it, which was the first formulated presentation, so far as we have found, of post-millenarianism—the doctrine now generally in vogue in the theological schools of this country—a Bishop of the English Church expressed his dissent from the hypothesis on the ground that it tended to destroy the doctrine of the resurrection by making the time of each man's death equivalent to the coming of Christ and the day of resurrection.

This tendency culminates we conceive in Dr. Warren's work. In it death and resurrection have at last been reconciled. To die is to rise from the dead: to lie down in corrup-
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...tion is to put on incorruption. Then waiting for God's Son from heaven is a needless attitude and an obsolete duty. The crown which belongs to Immanuel is put upon the ghastly head of death—and we are to wait for the coming of death instead of watching for the coming of Christ in glory.

This teaching we do not charge exclusively, however, upon "Parousia." It is in the air—"Parousia" has condensed it and put it into tangible shape. Those who feel the untenability of modern Post-millennialism will fly for refuge to this theory. Those who wish to stand on the securer foundation of the Pre-millennial faith,—the doctrine of the advent which even so prejudiced a witness as Dr. Whitby himself admits passed unchallenged for the first two hundred and fifty years of the church as the belief of "all Christians who were exactly orthodox,"—will do well to follow the lines of criticism which Dr. Litch has so ably marked out.

A. J. G.

Boston, May, 1880.
As of liberty so of evangelical doctrine, its price is "eternal vigilance." The tendency of human nature has always been downward; and Satan's tares are profusely scattered in every field where the wheat of Christ is sown. After the experience of Orthodoxy some fifty years ago, in its struggle with Unitarianism, and the battles fought and victories won by Drs. Griffin, Beecher, and their associates, and the establishment of orthodox principles, churches and schools over New England, there was good reason to hope that at least for the nineteenth century the ground would have been maintained and the work of God have been carried on upon the same basis. But such hopes have been doomed to disappointment. A leading journalist, editor of a professedly Orthodox periodical, the leader of the denomination in a New England State, puts forth before Christendom a labored work to prove that Jesus Christ is never to return visibly in the clouds of heaven; that instead of the resurrection of the dead being (as the Scriptures plainly teach) at the close of this dispensation, when "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven," each human being is resurrected at the moment of death, by an elimination of a "non-atomic enswathelement of the soul"; that instead of a day, or period, of general judgment, when the human race shall be arraigned and judged—each receiving his final doom, the judgment is now; and that instead of the dissolution of the material world, the aerial heavens and the earth, by the action of fire at "the day of judgment and retribution of ungodly men," to give place to "a new heaven and a new earth," as Peter
wrote the, great forecasted change is to be brought about by hu-
man agency.

Had these utter perversions of God's most holy word been
the work of an open enemy, I had held my peace; but when
Christ is thus betrayed and pierced in the house of his pro-
fessed friend, and the leaders of professed orthodoxy, from
professor's chair, press and pulpit, either pass lightly, or else
endorse and commend such betrayal of a sacred trust, feeble
though the effort may be, the reviewer of Dr. Warren's PAR-
OUSIA felt constrained to do what he could to expose such
heresy and neutralize the virus thus infused into the sacred
mystical body of Christ.

Let the principles of hermeneutics involved in Dr. Warren's
book be adopted and the Bible, as a standard of faith, is of no
value whatsoever. There is not a heterodox sentiment extant
but what may be sustained by it; nor is there a doctrine
taught in its pages that is of any force whatever. If the Book
of God does not mean what its words express, who is the pope
that shall tell us authoritatively what it does mean? If the
sin-sick soul cannot be assured that the Holy Scriptures mean
what the obvious import of the words express, on what shall
its confidence be based in order to find peace and rest? When
Jesus Christ says to a sinful world: "This is the will of the
Father which sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and
believeth on him should have everlasting life; and I will raise
him up at the last day," if the last clause of the promise does
not mean what it says, what perishing, sinking soul will dare
to risk his eternal interests on the testimony of the first part
of the verse?

Believing most firmly as the reviewer does, that Dr. War-
ren's PAROUSIA is jeopardizing immortal interests, and under-
mining the faith of those who embrace his sentiments, he has
undertaken this review, and now sends it forth in this form,
in the name of the Lord, on its mission of protest, wherever it
shall find a reader, against a system of grievous and dangerous
error. For Dr. Warren himself, the author has only the kind-
est of feelings; and only wishes that his valuable talent might
have been employed in a better cause than thus shamefully
perverting the word of God, removing the old landmarks of
the Church, and sowing broadcast the seeds of Swedenborgian-
ism over the land. To one who carefully watched the down-
ward course of that bright star, as it waned into darkness—
the late Prof. Bush, the course of Rev. I. P. Warren, D.D., can
but seem full of peril to himself and to those under his influ-
ence.

The Summary of Eschatology appended to the Review, the
author trusts may prove an assistance to inquirers after truth,
as opening to their minds the scheme of Redemption and its
final outcome.

In the Appendix will be found the author's Rejoinder to
Dr. Warren's Reply to the Review of his book. It will be
found to contain considerable repetition of what was said in
the Review. But this is inevitable in such a work.

Invoking the divine blessing on this feeble effort to subserve
the cause of truth, the work is sent forth in this more perma-
nent form and respectfully dedicated to all evangelical churches
in Christendom, by

THE AUTHOR.

42 Prairie Avenue, Providence, R. I., April 28, 1880.
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CHRIST YET TO COME.

CHAPTER I.

"THE PAROUSIA OF CHRIST."


The writer takes the ground that Christ's coming transpired at the period of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; that his kingdom was set up and he enthroned on the day of Pentecost; that the resurrection takes place at death, etc. I propose in a few chapters briefly to review this work. Dr. Warren says:

"Having, after many years of study begun under the most painful perplexities, attained certain views of the subject which afford great satisfaction to my own mind, I cannot resist the feeling that others similarly perplexed may possibly be equally relieved by a statement of those views and the grounds on which they are based. . . . . . I shall welcome from every source whatever light will serve to correct any error into which I may have fallen and give to the church a deeper and more fruitful knowledge of the Divine teachings as to the coming and kingdom of our Lord."—Preface to Parousia.

This closing paragraph greatly encourages me to make the attempt to point out what I conceive to be his errors, and thus accomplish the object he indicates.
Dr. Warren continues:—

"The term employed in the New Testament to denote the second coming of our Lord is in the original THE PAROUSIA. 'What shall be the sign of thy parousia?'"—Parousia, p. 9.

I acknowledge parousia to be one of the terms used, but do not admit that it is the term. In Christ's answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" as written Matt. 24:30, he said: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man COMING [erchomenon] in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." So also is the verb erchomai, from which the participle erchomenon is derived, frequently used in its various moods and tenses to denote the same event:—Rev. 22:12, 20, "Behold, I come [erchomai] quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every one as his work shall be." He surely will not deny that these texts denote His second advent. Then parousia is not the term, but one of the words used to denote the second coming of our Lord. If he means the noun used, he should say so. But he subsequently admits other nouns.

Dr. W. says again:—

"It will be our first endeavor to ascertain its [parousia] exact meaning. . . . The signification of the word is the being with, or the presence. It is derived from the compound verb pareimi—from para, with, and eimi, to be."

I admit this derivation and also the import of the verb; so likewise the use of the noun parousia in the sense of presence. But when Christ answered the question, "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" by erchomenon—coming, he certainly authorized the use of parousia in the sense given it by the translators. So
also did Paul (2 Thess. 2:1), when he said: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming \textit{[parousia]} of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him." If we turn to Matt. 24:30, 31, we find what Christ answered about his \textit{parousia}: "They shall see the Son of man coming \textit{[erchomenon]}." "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds." Evidently Paul had reference to this statement of Christ as to what will take place at his \textit{erchomenon}—coming; as he does also in 1 Thess. 4:15–17, "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord"—the word the Lord himself spoke, we reiterate—"that we which are alive and remain unto the coming \textit{[parousia]} of the Lord shall not prevent [go before] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself [not the Roman armies, nor the Lord's providence, but \textit{himself}] shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God." The very description Christ gave of his \textit{erchomenon}—coming, Paul gives of his \textit{parousia}. But Paul proceeds to speak of "our gathering together unto him": "And the dead in Christ [not all the dead] shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Both Paul and Christ, then, have translated \textit{parousia} into \textit{erchomenon}, which Dr. Warren will not attempt to deny means coming, advent, etc. No matter, then, what the meaning of the verb is, nor how many times \textit{parousia} in connection with other persons and subjects may have been used in the sense of \textit{presence}, the \textit{usus}
loquendi of Christ and his apostles authorizes the rendering of the word when used in reference to the second advent of our Lord, by coming. And so Robinson, as quoted by Dr. Warren, (p. 13,) defines it: "Parousia, properly, the being or becoming present; i.e., (a) presence, 2 Cor. 10:10; (b) a coming, advent, etc." I heartily accept this definition. Will Dr. W. do the same? If Robinson is correct, no matter about the other critics quoted, parousia means a coming.

Once more. The presence of one who is absent implies a coming in order to a presence. An absent person cannot be present except by coming. Can he?

But we will hear Dr. Warren's argument on the etymology of the word:—

"From this view of the word it is evident, I think, that neither the English word 'coming,' nor the Latin word 'advent,' is the best representative of the original. [If not the best, it is one representative.] They do not conform to its etymology; they do not correspond to the idea of the verb from which it is derived; nor could they appropriately be substituted for the more exact word 'presence,' in the cases where the translators used the latter. Nor is the radical idea the same. 'Coming,' and 'Advent,' give most prominently the conception of an approach to us, motion toward us; 'parousia' that of being with us, without reference to how it began. The force of the former ends with the arrival; that of the latter begins with it. Those are words of motion; this of rest. The space of time covered by the action of the former is limited, it may be momentary; that of the latter unlimited,—continuance that may be eternal. So in respect to place; a coming implies an arrival at some locality; a presence may be universal, 'wherever two or three are met.' The promise of the Lord's coming to men, therefore, is not the same thing as a promise of his presence with them. The one implies nothing more, necessarily, than a single manifestation, a visit however short; the other implies a stay with them, relations of permanence; not the performance of a single act, but a dispensation including within it many acts, covering a long period of duration possibly, eternal. . . . Had our translators done with this technical word as they did with 'baptisma'—transferring it unchanged—or if translated using its exact equivalent,
presence, and had it been well understood, as it then would have been, that there is no such thing as 'a second presence,' I believe that the entire doctrine would have been different from what it is now. The phrase 'second advent' and 'second coming' would never have been heard of."

But, my dear sir, you seem to forget that before any translation from the original Greek was ever made, a man, who under oath declared that the gospel which he preached he received directly from Jesus Christ said, that "unto them that look for him [Christ] shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation."—Heb. 9:28. You seem to forget that the fathers who read, and preached, and wrote in Greek have left their writings full of the second advent of Christ. You are not mindful of the fact that if our translators had left parousia untranslated, or, translating it, had rendered it presence, still there remains the fact that Christ told his disciple John, long after he went to heaven: "Echomai,"—"I come,"—and if so, it would be a second coming. "And they shall see the Son of man coming" [erchomenon], a second coming, surely.

I confess that your argument presents the distinction between "coming" and "presence" with great force. But it does not meet the stubborn fact that Christ answered the question concerning his parousia by the word erchomenon—coming. That his parousia would be a coming to abide, I freely admit and firmly believe; but it expressed a coming, nevertheless, before abiding: a coming to abide. "What shall be the sign of thy presence, and of the end of the age?" would be without significance in the light of his answer in verses 29–31, if it did not involve his coming. In fact, it would be grossly absurd as an answer.
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I now pass to the next point in the discussion. Dr. Warren says of

"THE NATURE OF THE PAROUSIA:"

"This recital of the familiar truths involved in the revealed plan of Redemption will if I mistake not, lead us to the true idea of the Parousia. *It is the presence of Christ in this world in the exercise of his mediatorial office.* In this view, it is the complement and the contrast of the first advent, when he came in the flesh. It is the completion of the work which he then began. It is for the harvesting of the seed then sown."—Parousia, p. 20.

"This presence, it may further be remarked, I understand to be a literal one. The expression, 'Christ's literal presence,' or 'coming,' is often taken as meaning nothing less than a material and visible one. So that the denial of such a coming is thought to be a rejection of the doctrine of his literal coming. This is wholly unwarranted. It might as well be said that to deny that God is a material and visible being is to deny his literal existence. The Parousia is a literal presence, as truly as when Christ says, 'Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' It is not a figurative one, not one existing constructively, or an object of thought, but a true, actual presence, as real, though not under the same conditions, as when he was here in the flesh."—Parousia, p. 21.

That Christ is an omnipresent, divine being all evangelical pre-millennialists as firmly believe as Dr. Warren does, and that He was on earth and in heaven at the same time; but not in the same sense was he in heaven as he was on earth. Will my brother tell me when the time ever was that Christ was not with his people in this sense? Did he ever "go away" so as to cease to be with his disciples? When he commissioned and sent them forth (Matt. 28:20), he said: "Lo, I am with you all the days, till the end of the age." So from that moment onward until the end of the age, he is with his disciples. But not in the sense in which he will "appear," and they "shall see him as he is" (1 John
Contrast this divine omnipresence then existing, now existing and its continuous existence to the end of the world, with the question, "What shall be the sign of thy omnipresence, [for that, if Dr. W. is correct, is its meaning] and of the end of the age?" and Christ's answer; and it will be clearly manifest that that was not what either party had in mind. If that was it, did Christ give any answer to the question? If so, where is it? "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" if that be the sense, remains to be answered. But Christ did give the sign of his erchomenon—coming, in answer to the question proposed.

Jesus was "the man Christ Jesus" when he said on earth that he was in heaven; he was a man of flesh and bones when he went up from Olivet into heaven; and as late as the time when Paul wrote his letter to Timothy, he was the "one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. 2:5. He was a man possessed of the divine attribute of omnipresence. He was on earth a divine being as well as human; he came and went as we come and go; he was seen and handled as we are seen and handled; and this as well after his resurrection as before. He went away into heaven in a sense in which he did not remain with his disciples on earth. He is in heaven bodily, as he is not on earth. Christ as divine was in heaven and on earth at the same time; but as to his human body he was only on earth. There is no record that he was ever seen in more than one place at the same time. If his body was in heaven before he went up from Olivet, why did he ascend from there? If his body is there it is not on earth. To be here literally is to
be here in his body as he was before he ascended from Olivet. That he was not in heaven bodily, even after his resurrection, himself declared: “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father.” But that he was about to do so he also declared: “Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God.” He was there literally, “persona propria,” a man who had not, but would ascend to God. That ascension was motion upward to a cloud, and then to heaven.

Dr. Warren continues:—

“It is also a personal presence. The same unwarranted restriction of meaning is often given to this phrase, as if Christ could not be personally present unless subject to the senses of sight and touch. How often after his resurrection did he render himself invisible to his disciples while he was with them. By a personal presence, I mean that Christ is here himself in propria persona, not merely by the official work of the Spirit, nor by any representative whatever.”—Parousia, p. 21.

How does Dr. Warren know that Christ was personally present with his disciples after his resurrection, but concealed from their view? He did hide himself from his enemies before his death, and passed through the midst of them; but that he ever hid himself from his disciples after his resurrection it will be difficult to prove.

Mary, at the sepulchre, “turned herself” and saw Jesus standing. The same day at evening “Jesus came and stood in the midst.” Was he there before he came? “The disciples were glad when they saw the Lord.” Eight days after “came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst.”—John 20:14, 19, 26. To the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, while con-
versing, "Jesus drew near and went with them." Was he with them unperceived? Does "drew near" mean that he was with them before, but unperceived? True, when they knew him "he vanished," but like themselves he went to Jerusalem, where they found him. Another testimony is: "To whom he showed [not concealed] himself alive after his passion, being seen of them forty days."—Acts 1:3. He showed, and they saw him. No evidence exists here that he "hid himself from them." That he could be present and concealed if he desired to do so, I do not doubt; but that he did, except when he vanished and went to Jerusalem, is not provable by Scripture.

That Christ came when they saw him is evidence of preceding absence in his propria persona; but that his omnipresent presence was there invisible there is no room for doubting. In his human presence "he came." That Jesus who came was in propria persona the Jesus who in propria persona spake to them "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God"; and who in the same literal propria persona entered heaven where he now is, on the right hand of God. You did well, dear sir, to say, "I understand," for it is not susceptible of proof.

Dr. Warren again says:—

"The only conceivable sense, then, in which Christ, in his divine offices of King, Life-giver, and Judge, can come to men, is that of manifestation."—Parousia, p. 23.

Of all the strange positions stated in the Doctor's book, this is the strangest. What does he mean by it? He answers that he means "that the word coming can only be used of a divine being in the sense of manifestation" (p. 106).
Was Jesus a divine being when he was here on earth and asserted his omnipresence? Is he any more divine now than he was then? "Much people, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took branches of palm trees and went forth to meet him" (John 12:12, 13). Was that coming simply manifestation, or was it an actual movement from Olivet to Jerusalem? Did Christ actually move from Olivet to heaven in presence of his disciples, or was it only manifestation? Or was he not then a divine being? Christ in answering the question, "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" after telling them the sign, said: "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven," etc. Does not optomai mean actually to behold the person with the eye?

But enough of this; let us proceed to the next point, "the time of the parousia."
CHAPTER II.

"THE TIME OF THE PAROUSIA."

"The first of the inquiries addressed by the disciples to our Lord on the Mount of Olives, respecting his promised parousia, was, as to the time of its occurrence. 'Tell us, When shall these things be?' His answer is very full and explicit. Indeed, it may be said that on no subject whatever is the language of the New Testament more abundant, or more decisive."—Parousia, p. 25.

Are you not mistaken, dear sir, in saying that the question, "When shall these things be?" related to the parousia? If grammar is of any force in determining meaning, it was in reference to the destruction of the temple they asked, "When shall these things be?" What they asked about his parousia is quite another thing. "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" Should a critical scholar thus confound things so different?

Dr. Warren says of

"CHRIST'S TESTIMONY:"

"The very first public utterance that he made after entering upon his ministry of preaching, was to repeat the announcement of his forerunner, John, in the wilderness, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.'—Matt. 4:17. The coming of that kingdom was the same as the coming of its king. So when giving his apostles their commission, he says, 'As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Matt. 10:7). He adds (verse 23), 'Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of man be come.'"
"Matt. 16: 27, 28, 'The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' . . . The purpose of it was to comfort his disciples under his announcement that he was about to be put to death, and their expectations of honor and place in his kingdom be disappointed: that they must deny themselves and take up the cross, as he had done, and be willing to lose life itself if they would preserve it. Yet he would not have them discouraged, for their Lord would, after his death, speedily return in the glory of his new kingdom, which would thenceforth be established in power. He would then be invested with the office of administering judgment and reward, and would repay his faithful servants for all they had done and suffered for his sake."—Paroustia, pp. 27, 28.

With much of this I heartily agree. But when he says that He taught them that after his death He would speedily return in the glory of his new kingdom, and reward his faithful servants for all they had done and suffered for his sake, I must dissent. If the gospel dispensation or the Christian Church established on the day of Pentecost be that kingdom, He has sadly failed of fulfilling such a promise. From the very outset, instead of reward (unless it be that of a good conscience) they have had none. It has been only persecution and suffering for his faithful servants during the period of this dispensation, and especially in the early ages, as Dr. Warren has abundantly proved by citation of historical facts. What rewards have his servants yet received, except that of securing in another world a crown of life? I marvel at such a statement, from so able and scholarly a writer. If this be the reward of faithfulness, Paul was right when he said, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Certainly the man who wrote that paragraph did not
entertain such a view of rewards under any kingdom then in power. The kingdom and rewards are yet future.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN AT HAND.

Let us examine the foregoing texts. "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," was proclaimed by John the Baptist, Christ, the twelve and the seventy. The Doctor says well when he affirms that "the coming of that kingdom was the same as the coming of its king." Its king did come in kingly form and power, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

*His kingdom and throne were those of David:* "Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne" (Psa. 132:11); "On the throne of David and his kingdom, to order it and to establish it henceforth even forever" (Isa. 9:7); "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever" (Luke 1:32, 33). The territorial kingdom of David was Canaan; the capital was Jerusalem; and the people were the descendants of Jacob. The king, the then heir to the throne, was Christ.

After the messengers had proclaimed the kingdom at hand to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," as Christ came to do, and sent his disciples to do, *he came in the divinely prescribed form in his kingdom.* That divinely prescribed form was thus recorded (Zech. 9:9): "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: thy King cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass and a colt the foal of an ass." If Jesus is the Messiah,
he must sooner or later thus come to Jerusalem. He has done it literally—see Matt. 21; Mark 11; Luke 19, 20; John 12;—four witnesses. He proved his lineage to David (Matt. 1; Luke 3). He sent his heralds before him to proclaim his coming at hand; he came—just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass and a colt the foal of an ass. He came amidst the shoutings and rejoicings of Zion’s children. He came, and his kingdom was proclaimed by his disciples, by the multitude, and by the babes in the temple. Much people on his advent “went out to meet him and cried, Hosanna! Blessed be the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.”—John 12:13. “The whole multitude of the disciples” met him, saying, “Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord.”—Luke 19:37, 38. They that went before and they that followed cried, saying, “Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord.”—Mark 11:10. “The multitude . . . cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David.”—Matt. 21:9.

Christ assumed and exercised royal authority on this occasion. “Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves; and said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.”—Matt. 21:12, 13.

The authority. “By what authority dost thou these things; and who gave thee this authority?” This he declined to answer unless they would tell him whether the baptism of John was from heaven or of men. But he claimed and exercised the authority.
CHRIST'S COMING IN GLORY.

The set purpose. "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet" Zechariah (chap 9:9 and Matt. 21:4).

Christ justified the proceeding. "And some of the Pharisees from among the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples. He answered and said, I tell you, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."—Luke 19:39, 40.

I have thus proved beyond all successful controversy that Christ did literally come in his kingdom in the lifetime of some who heard the promise of Matt. 16:28; and we need seek no further for its fulfillment.

CHRIST'S COMING IN GLORY TO REWARD.

The promise of Matt. 16:27, "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works," next demands attention. He did not say that this should take place in the lifetime of some then present; nor did he say when it would take place. The time of its occurrence was left wholly indefinite. His coming in glory to reward men, and his coming in his kingdom, are two entirely distinct things.

THE TWO ROYAL ADVENTS.

The Old Testament prophets foretold two distinct royal advents. The first, that foretold in Zech. 9:9, when he should come to Zion in meekness and lowly form. No prediction ever had a more literal fulfillment, as we have just now seen. The second, that foretold by Daniel (7:13, 14), when he shall come in glory as the universal monarch of earth. The two are entirely unlike, and never to be confounded. "I saw in the night
visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him; and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him." If the former has been fulfilled to the letter can anybody give a good and valid reason why the other will not come to pass as literally? It must, and Christ declares it will.

"It seems little short of trifling to pretend that our Lord should so solemnly, and with the formula of weightiest emphasis, declare that there were some among all the persons standing about him, who would not die within a week."—Parousia, p. 28.

How much less trifling does it seem, to say that there were some standing there who would not die within sixty days, when the day of pentecost was fully come, and Christ's kingdom inaugurated, as the Doctor has taught? Such a remark ill becomes one who teaches thus.

Dr. Warren says again:—

"'Peter seeing him [John] saith to Jesus, Lord, what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come [erchomai], what is that to thee? follow thou me.'—John 21:21, 22. 'This is not, indeed, an express declaration that John should live till the time of his coming, but that meaning is implied in it.'—Parousia, p. 29.

Yes, and another thing is implied in it, and the disciples embraced the thought and sentiment: that whoever lived till Christ came should not die. Why did the Doctor so carefully avoid that fact? "Then went the saying abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die;"

But again Dr. Warren says:
"Matt. 24:34, 'This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' The word genea occurs forty-two times, and invariably in its ordinary sense of the men of this age, or those now living."—Parousia, pp. 29, 30.

I admit that to be the import of the word; but entirely dissent from the use made of the demonstrative pronoun rendered "this."

Dr. Warren once more:—

"Whatever else about the Parousia is unrevealed or obscure, it is not this particular of the time. I mean, of course, within the limits of that 'generation.' Not the fact of the Parousia itself is more clearly asserted than this concomitant of it. Not a fact is made more use of 'for doctrine, for reproof, for correction in righteousness,' than this element of its speediness. If any other thing in or about the doctrine seems inconsistent with this, they must be modified to harmonize with it, not it with them. If there be a foundation text in all the Bible where we can build the superstructure of doctrine securely, it is these words of the Lord; 'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.'"—Parousia, p. 72.

This is evidently, with the Dr., Gibraltar. But massive as it may appear in his eyes, I shall venture to fling my little stone at its frowning front.

I admit genea, as I said before, to signify the people living on earth at a given time. I admit the demonstrative pronoun haute to properly mean this. But "this generation" does not therefore necessarily mean the generation living when Christ spake; nor did it, as I will prove.

Christ, in the 24th of Matthew, warned his disciples that when they should "see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place," etc., they should flee to the mountains. Why? "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor
ever shall be." "This time" did not refer to the time of speaking, but the time designated by the adverb then: "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not" to this time spoken of. Just such a use of the demonstrative pronoun "this" we have in the text under consideration. Dr. Warren himself uses the demonstrative pronoun "this" in the same sense, for a period more than 1800 years in the past, but a period he had previously described (Parousia, p. 86): "There is no evidence that, at this period,"—the period of Christ and his apostles. This use of the word is good and common usage,—that after a speaker or writer has clearly defined a period of time or an event, in subsequently referring to it he should designate it by the demonstrative pronoun this.

For the sake of greater clearness I will take the 21st of Luke, a parallel passage. Christ gave first a prophetic statement of events which would follow the time of his speaking, to Jerusalem's desolation, ending with verse 19. In verse 20 he gives the sign by which his people should know the speedy desolation: "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains. . . . For there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people. They shall fall by the edge of the sword, they shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (v. 24).

Evidently this treading down by the Gentiles till Gentile "times" end, is embraced in the "all these things be fulfilled." There is no escaping this conclu-
sion. But those times are not ended, for the Gentiles still tread down and govern Jerusalem, as far as it is governed at all, and the generation to whom our Saviour spake long since passed away. Therefore, "this generation" means the generation concerning whom he spoke, who should be on earth when "the times of the Gentiles" are ended. But "all these things," embraced still more than the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles till their times shall end, for He adds: "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars,"—these are celestial phenomena; "on earth distress of nations with perplexity,"—these are terrestrial phenomena; "men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those those things which are coming on the earth,"—these are civil and social phenomena; "the sea and the waves roaring"—these are marine phenomena; "the powers of heaven shall be shaken,"—this is an aerial phenomenon; "and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory,"—this is the culmination of the series—"all these things." That this series of signs follows "the times of the Gentiles," is evident; and therefore is yet to come. What next? "And when these things begin to come to pass, THEN look up, and lift up your heads." Why? "For your redemption draweth nigh."

I wish to ask Dr. Warren what "redemption" came to Peter, James, John and Andrew, the four disciples to whom Christ addressed this discourse (Mark 13:3), either before, at, or after, the destruction of Jerusalem? What? And yet he insists that the whole series of texts—some seventy or eighty which he quotes, were
only applicable to those to whom they were originally addressed. If he does not mean that, then there is no force in his argument. I ask again, What redemption came to them? That they all died, before the destruction of the city, except John, is admitted; and if the Apocalypse was written, as he maintains, before that event, he cannot prove that even John was living to see it.

But I ask him, further, On seeing what were they "then" to lift up their heads? Was it when Peter, James, John and Andrew should see Jerusalem compassed with armies? Was it when they should see Jerusalem trodden down of the Gentiles and the Jews dispersed amongst all nations until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled? No; none of these. But when they, or those who should live to see them, should see signs in the sun, moon and stars, etc.—after the close of the Gentile times,—when these things begin, "then look up."

THE PARABLE OF THE FIG TREE.

Matthew, Mark and Luke all relate this parable, and in the same order.

Matthew and Mark state that after the great tribulation caused by the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place ("in those days, after that tribulation") the sun shall be darkened, etc. Can Dr. Warren tell us how long the tribulation caused by that abomination lasted, if it was, as he holds, the Roman armies—"that destroyed Jerusalem, or something connected with that event? Is it yet at an end?—if so, when did it end?" It is "in those days, after that trib-
ulation,” that “the sun is to be darkened, the moon not give her light,” and the other signs follow. Luke also gives the same order of events: the desolation of the city, the great distress in the land, the wrath on that people, their death by the sword, their captivity among all nations, the treading down of the holy city till the times of the Gentiles end. Is the wrath on Israel as a nation, or race, resulting in their overthrow and dispersion, yet at an end? The Doctor knows it is not. Beginning, then, “in those days, after that tribulation” and the following signs, we have the parable:—

“And he spake unto them a parable. Behold the fig tree, and all the trees; when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.”

I now ask Dr. Warren if they were to know that the kingdom of God was nigh at hand before the tribulation was past, and the signs which were to come after it began to appear? I pause for an answer.

But how nigh may it be when these things come to pass? As relatively near as is the summer when the trees shoot forth.

But, Master, will you not give us a little more definite idea of the relative time? Answer: “Verily I say unto you, this generation [of which I am speaking, that shall see these signs] shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

As I said before, so I say again, the generation to whom he spake has passed away, but Jerusalem is still
trodden down of the Gentiles, and the signs to follow have not come to pass. Therefore the only fair construction of the phrase, "this generation," is the one I have indicated, that which should live to see those signs—the generation concerning whom, not to whom, he spoke.

I believe I have met this great argument of Dr. Warren fairly, with no evasion or equivocation; and I in return ask him to candidly consider and either refute it, or acknowledge its force. His whole hypothesis stands or falls with this point: for if "this generation" does not mean the generation of Peter, James, John and Andrew, his whole system falls to the ground; and the Parousia is a future event, as also "the kingdom of God" a future institution; for it was not to come until after the great tribulation and Jewish dispersion with Jerusalem's treading down should be ended and the signs to follow had taken place. If there is any force in Scripture testimony, sound exegesis and logic, I am confident I have gained the case. And the wisest answer the Doctor can give is a candid acknowledgement of its correctness.

Again, Dr. Warren says:—

"Let it be noted that in none of these passages [quoted from Christ and the apostles, in reference to the coming], nor in any other of either Testament, is there any affirmation that the Parousia was distant. Nearly two thousand years have passed since that time, and if the Parousia is still future, it must then have been afar off,—how much more than two thousand years we cannot say. . . . Take this assumed fact—say twenty centuries—and carry it back and lay it along side the utterances quoted, as a supposed explanation of what their authors meant:—'at hand'—'before some standing here taste of death,' 'this generation,' 'from now,' 'quickly,' 'the time is short,' 'we who are alive and remain unto it,' 'a little, little while,' etc. Is that, I cannot help asking, a proper way of understanding inspired words?"
THE CONDITIONAL REIGN.

To this I reply: Our Lord did, as I have shown,—nay, I will say proved,—tell his disciples that before he would come in the clouds of heaven and gather his elect that Jerusalem would be desolated, the Jews be led into captivity, Jerusalem be trodden down of the Gentiles till their times were fulfilled; and that certain phenomena would take place which would indicate its nearness. He also told them, "Ye know not when the time is." "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father has put in his own power." He never gave them one intimation that he would come before the great tribulation ended, and the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled. Did he? when? where? how? Let us look at this from God's stand-point—"one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," and we shall see that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness."—2 Pet. 3:8, 9. I have also given a fair and full explanation of those texts, from John, Christ, the twelve and seventy, relative to the kingdom of heaven being "at hand," by citing those texts relating to the two royal advents; and how and when the first foretold royal advent was fulfilled.

THE CONDITIONAL REIGN.

I now proceed to show that Christ's reign at his first advent was purely conditional.

Zech. 6:12–15, "And speak unto him [the high priest] saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch; he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: even he shall build the temple of
the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and he shall sit
and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest
upon his throne; and the council of peace shall be
between them both. . . . And this shall come to pass
if ye will diligently obey the voice of the Lord your
God." That this related to the first advent is clear
from the statement, "He shall grow up out of his place."
Did the Jewish people diligently obey the voice of the
Lord their God? If not, the promise was void.

There were good things promised to the Jews under
Messiah which they forfeited by rejecting Jesus (Matt.
23:37,38). Among them was the gathering of Jeru-
salem's children to build the house: "How often would
I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen
gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would
not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate."
All failed because they rejected Jesus.

Again: Luke 19:42, "If thou hadst known, even
thou in this thy day, the things which belong to thy
peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes."

THE PROFFERED KINGDOM LOST.

After Christ came in royal form to Jerusalem and the
Jews officially rejected him, he said to them: "There-
fore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken
from you and given unto a nation bringing forth the
fruits thereof."—Matt. 21:43. Dia tauto, rendered in
the text "therefore," properly signifies and is often
rendered for this cause, and the text would read: "For
this cause I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be
taken from you and given unto a nation bringing forth
the fruits of it." The cause referred to is the refusal to
render the fruits in their season, and rejection of the headstone of the corner. They lost the kingdom which John, Christ, the twelve and the seventy up to that time had proclaimed as at hand; and Christ (as I have shown from the 21st of Luke) placed its revelation and establishment after the times of the Gentiles, and after the signs which were to follow, and at his coming in a cloud with power and great glory. The fact of these two royal advents—the one in humiliation, the other in glory; the reign in the first instance conditional and forfeited, the other unconditional and absolute, removes the whole force of Dr. Warren's argument above quoted, so far as the words of Christ are concerned.
CHAPTER III.

PAUL'S TESTIMONY ON THE TIME OF THE ADVENT.

Paul was explicit in his testimony that there were hindrances to the Lord's coming, and that until they were removed, "that day" should not come. As to the duration of those hindrances he gave not the slightest hint. He not only wrote this to the Thessalonians, but states that he told them the same thing when he was with them, and charged them to hold fast "the traditions" they had received, "whether by word or our epistle."

The usual mode of evading the force of this fact is, to divert attention from it by introducing a criticism on the word rendered "is at hand." I admit all that is said on that point, that the word properly means "is present," or "has come," or whatever other form it may take. But that does not at all change the fact that "that day shall not come except there come the apostasy first." No matter whether they thought it had come, or that it was at hand. In either case, Paul showed them that their apprehensions were groundless: (1) there must first be an apostasy; (2) "that man of sin, the son of perdition," must come, for he was to be destroyed by the epiphany of Christ's Parousia. But he could not yet be revealed, for there existed a hindrance.
to his revelation, and only when that hindrance should be removed would "that Wicked" be revealed. How long he would remain when revealed, is not remotely hinted by Paul.

It is only by claiming that Nero, the Roman emperor, who died A.D. 68, after a reign of thirteen years and eight days, was that man of sin, and hence that the prediction had been fulfilled, and that the brightness of Christ's coming had then transpired at Nero's death, that Dr. W. evades this passage. He says:—

"'The man of sin,' 'that wicked.' In attempting to show whom Paul meant by these appellations I would speak with becoming diffidence where the ablest commentators of every age have been so much puzzled. Apart from that fact, however, I confess it does not seem to be such an unresolvable mystery. Three things, I think, ought to concur in the solution: 1, the man of sin must be a person; 2, he must be one in such position, and holding such relation to the Thessalonians as to be an object of apprehension to them personally ...; 3, he must be, nevertheless, one whom, for some reason, it would be unsafe to name more definitely. ... Taking these, then, as our clue, we are conducted at once to the emperor Nero as the monster in whom all the probabilities of the case meet.—Parousia, pp. 69, 70.

To this I reply: Not one of the three is involved in the text, or grows out of it.

Nero never sat in the temple of God,—whether we regard the Church as that temple, or the temple at Jerusalem,—"showing himself that he is God." No, never. Nor was Nero destroyed by the brightness of Christ's Parousia. Dr. Warren shall himself tell us how he died:—

"In the midst of the siege of Jerusalem, [that is, two years before Titus besieged it,] and in the very flush of his power, Nero was suddenly hurled from the throne he disgraced, and died like a dog in one of the sewers of Rome."—Parousia, p. 75.
And is this all that is intended by the sublime language of Paul? "Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" [parousia]. Let him believe it who can.

But Dr. Warren insists that the man of sin is identical with the wild beast having "seven heads and ten horns," in Revelation. In this view the thing is still more incongruous and irreconcilable. For the destruction, or perdition [apoolia], of that beast is to be—that he shall be taken, also his prophet, and be cast alive into a lake of fire" (Rev. 19:20). But Dr. W. says, "Nero died like a dog." Nero reigned thirteen years and eight days; but the Apocalyptic beast has "power given him to continue forty-two months." Whether the Doctor calls them forty-two literal months—1,260 days, or symbolic months—1,260 years, the time does not fit Nero in either case. I might name a large number of other points specified by Paul and John, which no more fit Nero than do those already noted. Therefore Nero is neither "the man of sin" of Paul, nor "the beast" of Revelation, and Dr. Warren's argument in support of the theory that the coming of the man of sin took place in Christ's generation, falls to the ground; nor did the Parousia take place in that generation.

As to the great mass of texts (seventy or eighty) to show that Christ, Peter, James, Jude and John taught the immediate coming of the Lord, nearly the whole of them are entirely indefinite as to the time of his coming. They assert the fact of his coming, the uncertainty of the time, and suddenness of the advent, but only a few can be made to speak at all of its nearness; and
they only in a relative sense. It is only in a relative sense, for instance, that Paul's language (Rom. 13:11, 12) can be understood: "And that knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand." What "salvation" came to the saints at Rome speedily following this letter, that they had not already received? None. The salvation to which Paul refers was a salvation still future, but drawing nearer; it was nearer at the time of writing than when they believed in Christ and received pardon and regeneration. If we call "the night" the course of sin which had then run over four thousand years, and its whole course to be six thousand, two thirds and more of that night were past, and "the day" of millennial glory was at hand relatively but not absolutely, for it has not yet come. Nor can Dr. Warren disprove this until he can show what salvation to the Roman Christians came speedily, —which he cannot do.

Dr. Warren says still further:—

"That the declarations of our Lord and his apostles, which I have cited, mean what they seem to mean as to the near approach of the Parousia, is evident from the connection in which they stand, and the purposes for which they were uttered. That doctrine is rarely or never advanced in the way of general, didactive statement, but always as having an important bearing for encouragement, incitement, or warning, on some present exigency, in which the very stress of the passage lies in the fact that the Parousia was near. When Christ told his disciples that he would come in the glory of his Father to reward every man according to his works, and added that some of them should not taste death till they had seen it,—what was it but to console them with the prospect of a speedy reward for their sufferings? Take away this element of speediness, and the promise is robbed of its meaning."—Parousia, p. 53.
CHRIST YET TO COME.

This seems specious, but is groundless in fact. I have already shown that the two verses (Matt. 16:27, 28) related to two entirely different events: verse 28 to his first royal advent, when he came to Zion as her king riding upon an ass and a colt—the foal of an ass; and verse 27 to his coming in the clouds in royal majesty as universal monarch, as foretold Dan. 7:13, 14. It is the fact of final reward when the Lord does come, whenever it may be, on which nearly all the texts cited depend for their force. That the element of nearness has a practical power, I admit; but I do not admit that the mass of texts quoted (and I have weighed them one by one with care) contain the element of nearness, until after the foretold precursors have been developed. "Then know that it is near, even at the door," said Jesus.

THE PAROUSIA TO COME.

Another point in the foregoing argument, as well as at different points throughout the book, deserves notice. He speaks of "the fact that the Parousia was near." If, as the Doctor so strenuously contends, parousia signifies "presence," not "coming," what does he mean by "was near"? Was there an interval of some forty years after Christ left his disciples on the mountain in Galilee, saying, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," to the time of Jerusalem's overthrow, when Christ's presence was not with them? I press this point and urge an answer. Was there forty years, more or less, when they had to work without his omnipresence? If there was not, and the time of his presence was still future when Paul wrote, where had
been his omnipresence? Either Dr. Warren or his reviewer is confused in his mode of apprehending and expressing this great theme. Does not the word near imply not yet here but coming: and if parousia is near, is it not coming? How is this?

That I do not misapprehend or misrepresent the Doctor's language or sentiments will still further appear from the following:

"Let the Parousia as a now existing fact be preached with as much earnestness as they preached it as an anticipated fact—in other words, that Christ has come and in now upon the throne of his kingdom, ruling, judging and rewarding men according to their works," etc.—Parousia, p. 55.

If this does not ignore Christ's presence with his people, and make it, in the days of the apostles, a still future event, and a coming, also, I confess I do not know what it does teach.

THIS SAME JESUS.

But Dr. Warren also says:—

"It is urged that the view I have presented is inconsistent with Acts 1:11, which it is said teaches that Christ's second coming was to be a visible and bodily one, which certainly has not taken place and must be still future. 'Ye men of Galilee, . . . this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.' The meaning of this declaration depends on the phrase 'in like manner,' Greek, hon tropon."—Parousia, p. 61.

The Doctor then proceeds to show that hon tropon, rendered in the common version "in like manner," signifies "as," rather than "in like manner"; for example, "Wilt thou kill me as [hon tropon] thou didst the Egyptian yesterday?"—Acts 7:28. I admit the force of his criticism on the phrase, and the correctness of his rendering—"as ye have seen him go." But I am un-
able to see any difference in the import of the phrase "as," or "in like manner as," so long as "this same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as ye have seen him go." Does not as mean likeness? Will "this same Jesus" so come? He moved from the earth heavenward; a cloud received him from sight, and his own testimony, as well as that of the angels, was, that he will come from heaven and a cloud disclose him,—that "every eye shall see him" come as he went. If he does, he will come bodily, visibly; and as human eyes saw him go, so "they shall see the Son of man coming."

It appears to me that Dr. Warren has spent a vast amount of labor and ingenuity to prove a difference without a distinction; nor can I discover in his labored argument anything but a cloud of dust to hide the real merits of the case. That our Lord will so come as, is the confessed import of the text,—that is, in a cloud, bodily, visibly to human eyes. But when, the two clothed in white did not intimate. As to the fact of his return in the same body, the text, translate it as we may, leaves no room for doubt. Let us then wait for him.

But says the Doctor: "There is not the slightest intimation that so long as he remained visible there was any other than his usual aspect. As he went up 'a cloud received him,' and that was all. But is that the way he is to come again?"

If Dr. W. is correct, it is to be even with less visibility and splendor. How bright the cloud was that received him, and how numerous his attendants, we are not told. But from the prophetic announcements, there
must have been great pomp and splendor (Psa. 68:17, 18): "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men." This Paul (Eph. 4:8) expressly applies to Christ's ascension into heaven. In Psa. 24:7-10 we have, if possible, a still more sublime view of what took place when he entered the celestial city: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in." What if the historian has not recorded a sight of the glory—still, it no doubt awaited and attended Him. And when he comes again, we have the fullest assurance that his glory will be visible: "They shall see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory."
CHAPTER IV.

SCOPE OF THE PAROUSIA.

Translating *en tē parousia, in or during the presence* instead of *at the coming* of Christ, Dr. Warren argues that the Parousia embraces a lengthened period and a variety of events. He says:—

"1. The first [event] as we all know, was the establishment of the new kingdom of heaven. The old theocracy founded by Moses was to pass away, and be succeeded by a new one of a more comprehensive sway and a higher glory. ‘They shall see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.’—Matt. 16:28."—

*Parousia, p. 74.*

I have already shown that this promise had a literal fulfillment at his royal entry into Jerusalem; and that it referred to the first royal coming instead of his second coming, "in the clouds of heaven," as foretold Matt. 26:64.

That the kingdom promised to Christ (Luke 1:31–33) is to begin *at, or in, or during his parousia,* is true. But Christ have never yet been seen "sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." "Ye shall see," Dr. Warren very well knows, does not mean, he "shall come invisibly." If seen, he must come *visibly,* which will be his *parousia*—coming to *abide,* as Dan. 7:13, 14, teaches.

"2. The second thing to occur in the Parousia was the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. 24:27, 34). Let it be observed (46)
that this prediction is not in that part of the chapter which many suppose refers to the day of judgment, but in that which is universally conceded to relate to the overthrow of the temple and city."—Parousia, p. 74.

It is only by ignoring the first of the three questions proposed by the disciples that Dr. Warren can possibly make the Parousia embrace "the overthrow of the temple and city." Christ foretold (Matt. 24:1, 2) the destruction of the temple, saying, "There shall not be left here one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down." Language can be no plainer than this concerning the destruction of the temple—a thing by itself. The Saviour, with Peter, James, John and Andrew, sat on the mount of Olives, looking down upon the temple. They asked him, first: "Tell us, when shall these things be?" Did that mean the overthrow of the temple, or his parousia? No one in the light of his prediction just uttered, and the question in reference to it, and then the next question: "And what shall be the sign of thy parousia?" can fail to see that the two things are entirely distinct. The answers were as distinct as the questions.

Concerning the time and sign of Jerusalem's overthrow he said (Luke 21:20), "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." Then he foretold the continuous desolation and treading down of the city by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are ended; after which is to come a series of signs of his Parousia, to culminate in his "coming in a cloud with power and great glory." We know that 1,810 years separate the two events; for the latter has not yet transpired, because no human being has testified to having seen it;
and besides, the Gentiles still tread down Jerusalem. Therefore Jerusalem's overthrow was not to transpire during, in, or at the Parousia, but before it.

Again Dr. Warren says:—

"3. The destruction of the man of sin. 'Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy by the brightness of his parousia.'—2 Thess. 2:8. If the view I have presented of this personage be accepted,—the view which generally prevailed among the early Fathers, and is confirmed by some of the ablest historians of modern times,—we see a literal fulfillment of the promises in the events of the same great catastrophe. In the midst of the siege of Jerusalem, in the very flush of his power, Nero was suddenly hurled from the throne he disgraced, and died like a dog in one of the sewers of Rome."

I marvel at this statement: "In the midst of the siege of Jerusalem." Let us hear Josephus on this point: "Now as Vespasian was returned to Cesarea, and was getting ready with all his army to march directly to Jerusalem, he was informed of Nero's death, after he had reigned thirteen years and eight days. . . . Wherefore Vespasian put off at first his expedition against Jerusalem, and stood waiting whither the empire would be transferred after the death of Nero."—Wars of the Jews, b. 4, ch. 9.

From the death of Nero to the accession of Vespasian to the Roman throne there were three emperors, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Vespasian waited from Nero's death in A.D. 68 to the spring of A.D. 70, when he was proclaimed emperor before the siege of Jerusalem was commenced. The conquests of the cities and villages of Judea were under Nero; but the siege, and overthrow of Jerusalem was under Vespasian, two years after Nero's death. To "die like a dog," as Dr. Warren says Nero did, and to be "cast alive into a lake of fire,
as the beast of Revelation is to be, whom Dr. W. contends was Nero, are two ends so different that they cannot be identical. Therefore Nero was not the man of sin; nor was he destroyed by the epiphany of Christ's parousia or "outburst of his glory," as the man of sin is to be.

THE CONTROVERSY ENDED.

Dr. Warren says:—

"4. In his epistles to the seven churches in Asia, which constitute the introduction to the Book of Revelation, John announces the repeated warnings of the Lord of his speedy 'coming' to try and reward them according to their fidelity. The word parousia is not indeed used in this case, but it will scarcely be denied that the 'coming' so often mentioned was identical with it."—Parousia, p. 76.

Dr. W. concedes in the foregoing, that "coming" and parousia are "identical"; therefore we should be at agreement: for he has stated that "coming" signifies a movement from one place to another, a movement to or towards a person or place, which is correct.

"Tachu," rendered in the Apocalypse "quickly,"—"erchomai tachu," "I come quickly,"—signifies also, "suddenly." Greenfield thus defines the word: "Tachu, adv., quickly, speedily, hastily, soon, shortly, immediately, suddenly: by implication, easily, readily." Render this word by suddenly, instead of quickly, and we have a correspondence with the frequent statements of Christ—come "when ye think not," "as a thief in the night," "as the lightning," etc.

Nor does Christ's coming to or on an individual, (as the pastor of a church to correct him for a fault, or on Jezebel for the same purpose,) imply his parousia—coming to abide.
“5. In Christ’s consolatory words to his disciples in view of his approaching departure,” & c.—Parousia, p. 76.

We are so nearly agreed under this head, and as Dr. Warren does not claim the words to mean the parousia, I pass it without further remarks.

“6. The Parousia in express terms was to embrace the resurrection of the dead: ‘every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.’” (parousia).—Parousia, p. 77.

Here we are perfectly agreed.

“7. Finally, the Parousia was in like manner to embrace the general judgment.”—Parousia, p. 77.

This point we shall consider in another connection. But the Doctor in the next section remarks:

“Its [the Parousia’s] two termini are the destruction of Jerusalem and the day of judgment. And the question now recurs, how can these two, with all that lies between, be included in one term if you do not make that term one of vast breadth and comprehensiveness.”—Parousia, p. 77.

I admit the term to have an eternal breadth and comprehensiveness: but have proved that it does not embrace the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; from the fact that the parousia, or coming does not transpire until after “the tribulation of those days” is fully ended, and the following times of the Gentiles are closed up, as all may read in the 21st of Luke. But the resurrection, judgment and eternal reign are all embraced in, at, during the parousia,—Christ’s coming to earth to abide and reign without end (Luke 1: 33).
CHAPTER V.

"THE COSTUME OF THE PAROUSIA."

This is Dr. Warren's next point of inquiry. He says:—

"It is declared that it should be attended with sublime physical phenomena; the darkening of the sun and moon, the fall of the stars, the burning of the world, the passing away of the heavens with a great noise, &c. Did all these things happen eighteen hundred years ago? In order to answer this inquiry, it is necessary to consider what was the meaning of the language in the prophetic Scriptures, and in the usage of the Jews of Christ's day. The representations are of two kinds, referring to two distinct things, identical indeed in time but wholly different in nature; viz. The establishment of the new kingdom of heaven, and the abolition of the old."

"THE IMAGERY OF INAUGURATION."

"Christ was to come for the purpose of establishing the new kingdom of heaven and of being inaugurated as its king. How should this event be fittingly set forth to the apprehension of mankind?"—Parousia, p. 80.

SOLUTION OF THE QUESTION.

I do not know of any better mode of determining the question than to inquire how God announced the establishing of the "old kingdom," and his manner of fulfilling the announcement: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee forever. And Moses told the words of the people"
unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai."—Ex. 19:9-11.

This is God's announcement. We shall now see how he fulfilled it. "And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the Lord came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount; and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the mount; and Moses went up."—Ex. 19:16-20.

I ask Dr. Warren if, sublime as was the description of the scene, the words of God were not literally fulfilled? He admits it.

How did God foretell the coming of Christ in his kingly character to Zion as her king? And how did he fulfill it? "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal
of an ass."—Zech. 9 : 9. This was the prediction. How was it fulfilled? Let Matt. 21; Mark 11; Luke 19 and 20; and John 12, answer. Nothing could be more literal, in all its parts, than the accomplishment of this prediction. Then why will not Christ's own announcement of his erchomenon—coming, in his parousia—coming to abide, be fulfilled after the same rule?

Christ's answer to the first question, "When shall these things be?" was thus answered: "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh," and it had a literal accomplishment. Then why will not his answer to the second question be fulfilled as literally? "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" Especially should we believe it when Christ, years after stating it to James, Peter, John and Andrew, reiterated it to Paul, who solemnly avers that he received what he taught directly from Christ.

Dr. Warren, after referring to the scene on mount Sinai, at the "establishing of the old kingdom," and admitting its literality, says:—

"Here then was the source of that peculiar imagery which ever after was wont to be used in describing the divine manifestations to man, and sometimes even of the ordinary operations of Providence. It was in terms thus hallowed by association with the founding of their own divine monarchy, and familiarized to the Jews as the technical phraseology denoting the accession of kings to their thrones—the court language of inauguration, so to speak,—that Christ described his coming to men in his kingdom."—Parousia, p. 85.

This is true. What reason have we, or had the Christians of any age, to doubt its realization as literally as the language of the promise was fulfilled at Sinai? And yet Dr. Warren affects to doubt it. He says:—
"Was there then to be in addition to this high symbolic signification, a fulfillment of this language in a literal sense? I think not. For first, there is no evidence that at this period such was its recognized meaning. We have no reason to suppose that the four disciples who heard our Lord's words on Olivet so understand him."—Parousia, p. 86.

This statement is astounding. "No evidence that at this period"—the period of Dr. W's writing the paragraph—"such was its recognized meaning." Surely the Doctor cannot have read the essays delivered at the New York Prophetic Conference!

"This period."

"This period," if Dr. Warren's reasoning on "this generation" is correct—that it must mean the generation existing at the time of Christ's speaking, and not the generation of whom he was speaking—must by the same rule mean the period of the Doctor's writing; but if by "this period," he means the "period" of Christ's utterance, he fully concedes my claim in reference to "this generation," and he cannot deny it.

Again, he says: "I think not," in answer to the question, "Was there to be a fulfillment of this [Christ's] language in a literal sense?" Why not? He gives two reasons: (1) "There is no evidence that at this period such was its recognized meaning." No evidence? How would he determine this? What was Christ's language? "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds," etc.

How did Paul understand this language? He thus states his understanding of it: "For the Lord himself
shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet of God, and the dead in Christ [his elect] shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.”—1 Thess. 4:16, 17. But, Paul, why do you make such a statement, and on whose authority? Paul answers: By authority of the “word of the Lord” (1 Thess. 4:15). This is positive evidence that in Paul’s day the language was so understood. Dr. W., then, is wrong.

But the Doctor further says: “We have no reason to suppose that the four disciples who heard our Lord’s words so understood him.”

Did not John more than so intimate when he wrote: “Behold, he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him”?—Rev. 1:7. Did not Peter, when he wrote: “We have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and Parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ,” for “we were eyewitneses of of his majesty;” and “we have also a more sure word of prophecy whereunto ye do well that ye take heed”?—2 Pet. 1:16-19.

Thus Peter has left his testimony in full view of his anticipated death, concerning the power and glory of the Parousia, a glory of the Father and Son, when a bright cloud from heaven came and enshrouded them, into which “they entered;” and Christ was clothed with a brightness like the sun; therefore we know his power and Parousia to be the simple truth, and no fable. But this was not his understanding of the matter alone: it was that also of his associates—“We heard when we were with him in the holy mount;”
"We made known to you the power and Parousia." What stronger proof would Dr. Warren have? If any, Peter will supply it; for he says: "Besides all" we saw and heard, "we have a more sure word of prophecy,"—more sure than seeing and hearing, (then they understood the language of prophecy as requiring a literal fulfillment in such form as they "saw on the holy mount" of transfiguration)—"whereunto you do well that you take heed as to a light shining in a dark place."

But if the language has no reliable meaning, if it is as loose and indefinite as Dr. Warren would have us believe, it is but an ignis fatuus—only designed if followed, to lead astray, instead of "a sure word," "a light shining in a dark place," "unto which we do well to take heed."

How does Dr. Warren know that the sublime language of Isa. 13:10, 11, was only uttered in reference to the fall of Babylon by the Medes? Does he answer that the context shows it? Then he determines the meaning of the passage on its own merits: as he does also the glowing description of Isa. 34, in reference to the overthrow of Idumea. Then why not follow the same rule in the interpretation of Christ's language in reference to his Parousia? Christ's statements were plain and "didactic," in answer to a plain question, with no intimation whatever that his language was to be interpreted any otherwise than literally.

Dr. Warren asks:

"If [Paul] had understood that the day of the Lord was to be introduced by a visible appearance of Christ in the clouds, why did he not remind the Thessalonians, who thought the day had already come, that such an appearance had not taken place?—Parousia, p. 87."
Answer. Because he had already reiterated to them in his former letter what the Lord said about his coming, that all the saints whether dead or living were together to be "caught up to meet the Lord in the clouds." And in the second epistle he referred them to what he had taught them "whether by word," when present, "or our epistle." And so there was no need of repeating it. Another reason was, he chose to give them a statement that "the apostasy" and "man of sin" stood in the way. And that was a sufficient reason.

Dr. Warren says:

"We have something on this point even more definite than this. Christ was once 'demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come?' He answered them, 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation,' or, as it is in the margin, 'with outward show.' 'Neither shall they say, Lo here, or, Lo there;'—you are not to expect it in one locality or another—'for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.' It is in the hearts of men you are to look for its coming. It is a spiritual, not sensuous kingdom, such as you anticipate."—Parousia, p. 89.

This is a confession that they expected it literally. The Pharisees asked the question, and he "answered them." He did not say "in the hearts of men," but "within you," who ask the question. If in anybody's heart it was their heart: a class whom he characterized as hypocrites; and of whom he said, "Except your righteousness exceed theirs, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven." Then it is to be entered into, not be in. Did these persons have the kingdom in them? Dr. Warren will scarcely say they did. But in a note he says, "There is a difference of opinion among commentators whether the words entos humon mean within, or among you. The sense is substantially the same either way."
I think not; within means inside; among means in the midst of the people. The Doctor elsewhere says the phrase "kingdom of heaven is used for the king." This is true, and is the sense in which the word is used in the passage under consideration. "The king is among, or in the midst of you." In this light all is plain. But render the word within, and it is absurd and contradictory. John Baptist, Christ, and the twelve, had long been preaching: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Now the Pharisees demand, when is this kingdom, so long proclaimed "at hand," to come? By the coming of the kingdom, those preachers meant the Messiah, our king, is at hand. Christ now tells them, It is among you; I am the monarch of that kingdom.

And this is still more evident when we consider that he at once proceeded to say to his disciples: "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man and ye shall not see it. And they shall say unto you, See here, or, See there: go not after them, nor follow them. For as the lightning that lighteneth out of one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day. But first he must suffer many things and be rejected of this generation." There will be no need when the Son of man is revealed, to say to any one, "Lo here," or "Lo there," "See here, or there:" for in his day he will be as universally visible as the lightning, to everybody. And that universal visibility is, Christ states (Matt. 24:27), to be at (or, if Dr. Warren prefers,) in his parousia. No matter which, the Parousia is to be as visible as the lightning.
In concluding his chapter on the "Costume of the Parousia," Dr. Warren says:

"We do not argue that because the sun, moon and stars were not extinguished and the earth dashed out of her orbit, on that night in which Belshazzar was slain, therefore Babylon was not taken; and that its destruction is still to be looked for. Why should we reason thus in regard to that more stupendous judgment which came upon that city which crucified the Lord and became the bloody persecutor of the saints?"

**Answer.** 1. The Medes were stirred up and did take Babylon on that night in which Belshazzar was slain, as history attests: and so the words of Isa. 13:17 had a literal accomplishment. But Babylon did not at that time become "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah;" for Cyrus reigned in Babylon afterward; so did Alexander. There Peter wrote his first epistle. And there to this day stands Hillah, and the Arabians pitch their tents there. The doom of Babylon has been most gradual and progressive; nor is it (if travelers tell the truth) yet fulfilled. Its final doom as God foretold by Jeremiah (chap. 51:60-64) is thus stated as to its conclusion: "When thou hast made an end of reading the book, thou shalt bind a stone to it and cast it into the midst of Euphrates: and thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I bring upon her." Until this doom befalls her it will not be complete. And Dr. Warren had best await "the day of the Lord," the time Isaiah foretold for its completion; and perhaps we may see the sun, moon and stars darkened as the precursors of its sinking out of sight as have "Sodom and Gomorrah;" of which not a vestige remains.

2. The Lord did not predict any such phenomena
either to precede or accompany the destruction of Jerusalem. But he did predict them to follow the close of the Gentile times and precede his coming in a cloud with power and great glory.—Luke 21:20–27. Let us await, then, the ending of "the times of the Gentiles," which will be known by the cessation of Gentile rule in the Holy City. Then the Doctor may see "signs in the sun, moon and stars," etc.—the true costume of the "coming" (erchomenon) of Christ.
CHAPTER VI.

"CHRIST AS KING."

Dr. Warren says:—

"Thus was Christ’s Parousia to be commenced among men. He who first came in flesh in a state of humiliation and suffering, to die a shameful death as a sacrifice for sin, was now to come a second time in glory and establish his abiding presence with his people. And the whole course of human affairs thereafter, both prophetic, as delineated in the Scriptures, and providential, as developed in the history of the church and the world, was what should occur under that presence. The outline of that history is, I conceive, comprehensively sketched in our Lord’s great discourse on the mount of Olives. . . . . I beg leave to protest here against the treatment to which this discourse is generally subjected, by severing the concluding portion, in Matt. 25:31-46, from the rest."—Parousia, p. 100.

Answer. 1. The whole course of human affairs as foretold in Matt. 24 is to precede the erchomenon, or coming in the clouds of heaven, up to the resurrection and scenes of the judgment, as I have several times proved beyond successful controversy.

2. I do not know to whom the Doctor refers as being guilty of severing Matt. 25:31-46 from the rest of the discourse. It is not I, nor any commentator I have at hand. I believe Matt. 24th and 25th to be one continuous discourse. So we are perfectly agreed and need spend no words on this point.

3. That Christ was now “to come a second time to establish his abiding presence with his people,” I heart-
ily endorse. But I deny that that "second time" has yet arrived.

Once more: the Doctor says:—

"Christ's presence then in the world, beginning in that generation, and set forth under imagery so imposing, was to be the presence of its king. 'Then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.' The phrase 'to sit upon' is the appropriate one to denote accession to power."—Parousia, p. 102.

"Christ presence in the world beginning in that generation," was alone his divine "omnipresence" which was never absent. It was here when he said, "even the Son of man which is in heaven," as the Doctor claims. It is the same "omnipresence" which he said while here was "wherever two or three were gathered in his name." And this "omnipresence" he promised his disciples after his resurrection and before his ascension, saying: "Lo, I am with you alway [literally, all the days], even to the end of the world [age]." Therefore there has been no day from that moment when Christ's "omnipresence" was not with his people. In that sense he never went away, nor can the Doctor prove that he did; and therefore in that sense He could not come again. The only sense in which he went away visibly, in bodily form, in the act of lifting up his hands to bless those whom he led out to the mount of Olives. If that was the sense and form in which he went away, Dr. Warren well knows that "this same Jesus" is to "so come as" he went into heaven. His own labored criticism on "hon tropon," demands this. Let him abide by this result of his own argument.

"CHRIST'S ACCESSION TO THE THRONE."

Dr. Warren says:—
"CHRIST'S ACCESSION TO THE THRONE." 63

"This is expressly affirmed to have taken place at his ascension. Mark 16:19, "After the Lord had spoken unto them, he was taken up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God."—Parousia, p. 103.

To this I reply: Christ's throne is the throne of David on mount Zion in Jerusalem, in the land of Palestine. So it is written in the 132d Psalm: "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David, he will not turn from it, Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." Peter, on the day of Pentecost, says (and he spake "as the Spirit gave him utterance") that David, "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, . . . spake of the resurrection of Christ."

David's throne was never in heaven. "David," said Peter, "is not ascended into heaven." But David, in prophetic strain, after recording God's oath to him, in Psa. 132, proceeded to fix the location of that throne: "For the Lord hath chosen Zion, he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell, for I have desired it. . . . There will I make the horn [the kingdom] of David to bud." It is thus by oath and decree he has placed his "king upon his holy hill of Zion."

This throne of David, by the ministry of Gabriel, was confirmed to Christ (Luke 1:32, 33): "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Until Dr. Warren can prove the throne of God in heaven to be the throne of God on the holy hill of Zion, his position is baseless.

And Christ himself, long after he entered heaven,
CHRISt YET TO COME.

sent back to earth a message by his servant John, the beloved, saying: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father upon his throne."—Rev. 3:21. Can Dr. Warren see no distinction here between the "throne of God" on which Christ sat down on his ascension into heaven, and "the throne of his father David" which the Lord God has promised to give unto Him?

I will take the liberty at this point and in this connection to call the Dr.'s attention to Christ's charge in Luke 21:30, when—after predicting the fall of Jerusalem and its continuous treading down through the Gentile times, and stating the signs which should follow those times, to end with his coming; and relating the parable of the fig tree—he said: "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." How can this consist with his "accession to his throne" at his ascension? It cannot at all. All the passages quoted by the Doctor in proof, only relate to Christ's session at the right hand of God until his "foes be made his footstool."

Again Dr. Warren says:

"Heaven, 'the right hand of God,' 'the Majesty on high,' 'the heavenly places,' are not in this world of sense. It is in them Christ is enthroned; there he is sat down forever."—Parousia, p. 105.

If "until" means "forever" then Christ is on God's throne eternally. But if "until I make thy foes thy footstool," implies a limitation of that session, as the cultured generally understand the phrase, then he is unquestionably in the wrong.

He says well when he remarks: "'Heaven,' 'the
right hand of God,' &c. are not in this world of sense." But if the Scriptures are true and "cannot be broken," then, when the seventh angel sounds, great voices in heaven will proclaim: "The kingdoms of this kosmos are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever."—Rev. 11:15. And does not the Doctor know that the Lord has decreed that when his Son shall ask of him he will give him the nations for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession? Does he not know, or has he never read in Daniel 7:10-14, that it is when the fourth beast, the Roman government, with all his horns, has filled his course, that the judgment sits and the books are opened and the Son of man is brought before his Father, the "Ancient of days," and receives his kingdom and dominion, which is to endure forever and ever? Does he not know that that fourth beast so far from being destroyed at the time of the ascension of Christ, or on the day of Pentecost, or at the destruction of Jerusalem, was then in the full tide of triumph, crucified the Lord of glory, slaughtered his saints and destroyed his temple? I pity a Doctor of Divinity who does not know these facts.

But continues the Doctor:

"He will not change that throne for one in Jerusalem; he will not remove from the invisible and celestial sphere to a visible and terrestrial one."—Parousia, p. 105.

How does he know, so as to be able to pronounce so oracularly that he will not remove? His Father declares (Psa. 110:) that at the end of his session at his right hand and when he shall make his foes his footstool, He will "send the rod of his strength out of Zion"
and he shall "rule in the midst of his enemies," where "he shall fill the places with the dead bodies and wound the heads over many countries." In the face of this declaration Dr. Warren says, he will "not remove"! He admits (and his whole argument is based on the fact) the literal fulfillment of the first verse: that Christ has gone to heaven and sat down on the right hand of God. How can he then so suddenly change the whole import of language and make a part of even his chosen verse, "till I make," of no force whatever, as well as all the rest of the Psalm? Perhaps he can answer.

"CHRIST'S COMING IN HIS KINGDOM."

"It has been shown in a previous chapter," says the Doctor, "that the word 'coming' can only be used of a divine being in the sense of manifestation." And I have shown that if Christ was a "divine being," either before or after his resurrection, he did both come and go in a visible and physical sense. And there is not in all the Bible the first hint that he was more divine, or less human, after he ascended than while he was here. He is "the man Christ Jesus," now; our "mediator," and also "the Son of man" whom Stephen saw "standing on the right hand of God," in heaven.

Dr. Warren says again:

"The accession of our Lord to his throne, at his ascension, was speedily followed by that wonderful event which first disclosed to men his kingly power and initiated among them his visible kingdom."—Parousia, p. 106.

If the church is "his visible kingdom," it is a very hard one. Christ does not claim to have acceded to his throne, but to be seated on his Father's throne, and so do the various texts quoted by the Doctor teach the
same thing. There is not a text in the Bible which intimates that the throne of God is Christ's throne. Peter never intimated on the day of Pentecost that Christ was on his throne—but "being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of his Father the promise of the Holy Ghost he has shed forth this which ye now see and hear." The pouring out of the Holy Spirit was an exercise of his priestly office not kingly. It was in answer to his intercession that the Holy Ghost was given, not by kingly prerogative: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter." He is now exalted, according to Peter on that memorable occasion, to be "a prince and a Saviour." A prince is heir expectant, but not an enthroned king. A prince on his father's throne at his father's right hand, holds a very different office to that of a king on his own throne.

Dr. Warren's quotation from Neander is Universalism, pure and simple. Hear him:

"Next to the appearance of the Son of God on earth," says Neander, "this [the descent of the Holy Ghost] was the greatest event, as a commencing point of a new divine life, proceeding from him to the human race, which has since spread and operated through successive ages, and will continue to operate until its final object is attained, and all mankind are transformed into the image of Christ." —Parousia, p. 106.

If this does not mean universal salvation—of all mankind, what does it mean? Then Christ's declaration, "He that believeth not shall be damned," and, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," are all vain words.

Nor was the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost for the regeneration of men; but the gift
of power for the work of the Church. "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."

That that baptism was a great event is true; but it was no evidence of the exercise on the part of Christ of his kingly office. It was evidence of the exercise of his priestly office. "Sit on my right hand." . . . "Thou art a priest forever." Neither the outpouring of the Holy Ghost with its effects, the healing of the lame man, nor the death of Ananias and Sapphira, prove Christ to be on his own kingly throne. Nor did the apostles claim that they did, or that Christ executed that judgment. God had both healed and struck men dead, long before Christ ascended. What the apostles did claim was, that Christ was truly raised from the dead and was at the Father's right hand, "a prince" (not king) and "a Saviour."

Dr. Warren again says:

"Then it was that Christ began to come in his kingdom. A new power began to be felt among men."

A new power. Yes; but the disciples of our Lord called it—not "the Son" but "the Holy Ghost," "another Comforter," who came on the day of Pentecost. Not one apostle or evangelist ever intimated that that was the coming, either in its beginning, or ending, of Christ;—either his erchomenon, or his parousia. If Dr. Warren can produce such a passage, we wait to see it. If he can show that "another comforter," "the Holy Ghost," is the same comforter, "the Son of man" who went away, we await the production of chapter, verse and book. If he could have produced such a text we may be sure he would have done so ere now.

But says the Doctor:
"CHRIST'S COMING IN HIS KINGDOM." 69

“So then, the fact that it was customary for the apostles in that day to speak of the coming of the kingdom of Christ as still future, though very near, is no proof at all that in its higher significance it had not already taken place.”—Parousia, p. 111.

This is a confession that the apostles did to the close of the sacred canon speak of Christ's kingdom as future. Very well: If it had come in its higher significance, is it not marvelous that none of them ever spake, or wrote to that effect, but kept their readers and hearers looking forward for its future coming?

"It is proper to add that in this sense of manifestation, the coming of Christ may be regarded as progressive.”—Parousia, p. 111.

Progressive "coming" of an omnipresent being!
The kingdom of heaven is like: 1. "A grain of mustard seed." 2. "Leaven hid in meal." 3. "Seed cast into the ground." 4. "A stone cut out without hands," &c. These three parables and one symbol, Dr. Warren quotes in proof of the progressive character of the kingdom of heaven. I admit the progressive development of the kingdom. (1), In the conversion of the individuals who are to inherit the kingdom; (2), In the multiplication of the number of heirs, until the full number is made up. (3), That it is God's work to carry on this preparation as he does the growth of the natural seed, until the harvest. And (4), That when that harvest is ripe, or all the heirs are prepared, Jesus, "the Lord himself, will descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air:
and so shall we ever be with the Lord." This is the stone, Jesus Christ and all his, in their resurrection bodies, organized, on their ascension, into a kingdom, to come down from heaven together to meet and destroy the kings of the earth and their armies, and possess the "kingdom under the whole heaven" (as foretold Rev. 19th); and thus become the mountain which shall "fill the whole earth"—THE KINGDOM OF THE GOD OF HEAVEN.

This is all in perfect harmony with the parable of the tares of the field, which teaches that until the harvest, the end of the age, tares and wheat, saints and sinners, are to grow together in the kosmos, when Christ's angels will gather out the tares, "children of the wicked one," to burn them. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Territorially, that kingdom is the kosmos, or world, where tares and wheat once grew. Then, the "six-score obscure persons" who were together in that "upper room," on the day of Pentecost, will have multiplied into "a great multitude which no man can number, out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation," gathered before the throne.
CHAPTER VII.

DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

In his chapter on persecutions, under the head of "Judaism," p. 120, Dr. Warren refers to the date of the Apocalypse. The Doctor's whole book is constructed on the hypothesis that John was exiled to Patmos and wrote the Apocalypse, in the reign of Nero, before A.D. 68, as the emperor died that year.

But he says:

"It is freely acknowledged that the weight of external evidence is in favor of the later date; while the internal evidence seems even more decisively to point to the earlier date, viz., A.D. 67, during the reign of the emperor Nero."

There is no internal evidence that can set aside the positive testimony that it was under Domitian, about A.D. 96, that John wrote.

Irenæus was one of the early Christian fathers, and flourished as a writer about A.D. 178. "He was a pupil to, and trained up under the tutorage of Papias and Polycarp, both of whom were disciples of John the Revelator."—Taylor's Voice of the Church, p. 60. Irenæus says of the Apocalypse: "For it has not been long since it was seen, but almost in our own generation about the end of Domitian's reign." Eusebius says, "No contrary contemporary testimony can be adduced." We can ask for no stronger evidence of its
date, "near the close of the first century." This being the case, all the Doctor's arguments based on the hypothesis of the earlier date, fall to the ground. He has produced no passage from the book which would necessarily require an earlier date—not one. He has assumed certain passages to refer to Nero and his times and then seized on doubtful historical statements to prove that John wrote before Jerusalem's destruction; hence, that he was banished by Nero.

The Doctor continues:

"But even conceding the former opinion [the later date], I see nothing in it to forbid the reference of this portion of the book to the period of the Jewish persecution. If the object of the writer was to console the churches then suffering under the tyrannies of Domitian, he might well do so by referring them to the overthrow of their earlier enemy in Judea."—Parousia, p. 121.

There was no design on John's part, except to write what "he saw and heard." It is "the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave to him. And he sent and signified it by his angel to his servant John, who bare record." There is no evidence that John knew any more of its import than we do who live 1800 years later.

The beginning of chapter 4 introduces us to scenes future of the vision: "Come up hither, and I will show thee things which shall be hereafter." Then the series of events which he saw are an unit; they are events of the future of the vision, and have no retrospective character. All Dr. Warren's parallels between Matt. 24 and 25 and the scenes of Revelation do not require us to place either in the past. For I have demonstrated that the record of the Evangelist of Christ's prediction is not yet fulfilled. If not, and John's visions are parallel with
the Evangelist's description, then both relate to things this side of Jerusalem's overthrow, and are yet to be completed.

APOCALYPTIC EXEGESIS.

We now come to a most interesting part of Dr. Warren's book, his use of Apocalyptic symbols. His application of the beast, false prophet, and dragon will now claim our attention. He says:

"The principal characters engaged in this tragedy [pagan persecution] are portrayed with wonderful power. First, there appears a great bloody-hued, seven-headed dragon, horned and crowned, whose sinuous tail sweeps over the third part of the heavens, dislodging the stars from their spheres. That there may be no doubt as to who is intended by it, we are told that it represented 'that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world.' He is the prime instigator of the persecution. Next there arises out of the sea a hideous beast, of monstrous form, armed with whatever is terrible of horns and fangs and claws, to whom the dragon, his patron, gives power and a throne and great authority.... The cabalistic use of the Hebrew numerals shows him to be the reigning emperor Nero. A second monster, less formidable in aspect than the other, but endowed with infernal cunning and wonder-working skill, springs out of the earth and joins the dragon and the beast in their conspiracy against the saints of God. He is evidently the symbol of the pagan religion, with its splendid array of priests and augurs and magical rites with which the established cultus of the empire holds captive the minds of men."—Parousia, pp. 125, 126.

His accepted definitions of the trio are—the dragon is the devil, Satan; the Beast is the Roman emperor Nero; the other beast is the Pagan religion. Let us keep these definitions in mind. This beast, Nero, makes war on the saints, overcomes and kills them. I grant Nero did this to a large extent. But the Doctor does not think such little characteristics as that he had seven heads and ten horns; that he had the mouth of a lion, feet of a bear, and was himself like a leopard; and that
power was given him to continue forty-two months, and that "all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb," are worthy of notice in identifying the beast. Ingenious as he has shown himself in solving wondrous mysteries, he would find his intellectual and exegetical resources put to a terrible test to show that all the above specified characteristics met in Nero; and he acted wisely in not even attempting an application.

The only mark of identity he does attempt to fix upon is the number of his name. And how does he determine this to belong to Nero? Thus: "The cabalistic use of the Hebrew numerals shows him to be the reigning emperor, Nero."

But Dr. Warren should know that the Greek, not Hebrew numerals are the ones used to designate his name and number. Nor has he attempted to show that Nero or paganism ever caused anybody to receive that number "in his hand or forehead." As an application of symbols, I can conceive nothing more loose and unsatisfactory. It may be all clear to him, but ordinary mortals who entertain the idea that God means something by all his words, will not be satisfied with this summary way of ignoring so many marks of this monster.

The Doctor continues:

"In chapter 17 is given a vision of Rome itself, under the figure of a scarlet-robed harlot riding upon a scarlet-colored beast covered with blasphemous titles, and drunken with the blood of the martyred saints. A prophetic dirge laments her hastening downfall, while a rejoicing chorus in heaven exults over the retribution, and the approaching marriage of the Lamb."—Parousia, p. 127.
APOCALYPTIC EXEGESIS.

My dear Doctor, why did you not tell us how that terrible doom of what you say is "Rome itself," transpired before the death of Nero? You say—"A prophetic dirge of her hastening downfall." What word in that dirge intimates that it is "hastening." Not one. The dirge is over the harlot's doom already executed. So also is the rejoicing in heaven a rejoicing over the executed vengeance on their great enemy: "God hath avenged you on her."

"The approaching marriage of the Lamb!" What did the Doctor mean by this expression? Did he read the passage: "Let us rejoice and be glad and give glory to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come?"—Rev. 19: 8. Does "is come" mean "approaching"?

When what was represented in prophetic vision as a dirge over great Babylon's fall shall be realized, it will follow that fall. When heaven's rejoicing over that fall as seen in vision shall repeat itself in fulfillment, it will be heard following the final overthrow of Babylon, not preceding it.

And then how unlike was the fate of Nero to the doom of the beast! Nero "died like a dog in one of the sewers of Rome." The foretold doom of the beast is, that he "was taken and cast alive into a lake of fire." Again: at the time of the beast's doom, the beast, the kings of the earth and their armies are gathered together to make war against Christ. Did this occur at Nero's death?

Once more. The other beast, called also "the false prophet"—which Dr. Warren says represents "the Pagan religion"—meets his doom, the same doom as the beast, "cast alive into the lake of fire," at the same
time with the beast. And yet the Doctor argues that the *Pagan religion* was only overthrown in A.D. 324, when Constantine constituted the Christian religion the religion of the Roman empire. How is this?

**THE DRAGON THE SYMBOL OF THE DEVIL.**

We turn now to Dr. Warren's disposition of this character. As to who he is there is no controversy; on this point we are agreed, because we both accept the divine definition. For 1800 years nearly, the church with all her learned doctors has understood, from the 19th and 20th chapters of Revelation, the doom of the beast and false prophet, and the binding of Satan, to relate to one and the same period. But Dr. Warren has discovered that the beast met his doom in A.D. 68, at Nero's death; while the dragon was only bound in A.D. 324, a difference in time of 256 years.

The binding of Satan, Dr. Warren has determined, consisted only in taking the civil power from the supporters of Paganism in the Roman empire and giving it to the Christians. He admits that Pagans had equal rights of worship with Christians; and that idol worship was continued. Whereas the prophet saw the devil himself seized, bound, shut up in the abyss and sealed for a thousand years: not that he should not excite Pagan persecution any more for a thousand years, but "that he should deceive the nations no more until the thousand years are finished." Quite a difference.

But the loosing of Satan from his prison will be to common readers as singular as his binding.

The end of the thousand years was marked by the taking of Prusa, now Brosay, the then capital of Nico-
media, in Asia Minor, by the Turks in 1326; 1,002 years after Satan was bound by the decree of Constantine, making Christianity the religion of the Roman empire. And this is all God meant when he revealed to John that "when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea"! Gog and Magog of Revelation are to be found in, and come up from, the four quarters of the earth. The Turks, whom Dr. Warren calls Gog and Magog, came from Asia. Quite a difference again. The Gog and Magog, when gathered around the beloved city, are devoured by fire from heaven, without accomplishing their object,—to fight a battle. But the Turks took the Christian capital Prusa. Another difference. The devil, the deceiver of Gog and Magog, was according to John, at the time of gathering his hosts around the beloved city, without fighting the proposed battle, taken and cast into the lake of fire where the beast and false prophet were cast a thousand years before; while fire from heaven devoured his army. But according to Dr. Warren, the devil took the Christian capital and made it the capital of the Turks. While the Turks, Gog and Magog, have held on their way persecuting and killing Christians these 553 years, while they should have been in the lake of fire with their great chieftain, the devil. Quite a difference, truly.
CHAPTER VIII.

THE MILLENNIAL REIGN.

"They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."—Rev. 20: 4. Dr. Warren says on this passage:

"The idea then is, that these faithful witnesses for Christ, whom their enemies supposed they had utterly destroyed, still lived, i.e., they were exalted to a high state of felicity. Then, as if to be more explicit, it is added, 'they reigned with Christ.' In other words, their living consisted in the honor of participating in the administration of the kingdom with Christ the king." . . . "This reigning with Christ shall continue a thousand years; evidently the same thousand years as that of Satan's confinement. Not that it shall then terminate, but that period is mentioned in order that the two may stand in contrast with each other. As during the martyr age Satan was reigning in the beast and false prophet, and the saints were humiliated and oppressed, so now for a thousand years he shall be humiliated and they shall reign. This reigning was the 'judgment given them.'"—Parousia, pp. 148-7, 149.

Dr. Warren maintains that everybody, at least all saints, have their resurrection at death. So all the martyrs under the ten Roman persecutions, actually had their resurrection as soon as they died. But they did not obtain judgment and begin their reign till 324 A.D. He also says the reigning relates to their judgeship. But John wrote—"They shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." No judgeship is intimated. This binding of Satan, the Doctor says, does not imply the binding or imprisoning of his person—but "in his character as a persecutor . . . .
For this alone is he introduced upon the scene."—Parousia, p. 128.

How did Dr. Warren learn this? The text does not teach it. The language is such that the common people who read the Bible would never think it meant otherwise than the binding and shutting up of a person for a thousand years, to be loosed at its end. The Doctor's hypothesis is a pure assumption, without a word of Scriptural authority to sustain it. He is presented as a persecutor, but it is as a personal persecutor, or the language has no meaning. If he was a persecutor before the time of Constantine, he has been so ever since. For more by far have been killed by Papal Rome, the barbarian kingdoms, the Mahomedan and other powers, than ever the Roman emperors put to death—a thousand to one. Will he say that Satan had nothing to do with persecution from A.D. 324 to A.D. 1326?

The devil was laid hold of, the devil was bound, the devil was cast into the abyss, the devil was shut up, the devil was sealed—"for a thousand years;" and the devil was to be loosed a little season, &c., after the thousand years were ended. Why, in the face of all these statements, does Dr. Warren say it was not "Satan in his general character as the prince of all evil," but "solely in his capacity as a persecutor"? Will Dr. Warren inform us what the martyrs were about after death and before A.D. 324, that they did not till then reign with Christ?

"THE JUDGMENT OF THE DEAD."

Referring to the 20th chapter of Revelation Dr. Warren says:
"The last five verses of this chapter are almost universally assumed to be a description of the general judgment, at which the whole family of man will be judged at the end of time. A careful study of the passage, however, in its connection, will disclose reasons for doubt as to whether this is its true import. Some very able scholars have taken a different view of it."— Parousia, p. 153.

It is not what "some very able scholars" think, but what the language and harmony of Scripture require. The Doctor gives three arguments against what he says is the "almost universal" assumption:

"1. . . Such an understanding of it impairs the unity of the narration."

If the Doctor had said, "It destroys the unity of my theory," I should agree with him, for that is in fact all the unity it destroys.

"2. The source of that imagery is plainly in Daniel 7: 9-11."

The source of the imagery in both passages is God, who gave the vision to Daniel, and he wrote what he saw. The same is emphatically true of John. He says: "I saw a great white throne." "I saw the dead small and great." Each only wrote what he saw. If the one description is like the other it is because God showed the same thing to each. And so he evidently did; each saw in vision the scenes of the judgment day. To make plain the similarity of the two narratives Dr. Warren places them side by side thus:

**Dan. 7: 9-11.**

"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A

**Rev. 20: 11-15.**

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were
fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.

opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it: and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

On this he says:

"In each of these cases we have the throne and one sitting on it in resplendent majesty, the vast multitude standing before it, the opened books of remembrance, the judgment and the casting of the condemned into retributive fire. Now we know, because the interpreting angel positively assures us of it, that the first refers to Daniel's fourth beast, or in other words to Antiochus Epiphanes, the great Syrian persecutor of the Jews, the prototype of Nero and the persecuting emperors of the Christians at Rome. Why should not the second have a like application to the latter?"—Parousia, p. 155.

This will be news to most of my readers. Daniel's fourth beast Antiochus Epiphanes! Did he have great iron teeth, and nails of brass; and ten horns, and another little horn before whom three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots? and were saints, times and laws, given into his hand for a time, times and the dividing of a time, and did the judgment sit at the end of that period, and was the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, then given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom? All these points in the vision, (call them what he pleases) are to
find a fulfilment in Antiochus, before we are bound to receive him as Daniel's fourth beast. It is not a harsh judgment to say that Dr. Warren very well knows that the vision and its interpretation never had a fulfillment in that man. So does the whole literary world know it.

Antiochus was not and cannot be proved to be "the fourth kingdom on earth," as the angel said this fourth beast was. Antiochus was the then ruling monarch of one of the four divisions of the Alexandrian kingdom, a representative for the time being of one of the goat's horns,—that is all. The Roman dominion, beginning with the kingdom of Nimrod, Gen. 10:10, in Babylon, was the fourth great kingdom on earth, as the common consent of historians agrees. Let us consider this subject a little more minutely. Daniel says: "I came near to one of them that stood by and asked him the truth of all this" vision of the four beasts. The answer was: "These great beasts which are four, are four kingdoms which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and even."—Dan. 7:16-18.

The angel continued: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth," which "shall devour the whole earth and shall tread it down and break it in pieces."—Dan. 7:23. Antiochus, so far from devouring, treading down and breaking in pieces the whole earth, was driven from Egypt by the simple command of the Roman senate, without their striking a blow. He never invaded either Thrace, Macedon, or Greece,—all of which were embraced in Alexander's empire. All he ruled was a curtailed Syria. And yet Dr. Warren
would have us believe that he fulfilled the part of this fourth beast! But Rome reigned from the Euphrates, on the east to the Atlantic on the west; the Rhine and Danube on the north and the great desert of Africa on the south, with all the isles of the Mediterranean. While Great Britain, France and Spain—parts of the Roman empire—have conquered and hold North and South America, the Society Islands, South Sea Islands, Australia, the East and West Indies, large parts of Africa and many other parts of the earth. Roman law is the basis of civil law throughout the civilized world. What was Epiphanes? What did he devour, tread down, and break in pieces, that could be called "the whole earth?" Who were "the saints of the Most High" to whom was given "the dominion under the whole heaven" on the casting of the "condemned' Epiphanes to the "burning flame"? Will Dr. Warren inform us? What is the "forever, even forever and ever" of the universal reign of the saints, beginning at the death of Antiochus Epiphanes?

The Doctor's next argument against the "almost universal" assumption, he thus states:

"3. The judgment here described is the judgment of the dead only: the general judgment is to embrace both 'the quick and the dead.' The latter is to be preceded by the instantaneous change of the living into the immortal state; and by the resurrection of the dead. But nothing of this kind is mentioned in connection with the judgment before us. It is not the living nor the risen that are judged, but those who are dead. What then is the import of the passage? As already remarked, I regard it as an integral part of the prophecy relating to the overthrow and punishment of the persecutors of the church."—Parousia, p. 156.

If their overthrow, it is the overthrow of the dead persecutors, for as the Doctor has just remarked, "it is
the dead only" who are spoken of in the passage. Now, it appears to me that if dead they had been already overthrown. Perhaps the Doctor has a scheme by which he can overthrow them after death! But to the common mind it will appear somewhat mystified: for, as the Doctor remarks, "Four times is that term ('the dead') applied to them, as if to emphasize the fact." This is true; and the wonder is, that in full view of it, he should make it merely an "overthrow of persecutors!"

But to the main argument: "This is the judgment of the dead, while the general judgment is of both quick and dead." I ask him, will the dead be judged twice? He says: "The latter [general judgment] is to be preceded by the instantaneous change of the living into the immortal state, and by the resurrection of the dead."—Parousia, p. 156. There is no such thing taught in God's book as a change of the living and resurrection of the dead before the general judgment. I make this issue fearless of successful refutation by Dr. Warren or any other man.

THE TWO ORDERS OF JUDGMENT.

God's judgment, like human tribunals, consists of two parts, as our Saviour said: "Lest thine adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison." The two parts here recognized are, (1) judicial:—examination, or trial, and sentence by the judge; (2) executive:—"deliver to the officer," and "cast into prison." Just so God sits on the throne of judgment, both in Dan. 7th and Rev. 20th; and before him are the books opened
and the judgment rendered. Christ, "because he is the Son of man," receives authority from his Father "to execute judgment" (John 5:27). Accordingly, after the description of the judgment before "the Ancient of days," the Son of man is brought before him and receives from his Father his royal investiture—as executor of judgment. The resurrection is a purely executive proceeding: for "they that have done good" will come forth "unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." The absurdity of such a resurrection for the two classes, and then a trial afterwards, stands out so prominently that it is strange that thinking men should ever have entertained it for a moment. To hang a man and try him afterward is not more absurd.

The representation of Scripture is, that at "the voice of the archangel and the trump of God," the saints living and dead are to be immortalized in a "moment," and caught up to meet the Lord in the air to be forever with him. He is coming to gather together his elect. Christ thus describes the separation: "in one bed," "in the mill," and "in the field," side by side—"one shall be taken and another left." There will be no more commingling of saints and sinners for a general judgment.

Then it follows that if there is ever a general judgment of Adam's race it must precede the resurrection of either class, saints or sinners; hence, before the advent. This being the case, clearly the dead and living will not be arraigned in one body, because their states will not admit of it. Therefore, when the judgment scene is presented, it is "the dead" who are arraigned before God. But Dr. Warren says, "nothing of the kind,
CHRIST YET TO COME.

[that is, the resurrection,] is mentioned in connection with the judgment before us."

Surely he failed to read the entire passage quoted. For after describing the judicial proceeding before the great white throne, the apostle proceeds to describe the executive proceeding: "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and Hades delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to his works:" they were judged executive; "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." This is the exact order of judgment I have indicated: the trial first, then the execution, by the resurrection and execution of the final doom of the wicked in the lake of fire.

DESCRIPTIVE AND CHRONOLOGICAL ORDERS.

The description of the judgment in the 20th of Revelation presents a view of the proceedings of both branches of the judgment with some detail, without reference to its chronological order, which is given us in Rev. 11:18, where, under the sounding of the seventh trumpet and at the time the kingdoms of this world are proclaimed the kingdoms of Christ, and that "he shall reign forever and ever;" the twenty-four elders declare: "The nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged." Then follows the executive proceeding: "And that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great." So much for the saints of God, who have their reward. So also of the wicked: "And shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth:" i.e., destroy them
from the earth. The chronology of this judgment of the dead is unmistakably fixed at the time of the sounding of the seventh angel, and therefore it is pre-millennial.

As soon as a competent tribunal pronounces a prisoner on trial "not guilty," his release from custody is his right, there being no further cause for his detention. So with the saints—when their names are declared to be found in the book of life, and the works done for Christ determined, they are released from the custody of death into glorious immortality.

It is rarely that in a well-ordered government a prisoner convicted of a capital crime is at once executed. He is sentenced and remanded to prison to be held until the day of execution arrives; and from the time of sentence until the extreme penalty is executed, he is suffering under his sentence. So the wicked, when it is declared by the Judge that their names are not found written in the book of life, and what sins they have committed, receive final sentence; but they are remanded to the prison of hades until a thousand years are finished; when they will live again, and be cast into the lake of fire—the second death.

**THE DESCRIPTIVE ORDER.**

The question will naturally arise, If the time of the judgment of the dead is pre-millennial, why is its description post-millennial? (1) Because it has pleased God to so order it. This is a sufficient answer. But there is an apparent reason that can be assigned: (2) The Apocalypse is constructed on the principle of a moving panorama, and is exhibited in parts.
The opening of the seven-sealed book, brings us down in that series to the great day of God's wrath, and silence in heaven. Then the seer goes back, takes another series, and reaches once more with the vision of the seven trumpets the day of God's wrath. Again, he takes the seven vials, and brings us down until he points us to the "wine of the fierceness of God's wrath." Then he presents us with great Babylon's judgment and all heaven rejoicing over it. Next comes the marriage of the Lamb, and its ecstatic joy. Then follows the arrangements for "the great battle," and its results, the death of kings and their armies; the taking and casting of beast and false prophet alive into the lake of fire; the taking, binding and casting of the devil into the abyss and shutting him up for a thousand years. This is followed by another scene—the enthronement and reigning of the victors in the war. There is no antecedent for the pronouns they and them—"THEY sat," "judgment was given unto THEM,"—except the King of kings and the armies of heaven of chap. 19. They gain the victory, judgment is awarded them, and they are enthroned and reign for a thousand years. This company embraces the martyrs and all who had not worshipped the beast and his image, which will be all saints. But the martyrs, as having yielded up their lives for Christ, are accounted worthy of special mention. "This" enthroned company "is the first resurrection," or fruits of the first resurrection. But there will be saints who will never die, and therefore never have a resurrection: what of them? "Blessed and holy is he that hath part with (en) the first resurrection." "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Will
THE MILLENNIUM ENDED.

They live then? Undoubtedly; for "all that are in the graves" who "have done evil" shall come forth at Christ's call "to the resurrection of damnation."

THE MILLENNIUM ENDED.

The thousand years being ended and the devil loosed, he gathers the two nations who occupy the earth in its four quarters, "Gog and Magog,"—the resurrected wicked, to battle against Christ and his saints who are encamped in the holy city. There they meet their final defeat, and are cast into the lake of fire,—the second death.

The next scene opened is the descriptive order of the judgment. First, the arraignment and trial. Second, the execution, by the resurrection and casting, not of all who are raised, but of "whosoever was not found written in the book of life," into the lake of fire. This judgment, trial and execution, constitutes a scene by itself, without reference to its chronological order which had been already given.
CHAPTER IX.

"THREE FIRST RESURRECTION"

On this phrase Dr. Warren remarks:

"This is the first resurrection. Not of the body, for there is not a word said of this, and historically, we know that nothing of the sort took place at the period referred to. The persons whom John saw were the souls of the martyrs, and it was these that lived and reigned. The word anastasis does not of itself imply a corporeal resurrection. Its literal meaning, as will be shown hereafter, is the second or future life. The place where they lived and reigned was 'with Christ'—that is, in heaven, not on earth."—Parousia, p. 150.

"Not of the body." "Historically, we know that nothing of the sort took place within the period referred to." True, if that period was at Nero's death, or Jerusalem's fall,—which it was not as I have proved.

ANASTASIS.

"The word anastasis does not of itself imply a corporeal resurrection. Its literal meaning as will be shown hereafter, is the second or future life."

I may as well at this point as "hereafter" take up the gauntlet thus thrown down in the face of the Christian world. In the foregoing quotation the issue is fairly made and I accept it, and state on my part this proposition:

Whenever the word anastasis is used in the New Testament in reference to the dead, it always implies a corporeal resurrection.
ANASTASIS.

1. Christ's *anastasis* was a corporeal resurrection. Proof: (1.) His body was absent from the tomb. (2.) He showed himself to his disciples and said, "Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."—Luke 24: 39. (3.) He took "a piece of broiled fish and of an honeycomb and did eat before them."—Luke 24: 42, 43. (4.) The Spirit of Christ in David foretold, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Peter "being full of the Holy Ghost," on the day of pentecost, declared that David "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, he seeing this before, spake of the *anastasis* of Christ: that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." Then Christ's *anastasis* was without doubt corporeal. Therefore whenever the word is used in reference to Christ, it means a corporeal resurrection. Acts 1: 22, "be witness of his *anastasis.*" Acts 2: 31, "spake of the *anastasis* of Christ." Acts 4: 2, "Preached through Jesus the *anastasis* of the dead." Verse 33, "With great power gave the apostles witness of the *anastasis* of the Lord Jesus." Rom. 1: 4, "Declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the *anastasis* from the dead." 6: 5, "We shall be also in the likeness of his *anastasis.*" 1 Cor. 15: 12, "If Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection (*anastasis*) of the dead?" Verse 13, "And if there be no *anastasis* of the dead, then is not Christ
risen.” *Verse 21,* “For since by man came death by man came also the *anastasis* of the dead.” 1 Pet. 1: 3, “Begotten us again to a lively hope by the *anastasis* of Jesus Christ from the dead.” Chap. 3: 21, “Good conscience toward God by the *anastasis* of Jesus Christ.” Thus twelve times out of the forty-two occurrences of *anastasis* in the New Testament, it refers to Christ’s resurrection, which was corporeal.

Twelve other instances of the use of the word occur in the controversy with the Sadducees by Christ and Paul. They are as follows, Matt. 22: 23, 28, 30, 31; Mark 12: 18, 23; Luke 20: 27, 33, 35, 36; Acts 23: 6, 8.

**THE DOCTRINE OF THE SADDUCEES.**

“The same day came to him the Sadducees who say, *me einai anastasín*—not to be a resurrection,” Matt. 22: 23. So also Acts 23: 8, “For the Sadducees indeed say *me einai anastasín*, not to be a resurrection, neither angel, neither spirit.”

Thus there were three points of denial: 1. There is not to be a resurrection. 2. There is no angel. 3. There is no spirit. They made a clear distinction between a spiritual existence and a resurrection existence; and never confounded the two. It was not, therefore, a question of “a second or future life,” in spirit, concerning which they questioned Christ, but *anastasis.* “In the *anastasis*, when they rise, whose wife,” of the seven, “shall she be?”—Mark 12: 23.

How did the Sadducees understand the teachings of Christ and the apostles on this subject? “The priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees came
upon them, being grieved that they taught the people and preached through Jesus the *anastasis* of the dead."—Acts 4:2. How had these apostles preached through Jesus the *anastasis* of the dead? Thus: Ye "killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses."—Acts 3:15.

Because these men affirmed the corporeal resurrection of Christ they understood them as teaching and preaching through Jesus the corporeal resurrection "of the *dead*" in general. Again: "Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead."—Acts 10:40, 41. Could Peter's hearers understand anything else than a corporeal resurrection? There was no disagreement between Christ, the apostles, and the Sadducees, as to the import of the word.

**CHRIST'S USE OF THE WORD.**

"The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and they that hear shall live." The word "hour" (*hora*) signifies, as used in this text, not sixty minutes, but a *period* of time. If as is usually held, he meant that those who are spiritually dead should hear and live, it certainly covers the whole Christian age. So also, if it has reference, as it manifestly has, to those whom he called from the dead while on earth—as the ruler's daughter, the widow's son, and Lazarus—it covered a lengthened period.

But when the people marvelled at such a claim, he said: "Marvel not at this," that a few are called to life; "for the hour [period] is coming in which all that are
in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection—*anastasis*—of life and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."—John 5: 25, 28, 29.

What is the nature of this *anastasis*? 1. Its subjects are *in the grave*. 2. These persons in the graves shall hear Christ’s voice. 3. They that hear shall come forth. 4. Come forth according to character, to the *anastasis* of life or damnation. Then Christ used *anastasis* to designate a corporeal rising from the grave, where alone the body rests. For *mnema*, rendered grave, is never confounded with *hades*, the place of the soul.

When at the grave of Lazarus Christ promised Martha, saying, "Thy brother shall rise again," she said, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." What did she and Christ mean? He showed what he meant by what he did: He "called Lazarus out of his grave and raised him from the dead" corporeally. When he said, therefore, "I am the *resurrection* (*anastasis*) and the life, he that believeth in me though he were dead yet shall he live," he clearly meant, "I am the author of the *anastasis*, who will raise the dead to life, as I will illustrate by raising Lazarus." Thus both Martha and Jesus used the word in the sense of a corporeal rising.

**PAUL’S USE OF THE WORD.**

We begin with his memorable speech at Athens: "Whereof he has given assurance unto all men in that he has raised him from the dead. And when they heard of the *anastasis* of the dead some mocked."—Acts 17:
31, 32. What Paul called the raising up of Christ from the dead, his learned Greek audience called his *anastasis*. And certainly if any tribunal was ever competent to determine the import of Greek words, that one which stood on Mars' Hill was the one. We pass on to Acts 23:6, "For the hope and resurrection of the dead I am judged." There is nothing in this passage to indicate any different sense than that which elsewhere attaches to the word, a corporeal resurrection. If there were any room for doubt, his use of the word (Rom. 1:4) will settle its import: "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the *ex anastaseos nekron*—resurrection from among the dead." Here we have him connecting it again with the raising of Christ, whose *anastasis* was confessedly corporeal.

The next occurrence of the word is Rom. 6:5, "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of his resurrection." Here Paul again uses the word in reference to Christ's resurrection, which was corporeal.

Turning to Paul's masterly argument on the subject of the *anastasis* we find the following uses of the word: "If Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" The preaching that Christ rose from the dead, as all the apostles preached, was preaching his *anastasis*, "But if there be no *anastasis* of the dead, then is Christ not risen." Once more: "For since by man came death, by man came also the *anastasis* of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Again: "So also is the resurrection (*anastasis*) of the dead."—1 Cor. 15:12, 13, 21, 42. Each and all of
these texts relate to a corporeal resurrection. But to this it is often replied, that Paul defines himself by saying: "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." True, he thus defines his words.

**NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL BODY.**

None will dispute but what psyche and pneuma are alike spiritual as to their substance. This being so, it will determine the import of Paul's language. He says: "It is sown a soma psychikon—a soul-body: it is raised a soma pneumatikon—a spirit-body." He deduces this result from his statement in verse 45, "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living psyche—soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." The psychikon body was a body quickened by psyche—soul. The resurrection body of Christ was quickened by the divine Spirit, as we read, Rom. 8:11, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal body by his Spirit which dwelleth in you."

As the human soul quickened the body of Adam and although it was corporeal constituted it a psychikon body, so the quickening power of the Spirit of Christ, the last Adam, will constitute our mortal body a pneumatikon body. If the first is psychikal and yet corporeal, what shall hinder the latter from being corporeal and yet pneumatical? which is precisely Paul's idea. "With what body do they come?" "It is sown a psychikon body, it is raised a pneumatikon body." It is the body which is sown that is raised: "it is sown, it [the same it] is raised." Only at first quickened by a
soul from the first Adam, at last quickened by the last Adam's quickening spirit. So is the anastasis of the dead, a corporeal body brought forth at Christ's call from the grave. But we follow Paul still further. Philip. 3: 10, "If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection—exanastasin—out from among the dead." There is nothing here to indicate any other than a corporeal resurrection, while his words in verse 21, "Who shall change our vile body and fashion it like his glorious body," determine that it is this body, corporeal, which is to be fashioned like the body of his glory.

Heb. 6: 2, "The doctrine of baptisms, and of the laying on of hands, and anastasis of the dead." No change of import is found here. He continues: "Women received their dead raised to life,"—ex anastaseos tous nekrous—(Heb. 11: 35). We know that resurrection of dead children to be corporeal; as when Elijah and Elisha, each raised the son of their benefactors. In the light of this text, too, we have it demonstrated that Paul uses the word to designate a corporeal resurrection. 2 Tim. 2: 18, "Saying that the resurrection is past." This in the light of the other texts from Paul needs no comment.

We now turn to 1 Peter 1: 3; 3: 21. But here also, after what we have read of his preaching on the day of Pentecost and before the council, we need have no doubt as to the meaning he attached to anastasis. "Has begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of of Jesus Christ from the dead." "The answer of a good conscience toward God by the anastasis of Jesus Christ." These are, if I mistake not, all the instances of the use of the word in relation to the dead until we come to Rev. 20: 5, 6, "This is the anastasis, the first."
To what does the demonstrative pronoun *this* refer? Clearly to the enthroned and reigning company. Not to the resurrection process, but to the enthroned company who are the fruits of that process: which according to the nature of things, will already have taken place. The most accomplished grammarian will find it difficult to find anything else to refer *this* to. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part *en-with*—the resurrection, the first," or the first resurrected company. These are the saints who never die, but are changed at the Lord's coming and go with the resurrected to meet and be forever with the Lord.

If in every other case where the literal dead are referred to, the word *anastasis* is used to express a physical, or corporeal resurrection, it must be so understood in this passage until good reason can be given for a change of import—which has never yet been done.

The obvious import of the passage is—that the martyrs, all the dead—(1) who have not worshiped the beast; (2) who have not worshiped his image; (3) who have not received his mark, name, nor number,—which will include all dead saints, and all living and changed saints, will live and reign with Christ a thousand years, before the wicked rise; making two resurrections a thousand years apart.

The Doctor further says of the

>SOULS OF THE BEHEADED:

"The persons whom John saw were the *souls* of the martyrs, and it was these that lived and reigned."

"*The persons.*" Very well, but Dr. W. knows that by synecdoche "soul" is very largely used in Scripture, as well as in common use, for "*person.*" "Adam be-
SOULS OF THE BEHEADED.

came a living soul;” “The first man Adam was made a living soul,”—person. He was so called because he was possessed of a soul, and hence the synecdoche, a part for the whole, or the contained for the container. If the Doctor will revise his statement, thus—“The persons whom John saw were the persons of the martyrs, and it was these that lived and reigned,” he will make the case clear. But as I am not certain that he will do so, I have done it myself.

Again, the Doctor says:

“it is called the first resurrection, not in point of time, but of rank and honor. The use of this Greek word is very common. It is translated chief in Matt. 20 : 27,” etc. “In Luke 15 : 22 it is best.”

What the Doctor says of the use of the word rendered “first,” is true: “The use of the Greek word is very common.” It is translated chief in the ten texts he has named. But what shall we say of the seventy-six times it is translated “first”? such as, “He first findeth his own brother Simon.” This is a fair sample of the use of the word in the numerous texts in which it is rendered “first.” There is nothing in the text or context of Rev. 20 : 5, 6, demanding any other than the sense the Christian world has always attached to it. And only Dr. Warren’s theory, and its necessities, demand any such construction as he gives.

If words have any determinate meaning the passage relates to the living of two classes of dead persons, i.e., the martyrs, &c., during a thousand years: “but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” How in the face of so plain a statement the Doctor could attempt to evade the force of the passage by such an unwarranted criticism, is amazing.
CHAPTER X.

THE TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

Dr. Warren, after his argument in reference to a spiritual body, asks,

"When, then, does this spiritual body emerge from the body of time and sense, and enter into its new, its resurrection life? We answer the proposed inquiry unhesitatingly, at death. Not simultaneously with all the family of man, in some supposed far-off epoch at the end of the world, but with each individual at the close of this mortal life."—Parousia, pp. 237-8.

To this I reply: Christ's resurrection was not until "the third day" after his death. This he several times foretold; this the evangelists have recorded; and this all the apostles preached.—1 Cor. 15: 3-11. "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures. . . . He was seen of James, then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also. . . . Therefore, whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."

Then the universal apostolic testimony was, that Christ's resurrection life took place the third day from death. And so the whole church believed. If he did not get his resurrection body until the third day, what was the condition of his soul during that time? It was not in the old body, for that was dead; it was not in
the old body, for that was dead; it was not in the new, or resurrection body, for that did not exist until the third day. Then his soul was disembodied. And if Christ's soul was disembodied three days and yet had such an identity as that he rose the third day, then Dr. Warren's labored argument to prove—that "the only ground on which the resurrection itself is conceivably possible," is the elimination of the spiritual body from the corporeal, at death, falls to the ground. He says, "A strictly disembodied state of the soul is inconceivable." Yet Christ's soul was disembodied—at least it was not in his resurrection body—three days. If Christ's soul was disembodied and yet so existed that he rose again to life, so may all souls thus exist in a disembodied state, and retain the personal identity of the man.

2. The soul of Rachel departed from her when she died (Gen. 35: 18, 19); not her resurrection body. So also when Elijah prayed, "O Lord my God, I pray thee let this child's soul come into him again, and the child's soul came into him again and he revived" (1 Kings 17: 21, 22). Paul calls it an anastasis (Heb. 11: 35). The soul was clearly existing disembodied.

3. When Christ solemnly affirmed: "The hour cometh when all that are in the graves shall hear his voice," he placed their resurrection in the future—"shall hear," not that they were already resurrected, even before they reached the grave. No forced construction can get such a sentiment from the words of Christ. To those then in the graves the resurrection was an event of the future.

4. Christ promised those who shall eat his flesh, &c., "I will raise him up at the last day." This was not a Jewish idea but Christ's positive promise (John 6: 54).
It was on such words of Christ Martha's faith was founded,—that her brother would "rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Christ reiterates this promise in various forms in the same chapter:—"I will raise him up at the last day," four times. Would he have made all these promises if their resurrection was to transpire at death? Why, then, should not all Christians look for a resurrection "at the last day," according to his promise?

5. Did Lazarus have his resurrection when he died? or was it not rather four days after his burial that Jesus "called him out of the grave and raised him from the dead"?

6. Paul, in 1 Cor. 15: 23, 24, states the order of the resurrection to be as follows: (1), "Christ the first fruits; (2), Afterward they that are Christ's at his parousia. (3), Then cometh the end." Three orders. Christ's parousia was an event in the future when Paul wrote; and hence, as they who are Christ's are only to rise at, or in, (as the Doctor pleases) his parousia, it follows according to his theory, that none of Christ's were resurrected at death up to the destruction of Jerusalem. What became of all the saints who died during those forty years between his resurrection and his parousia. Did their souls exist in a disembodied state? or were they extinct? It must be one or the other, for it matters not what theory of the resurrection body he adopts, the language of Paul absolutely excludes the idea of a resurrection before the parousia: "they that are Christ's at his parousia." This language excludes all who are not Christ's from a resurrection even at his parousia. It is only those who are his who are then raised.
until "the end." If the soul cannot exist in a disembodied state and the wicked have no resurrection until "the end," when "the last enemy" is to be destroyed and Christ restores the recovered kingdom to the Father, then up to that time they are extinct. And if extinct, according to the Doctor's argument that if extinct there can be no resurrection (and his argument on that point is unanswerable), then it follows that all the wicked dead are annihilated. Let Dr. Warren escape this conclusion if he can. From this language of Paul, in the light of Dr. Warren's theory, all the disciples of Christ who died between his resurrection and his Parousia, having no resurrection until his Parousia in A.D. 70, or thereabout—for the Doctor is not very definite as to the precise time of the event of the Parousia—and not being able to exist as disembodied souls, are also, as well as all the wicked, eternally extinct. And more than that—all the saints who died before Christ came in the flesh are extinct, having had no resurrection. The Doctor's premises given, these conclusions are inevitable.

7. Christ is declared to be the first-fruits of the resurrected dead. If so, the harvest must be like the sample and not something entirely different. But Christ's resurrection body was corporeal, as he himself affirmed—"It is I myself, handle me and see: a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have; and he showed them his hands and his feet." If such a body was the first fruits, such also must be the full harvest. "We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."—1 John 3: 2.

8. I next invite the Doctor's attention to 1 Thess. 4: 15-17, "For this we say unto you by the word of the
Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming [parousia] of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: [this describes the parousia], and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” By whose authority did Paul say this? Ans. “We say it by the word of the Lord.” What did the Lord authorize him to say? That “the Lord himself shall descend from heaven,” and that “the dead in Christ [not all the dead] shall rise first.” First of what? Before the translation of the living; before those who are not Christ’s. “The dead in Christ” implies that they only will rise at the parousia, and that the wicked will be left behind, making as stated Rev. 20, two resurrections. Note the time of this resurrection: when “the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God.” By what authority does Dr. Warren say this is only the costume of the Parousia? Paul declares it to be “the word of the Lord.” It is rather a fearful responsibility for a poor mortal to take on himself to say that it does not mean what the words express. But Dr. Warren disposes of these sublime words by a flourish of his pen—it is only the costume of the parousia. What if it is costume? It is the costume with which the Lord himself has clothed it.

These eight scriptural arguments on the time of the anastasis of the dead—proving that it is not at death,
but at the descent from heaven of the Lord himself, are sufficient for my purpose, although I might fortify these by a large number of others equally unanswerable. But I cannot dismiss this question of the resurrection without noticing Dr. Warren's collateral

ARGUMENT FROM SCIENCE.

On the question, "What is the body?" he proposes to "interrogate science." Dr. Mark Hopkins is summoned. But his answer to the question not being very distinct, President Noah Porter of Yale College is called forward. He "recognizes the threefold nature of man—body, soul and spirit. He attributes the organic force to the psyche, or soul. Soul originally signified the principle of life or motion in a material organism." He argues that "soul is the elementary principle of bodily life. It originates the bodily organism and actuates its functions." So far, I am in the most hearty accord with Dr. P. But he proceeds: "That the soul begins to exist as a vital force, does not require that it should always exist as such a force, or in connection with a material body. Should it require another such body, or medium of activity, it may have power to create it for itself as it formed the one it first inhabited." This looks much like transmigration—certainly not very much like resurrection. But he proceeds: "Or it may have already formed it in germ, and hold it ready for occupation and use as soon as it sloughs off the one which connects it with earth. These are possibilities," etc.

As Dr. Porter has only reached possibilities, Dr. Warren next brings forward Rev. Joseph Cook as the
representative of the German scientists. Of Mr. Cook he says:

"He claims that it has been made certain that the soul does dwell in such an ethereal, non-atomic body as the President suggests. Mr. Cook says: 'The late German philosophy holds the view that the soul must be conceived as a property or occupant of a fluid similar to ether; this fluid, however, does not, like ether, consist of atoms. It is Ulrici's view that the soul is the occupant of a non-atomic ether that fills the whole form, and lies behind the mysterious weaving of the tissues. This non-atomic fluid is absolutely continuous with itself. Its chief centre of force is in the brain; but it extends out from that centre, and permeates the whole atomic structure of the body. The soul, as an occupant of this ethereal enswathe-ment, operates in part unconsciously, and in part consciously. It co-operates with the vital force. It is not identical with that force. It is the morphological agent which weaves all living tissues. It spins nerves. It weaves the muscles and the tendons, the eye, the brain. It arranges each part in harmony with all the other parts of the organism. So far as the ethereal enswathe-ment of the soul is non-atomic, it is immaterial. This non-atomic enswathe-ment of the soul is conceivably separable from the body. It becomes clear, therefore, that when in that state of existence which succeeds death, the soul may have a spiritual body. The existence of that body preserves the memories acquired during life in the flesh. If this ethereal, non-atomic enswathe-ment of the soul be interpreted to mean what the Scriptures mean by a spiritual body in distinction from a natural body, there is entire harmony between the latest results of science and the inspired doctrine of the resurrection.'"—Parousia, pp. 223-5.

To the acceptance of these propositions of Mr. Cook as the conclusive demonstration of the existence of such a spiritual body as the habitation of the soul in its separate state, and calling it the same thing as the spiritual body of Scripture, I have several objections.

So far as Mr. Cook's statements go, they are largely hypothetical: "Philosophy holds;" "Must be conceived of;" "It is Ulrici's view;" "the soul may have;" "The existence of that body preserves." This is assumption until something more positive than may
ARGUMENT FROM SCIENCE.

have determines the existence of such a body. “If this ethereal . . . . be interpreted.” I do not conceive of this as being very “haughty axiomatic certainty,” nor yet very “clear, cool precision.”

By what means these German scientists arrived at their conclusions as to the existence of this “ethereal enswatethement of the soul,” he does not inform us in the foregoing propositions. He may have done it elsewhere. But clearly—the discovery is not “microscopic,” for its powers are only brought to bear on atomic matter. It is not “physiological:” for the “scalpel” does not deal with non-atomic substance. For aught I know, such an enswatethement may exist; but so far, the proof is wanting; and before accepting it as a demonstrated fact, I await further information. In the meantime I will say that I have the most perfect confidence in the “proposition” of “the God of Israel,” “who made us this soul,” as to its enswatethement, who states the fact that “the life of the flesh is in the blood.”—Lev. 17: 11. And here I rest my faith.

The life (or soul) of the flesh being in the blood, it fills the whole human form, for the blood ramifies every part, and gives the perfect form of the man to the soul. It is the “weaving” and “spinning” agent spoken of by Mr. Cook. When the blood is drawn off, the soul leaves its tabernacle. When the soul leaves the blood, it coagulates, and the material body decomposes. That it is capable of disembodiment and of existing in life in that condition, the Bible clearly teaches: “Fear not them that kill the body but are not able to kill the soul.” (Matt. 10: 28). The soul as a disembodied entity will live. Again Christ’s soul was in
hades, but not left there: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades." "His soul was not left in hades, neither did his flesh see corruption." It was not a spiritual body enswathing the soul that was there. His body was one of flesh, not corrupted, but awaiting the return of the soul into it again.

Says Dr. Warren, p. 230,—

"It is only upon the assumption of the resurrection at death that man's immortality can be shown to be probable or even possible."

My dear sir, Jesus Christ was not raised until the third day after death; and he, by existing in a disembodied state those three days and then living again forever, has demonstrated your assertion to be untrue. Dr. Warren quotes from Prof. Wescott: "Pure reason cannot suggest any arguments to establish the personality of the soul when finally separated from the body, and for us personality is only another name for existence."

To this I reply: The Professor is mistaken. Samuel Drew, in his Treatise on the Soul, has "suggested" from "pure reason" many arguments to "establish it." But it is not reason, but revelation to which we make our appeal on questions of our future being; and that is most explicit on all points which it is needful for us to know, both as to the state of death and that of the resurrection.

Dr. Warren, on 1 Cor. 15: 44, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," says:

"The two are spoken of as co-existing. The verbs are in the present tense, as if alike asserting a present truth. I cannot see how such a form of speech is consistent with the idea that there was at that time no spiritual body actually in exis-
ARGUMENT FROM SCIENCE.

tence, and would not be for a period, then, of at least two thousand years."—Parousia, p. 232.

To help the Doctor out of his difficulty, I beg leave to refer him to the upper part of the page just quoted, for a solution: "The first or psychological man, having been made out of the earth was earthly: the second, or spiritual man, was from heaven." That was Christ. He had then such a spiritual body as all his saints will have. If both verbs are in the present tense, what they teach was true. All Adam's children do bear the image of the earthly. And if we have borne the image of the earthly, "we shall"—is that the present tense?—"bear the image of the heavenly." The heavenly man Christ, has already the true spiritual body, composed of flesh and bones, but quickened into everlasting life by the quickening Spirit which raised him from the dead (Rom. 8:11), and which, if he dwells in us "shall"—in the future—"also quicken our mortal body"—not the soul's immortal, ethereal, non-atomic enswathelement—but "mortal body," by his Spirit which dwelleth in us. Thus "we look for the Saviour from heaven, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like his glorious body, according to the power whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."—(Phil. 3:20, 21). Then not a new ethereal non-atomic body enswatheing the soul, will be ours; but our vile body changed. We do not look for this to be done by natural law, but according to the power whereby Christ is able to subdue all things. He "shall change." "We shall all be changed." "This corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality," not the soul depart with a pure ethereal non-atomic enswathelement, calling it body.
CHAPTER XI.

"THE AGE OF CONQUEST."

Dr. Warren; under this head, maintains that although the 20th of Revelation relates to another event, yet there is to be a millennium in the sense "of universal peace, rest, and felicity." He states that "there are two theories" as to the "methods by which it is to be introduced."

"The first is, that it is to take place suddenly, ushered upon the world by a grand, visible appearing of Christ in the clouds of heaven, to destroy all the wicked and with glorious power and majesty set up his kingdom upon the earth. . . . For myself, I know of nothing to warrant it, or even to give it plausibility. As to any such coming of Christ, the Scriptures are silent."—Parousia, p. 100.

Before proceeding to reply to this strange statement, I will introduce Dr. Warren's principle of interpretation with which he set out. I quote from the Preface to his work:

"I have never seen any reason why the Bible should not be read precisely like any other book,—I mean, of course, if there be only a reverent recognition of its divine origin, and a deep spiritual sympathy with its themes. Its meaning is that of its words in their plain, historical, grammatical sense, modified only by the figures of speech common to all languages, and the local Jewish usage above referred to."

In the light of this rule, what shall we say to Dr. Warren's whole course of treatment of the language of
Scripture; and especially, what shall we think of such statements as are contained in the quotation from p. 160, as above? A sounder rule can scarcely be formulated than he has enunciated. Nor can I conceive of a more gross disregard of it than I find throughout his book. "As to any such coming of Christ, the Scriptures are silent!" "I know of nothing to warrant it, or even to give it plausibility!"

I refer the Doctor once more to Dan. 7: 13, 14, where the Son of man is seen coming in the clouds of heaven, and receives his eternal "kingdom and dominion." I once more refer him to Luke 21: 25-31, where Christ himself gave a series of signs which should follow the times of the Gentiles, culminating in their seeing "the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." And when they should see these signs come to pass they should "know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand," even within a generation.

But to proceed. "The other theory," he says, is "that the consummation is to be reached by development, under the operation of established laws, and may therefore require many years, perhaps centuries, for its attainment." This theory he proceeds to argue at length. He says:

"For, first, our Lord has expressly asserted this to be the mode of progress in his kingdom. We have before cited some of his words on this subject. 'It is,' said he, 'as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up,—first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.'"—Parousia, p. 161.

If Dr. Warren has "before cited some words," so have I replied to them. But as he again cites them, I will again reply and more fully.
This comparison of "the kingdom of God," first demands careful attention (Mark 4: 26–29). The process is that of a husbandman raising and harvesting his crop. 1. He sows his seed. 2. He waits for progressive development, which is progressing under the law of growth, both when he sleeps and when he wakes. The blade first, then the ear, then the full corn, then the ripeness, and then the reaping and garnering. This is all according to the nature of things. The strange thing about the Doctor's quotation and use of this parable is, that he entirely forgot to notice the conclusion of the parable. It reads as follows: "But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle because the harvest is come." Dr. Warren would never have a harvest, but keep the crop forever growing. But this parable is his own chosen illustration of the development of the "kingdom of God," and he must abide its decisions.

The Doctor says further:

"Now, it seems to me in the highest degree unreasonable to assume that Christ is going to violate or ignore this principle which he has so clearly enunciated, and by a sudden interference, with miracle and violence, arrest this established course of things and introduce another. He will not devastate the growing field, and instantaneously create a crop."

No, my dear sir; he will not devastate the growing field, but reap the ripe field. This principle he has "clearly enunciated," and will carry out. He would be an unwise farmer who labored to produce a crop, and when ripe failed to reap and garner it.

The question which at this point should interest us is, what does Christ mean by the harvesting of the crop of grain? And no one is more competent to answer
THE AGE OF CONQUEST.

The question than himself: and this he has done with very great distinctness in expounding the parable of the tares of the field in the 13th chapter of Matthew.

The disciples said to him: "Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field." He answered and said unto them, "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man." [I may as well say just here, that Dr. Warren declares it was God by Moses. But we will let that pass.] "The field is the kosmos"—the globe we inhabit. "The good seed are the children of the kingdom"—that is, saints. For the saints of the Most High are to take and possess the kingdom forever, Dan. 7: 18. "The tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil. The harvest is the end of the age" or dispensation, "the reapers are the angels."

This statement of Christ is definite and conclusive as to all the elements of the parable. Especially is it so as to the seed, the sowers, the field, the reapers, and the time of the harvest. The action of the reapers and disposition of the crops are stated with equal explicitness: "As the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of this world [age]. The Son of man [he that sowed the good seed] shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom [then the kosmos where the seed was sown is his territorial kingdom] all things which offend and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." It would seem impossible to mistake such language coming from such a source.
The harvest is to extirpate all who do iniquity from the kosmos, and the glorified righteous are to be its occupants. I feel quite a curiosity to know two things in this connection, which probably I shall never attain: (1) Why Dr. Warren took no notice of the concluding verse of the parable he quoted, respecting the harvest; and (2) why he said that he who sowed the good seed was God through Moses, in the face of Christ's statement that it was "the Son of man." Perhaps he will explain.

But the Doctor will see in the light of Christ's explanation, that he does not propose to "interrupt the growing field," even to rid it of tares; but to bide his time until the harvest is fully ripe. And then he does not propose to instantly create a crop, but to gather the wheat into his "barn," as any wise farmer would do.

And until that harvest comes, there will (in the light of the parable of the wheat and tares) not be a time when all the inhabitants of the earth will be holy. And even then, it will not be brought about by the conversion of all, but by exterminating the tares, and leaving the field for the perfected wheat. Will the Doctor, in view of these two parables, continue to assert that he "knows of nothing to warrant, or even give plausibility" to the idea that Christ "will destroy by his judgments all the wicked, and with glorious power and majesty set up his kingdom upon earth"?

I pass next to his reference to Christ's parable of the mustard seed, "which when it is sown in the earth is less than all the seeds that be in the earth; but when it is sown it growtheth up and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches, so that the
"THE AGE OF CONQUEST."

fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it." What use he intends to make of this parable he does not say. But one thing is evident about the mustard tree, it has its maturity like the wheat; after which, if the Doctor were to leave it in the field a whole millennium it would grow no more. All the development there is to it, is developed to ripeness. After which the producer gathers in the seed. Did the Doctor never think of this?

Another parable quoted by the Doctor unto his readers is to the same effect as the others: the parable of the leaven. He quotes:—"It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." On this (probably with the other two parables) Dr. Warren says: "In other words, development from within, growth from its own divinely implanted law of life, is the mode of that kingdom's advancement."

Granted. But even the leaven will only leaven the measures of meal into which it is put; not all the meal in the world. Leaven, like seeds, has its period, after which it becomes dead and will ferment no longer. All housewives know that to use leaven for raising their dough after it is past a certain point of fermentation is a certain way to spoil their batch. No, Doctor, leaven has its times, first of fermentation, and then of death. The chemical action in the raising of bread is at an end when the bread is baked: it no longer acts upon it. So the grace of God in its action on the human heart, transforming it into the divine nature has its period of inception, development and perfection, when the mystery of God shall be finished, and the results of grace will alone remain in the glorification of the saint.
And what is true of one saint is true of all saints and consequently of the whole body of Christ. Our Lord has given us in the parable of the wheat and tares the limitation of the work of grace by saying, "The harvest is the end of the world." And it is only to that same period the commission of his ministers extends: "Lo I am with you all the days even to the end of the age." When that end comes there is no promise of his divine energizing presence in evangelizing the nations any longer. Is there? Then comes the time of harvest, when the fruits of former ages of toil and waiting, will "shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Here the children of God go on from grace to grace; then "we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Dr. Warren under his second head, p. 162, says:

"What was thus asserted in principle as the law of growth in Christ's kingdom, has been confirmed in fact. It is now two thousand years, nearly, since that kingdom was first established, [I have proved the contrary,] and during all this period the vital forces implanted in it have been working; and it is these, under the fostering care of God's providence and Spirit, which have resulted in what we see to day of the majestic prevalence and power of Christianity."

But has the Doctor any certain means of determining how nearly ripe the harvest is? Can he determine just how long it will be before the husbandman will thrust in the sickle, because the harvest is come? Does he know with any degree of certainty how much longer it will be ere the three measures of meal will be fully leavened, and ready for the baking? For these are the next developments. The work of grace will develop into glory. But the Doctor continues, on p. 163:
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"What has been, we have every reason to believe will be, save that there may be increased rate of progress. Nations, by and by, will be born in a day."

If the Doctor had known any word of revelation from God authorizing this prediction, he would certainly have quoted it. But no such divine word exists within the lids of the Bible, and therefore he has "spoken presumptuously."

His collateral argument from the geological changes in the earth's structure, has little to do with God's revealed purpose as to the future. But of one thing we are assured by Paul, that when God says, as he has by the prophet Haggai: "Once more, I shake not the earth only but also heaven," "this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." We may therefore be sure that only one more shaking of earth and heaven remains; then comes permanence—"a kingdom" for the saints "which cannot be moved." Then "let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear."

"Sir Charles Lyell, than whom," says Dr. Warren, "there is no higher authority in these matters, says: 'I see no reason for supposing that any part of the revolutions in physical geography indicate any catastrophe greater than those which the present generation has witnessed.'"

Yet when the Holy Ghost speaks, "a greater than" Lyell "is here." And so Dr. Warren feels constrained to confess. If Christ declares, "Heaven and earth shall pass away," he also adds—"My word shall not pass away." Has his word ever yet failed of accomplishment.
in the "baldest" literal sense, when the time arrived for its accomplishment? No such instance has occurred. Then let us believe him.

Again Dr. Warren says, p. 165: "In hinting at the course of this progressive development,—for I can do no more—we have very little help from Revelation." That is so. Again:

"Prophecy, while so full and impassioned in describing the consummation itself, gives but the merest glimpse of the steps, or stages which are to lead to it. But I venture to suggest only the following: 1. Christianity is to become universal throughout the earth."

This is a palpable contradiction of our Saviour, who says the wheat and tares, saints and sinners, are to grow together in the same field—the kosmos,—till the end of the age, when he will make a final division, casting all who "do iniquity" "into a furnace of fire," and "then the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." As this has never yet transpired, the end of the age has not yet arrived. As Christ is still with his ministers, the end of the age has not come. Christ has declared that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world (οἰκουμένη) for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come." Every evidence of the near accomplishment of this prediction is another proof that the end draws near. But not one solitary text can be found intimating any such result as that "Christianity shall become universal throughout the earth." If it existed, Dr. Warren would have found and quoted it.

"2. Christianity is to become the sole religion of mankind."

This is also a prophecy out of his head, or heart, without one solitary text to confirm it.
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3. Christianity is to be greatly intensified in power. It is to bring those who are subject to it to a higher plane of experience . . . children of pious parents are to grow up into Christ from birth," &c.

The word of God teaches the direct reverse of this. In answering the question, "What shall be the sign of thy Parousia, and of the end of the age?" Christ said (Matt. 24: 13, 14), "And because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold: but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, . . . and then shall the end come." This has little appearance of "intensified power" in Christianity. But perhaps I ought to say that Dr. Warren contends that this passage relates to the times of Nero's persecutions. If so, neither Christ, or his apostles uttered anything to give a brighter aspect to the state of things in the church at any subsequent period.

As to children—the latest prediction we have concerning them is found in 2 Tim. 3: "Proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection," &c. If this is not true now, what mean our constantly multiplying reform schools for juveniles whose parents cannot control them? Neither Scripture nor facts warrant any such conclusions as the Doctor has stated above.

Again he says, p. 169:—

"The earth itself is to be regenerated morally and physically, the latter through the former. God is going to make new heavens and a new earth, but he will do it not by sudden miracle, but by the hands of the renewed and sanctified inhabitants of the earth. He is to be in the hearts of men as the new Creator who makes all things new. It is thus that his tabernacle is to be with them, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God himself shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death."
And all this in a world of mortality and death, where human beings are born and die! "Neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." And all this to be done by human hands, "not by sudden miracle!"

After reading all this and much more, I much prefer resting my faith on 2 Peter, third chapter, in its plain and obvious sense.
CHAPTER XII.

"THE CONSUMMATION."

Dr. Warren commences this theme by quoting 1 Cor. 15: 24–26, "Then cometh the end," &c. On this passage he says:—

"The word end. . . . may signify either the termination of a thing, or its consummation, that in which it eventuates: Matt. 26: 28, 'Peter went in to see the end,' i.e., the result, or outcome of the proceedings. I take it that this is the meaning of the word in this place as denoting the issue or consummation of Christ's reign as king."—Parousia, p. 271.

If Dr. Warren will examine the passage a little more critically he will see that the subject of the remark is the order of the resurrection, and relates to the termination of the resurrection: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every one in his own order [tagma,—appointed succession]: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his parousia; then cometh the end." The text demands the resurrection of all who died in Adam, which embraces all Adam's children. The first order of the resurrection was "Christ the first fruits;" the next order or succession will be, "they that are Christ's i.e., all who have his Spirit, "for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." None
of the wicked, therefore, have part in this order: they
are left for the next order, which will transpire at the
time of Christ’s delivering up of the recovered kingdom
to his Father, the rebellion being put down, all opposing
power overthrown, and all the earth bearing true al-
legiance to God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ,
the appointed and eternal king over all the earth. All
tries to evade the force of this passage as teaching
two distinct orders of the resurrection, are abortive.
Admit the divine authority of the text, and we are com-
pelled to believe that the wicked will have a resurrection
order of their own, at which time the office of death will
be at an end, for there will then be no more human be-
ings for him to hold in his grasp.

If Dr. Warren is aiming his blows at pre-millennial-
ists to prove that Christ’s surrender of the kingdom
to the Father, is held by them as terminating his reign
over the kingdom he has purchased with his blood and
redeemed by his power, he has labored in vain and
spent his strength for naught. For they believe his
reign will be just as Gabriel assured Mary—“Of his
kingdom there shall be no end,” and as the heavenly
voices proclaim at the sounding of the seventh trumpet:
“The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms
of our Lord and of his Christ and he shall reign forever
and ever.”—Rev. 11:15.

True, they believe he will reign with his resurrected
saints a thousand years before “the end” of the resur-
rection comes by raising the wicked, and casting all ene-
mies into “the lake of fire—the second death.” That
they hold that Christ’s reign will ever end, would be a
most unjust imputation. If Dr. Hodge held and taught
such a doctrine, let him bear the responsibility. But in behalf of pre-millennialists, I repudiate the thought.

PERPETUITY OF THE KINGDOM.

I am happy at last to find a theme on which I am in accord with Dr. Warren—and that is, that Christ's kingdom on earth will have no end. On this point the Doctor is eminently strong and emphatic; and his array of witnesses multitudinous.

The wonder is, that taking all these texts as he seems to do, in their plain and obvious sense, he has not discovered and owned that they require the presence of the man Christ Jesus, the Son of David according to the flesh, to return again to earth to receive "the throne of his father David and reign over the house of Jacob forever." For he must see that the throne of God on which for a season he is now set down, is not now, never was, nor will it ever be, the throne of David.

And really, I begin to hope that as he proceeded he inclined more and more to that idea. He quotes with seeming approval the following from "Pressel as quoted by Geikie" (Parousia, p. 175):—

"'Earth, thou grain of sand on the shores of the universe of God, thou Bethlehem amongst the princely cities of the heavens; thou art and remainest the loved one amongst ten thousand suns and worlds, the chosen of God.' [Reader, attend.] 'Thee will he again visit, and then thou wilt prepare a throne for him, as then thou gavest him a manger cradle. In his radiant glory thou wilt rejoice, as thou didst once drink his blood and tears, and mourn his death. On thee has the Lord a great work to complete!'

To this I respond most heartily, Amen and Amen.

With this quotation I leave his argument on the eternal perpetuity of Christ's throne on earth, lest by quoting more, the fair picture just drawn should be defaced.
“THE END OF THE WORLD.”

“The harvest is the end of the world.” This with several other texts Dr. Warren quotes, in which “the end of the world” is used; and shows just as all premillennialists do, that it does not mean the end of the material globe; but end of the age. He proves with great force, that the kosmos is never to be annihilated, just as premillennialists of all schools hold. Here, then, we are at one again. But when we come to the question of what age is meant, I fear we shall not be so well agreed. On pp. 189–90 he says:—

“When our Lord and his apostles, therefore, spoke of ‘the end of the world,’ they used the word, we cannot doubt, in the sense that was customary in that day, the only sense in which it was possible to have been understood by those whom they addressed.”

When a speaker or writer uses words which have a well and commonly understood meaning, he will be understood in that received sense unless he uses the words in such connection as to clearly show that he uses them in a peculiar way—different from the commonly received sense. When he does so we are bound to interpret his words in that peculiar sense. Or when he defines the sense in which he uses them, we are bound to recognize his own definition in interpreting his language. Those familiar with Webster’s Unabridged dictionary will see that probably three-fourths of his definitions are derived from the peculiar usage of the different writers quoted. Will not Dr. Warren allow Christ and the apostles the benefit of this law? or must they, alone, of all the race, be shut up to one meaning of words, and that the prevailing sense, when they speak or write?
Now Christ has used the phrase "end of the age" with such definition of the sense in which he used it, and in such connection, as to render his meaning clear, and as to render it impossible without violence to misinterpret his meaning. Let me illustrate by citation: "The harvest is the end of the age." Very well, we now understand so far. But what will characterize "the harvest" or "end of the age?" Christ answers: "As therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire so shall it be at the end of this age. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things which offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." With such clearness of definition could not any hearer understand his meaning, even if it did differ ever so much from the common usage? If I had not the proof to the contrary before me, I should be disposed to say, it is impossible that any one should misunderstand him.

Then according to Christ's own definition of his words, at the "end of this age" there is to be an everlasting separation between the righteous and the wicked, not alone on the gee, land of Palestine, but the kosmos—the whole globe, and each receive his final doom. Did any such thing take place at the end of the Mosaic age? The Doctor knows it did not.

Without pausing to notice the parallel parable of the net, I pass to Christ's promise to his ministers, (Matt. 28: 20), "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the age." Until Dr. Warren is prepared to take the
ground that Christ's commission and promise to his disciples expired with the end of the Jewish age, he must admit that Christ had in view that age which ends with the gathering out of the wicked and glorifying the righteous "in the kingdom of God."

**WHEN DID THE MOSAIC AGE END?**

With Dr. Warren I agree that this *kosmos* is never to end as an abode of man. With him I agree that the Jewish age was to end; and with Christ I hold that this Christian *age*—the age for taking out of the Gentiles a people for Christ's name, will end. The Doctor says, *pp. 202, 203*: "I do not, then, find the doctrine of the end of the world, either as a planet, or as the scene of human life and probation, taught in the Scriptures."

That is strange. Do you think there will be probation after Christ sends his angels and they gather out of the *kosmos* "all things which offend and them which do iniquity" and "shall cast them into a furnace of fire," and the glorified righteous "shine forth in that kingdom"?—which will be at the end of this world.

But to the question:

The Jewish or Mosaic age ended when the Jews rejected and crucified their King.

1. After Christ rode in royal form into Jerusalem and was proclaimed king by the people, but was rejected by the rulers, he said, Seeing you have rejected the chief corner-stone, "therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." What kingdom was taken from the Jews?
2. On their rejection of him, he told them, "Now is the krisis of this world: now shall the prince of this world [meaning not the devil, but the Messiah] be cast out; and I if I be lifted up will draw all unto me,"—I will break down the middle wall and embrace both Jew and Gentile in my call.

3. When Christ came to the cross he entered on his priestly work by offering up the final sin-offering, his own blood.

4. In making that offering he brake down "the middle wall of partition" by rending the vail before the most holy place, from top to bottom—signifying that the way into the holiest was now opened.

5. "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity, a change of the law."—Heb. 7:12.

6. "Now once in the end of the ages, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." When did he offer this sacrifice? "In the end of ages,"—where the two ages met. Then the Jewish age ended when Christ's sacrifice was offered.

Sentence was pronounced on the nation and city before Christ's death, by Jesus himself; but execution of sentence was deferred for some forty years, to give the Christian institution time and opportunity for development. Jewish service continued in the temple until it was destroyed; but it was a dead and worthless service, only an abomination in the sight of God: because it was a constant denial of his Son, and a treading under foot of his blood and authority.

If the death of Christ ended the Jewish and introduced the Christian age, then the promise of Christ to his disciples after his resurrection, that he would be
with them "to the end of the age," refers to the age of grace then introduced, the age in which we are living. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Therefore the age of which he spoke is the one which is to have an end at his coming in a cloud with power and great glory. It is at the end of this age when he will clear the kosmos, his field, of tares,—a work he did not do at the end of the Jewish age, nor has he ever done it at any time.

It seems now somewhat apparent why the Doctor attributed the sowing of the good seed to Moses, rather than to the Son of man. If the seed is of His sowing as He declared, then the end of the gospel age is the harvest of its fruitage, which would spoil the Doctor's theory of its being at the end of the Jewish age. But it was certainly a very bold statement for him in the face of Christ's words,—"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man"—to say Moses was the one who did it,—whether in part or whole.

One thought more. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till he come."—1 Cor. 11:26. If the Lord has come, why does the Doctor (as I suppose he does) adhere still to the observance of the Lord's supper? Why has the whole Christian church continued to observe it? Why did not the Christian fathers immediately succeeding the destruction of Jerusalem abandon it and teach that the Lord had come, and therefore the observance of the ordinance should terminate? Or why, even now, since Dr. Warren's discovery that the Lord did come at the period of Jerusalem's overthrow, does he not make an issue with Congregationalism, and do his best to have discontinued in the church an effete ordinance?
With this I close my review, at least for the present. There are some points in the Doctor's book which I have not particularly noticed, but as they are based on the assumption that the parts I have noticed are firmly settled, and as I believe I have fairly pointed out the fallacy of his positions so far, he will excuse me, I am confident, from going further.

Following the Doctor's example, I propose now to give a summary of Bible eschatology.
CHAPTER XIII.

SUMMARY OF ESCHATOLOGY.

Last things implies first things. Paul says: "So it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." The first Adam was made to have dominion over the earth and all its creatures; to multiply his race till earth was replenished or filled with them. But by rebellion against the Supreme Power, he (as men do under all human governments) forfeited his political franchise as ruler of the earth: his property—that beautiful home in the garden—and his life; and thus became alienated from the life of God, he and all who should spring from him. "For by one man's disobedience sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so, death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." All died in Adam. But "as in Adam all die: even so in Christ shall all be made alive." That is redemption and recovery.

Adam was to replenish the earth by natural generation; Christ is to do it by the regeneration of the old Adamic race, or such as accept the last Adam by faith. Unbelief, resulting in disobedience to God, wrought the ruin; and belief in Christ producing obedience will accomplish the recovery. How that simple act of believ-
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ing in Christ as the Son of God can bring about such a change of soul and body as shall bring the man back to holiness and immortality, is a mystery. So it was how looking on a brass serpent could neutralize the poison in the blood of the bitten Israelites, restoring perfect health. But that was God's plan and promise, and he did it; and so is this. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." It is ours to believe, and God's to save with complete and everlasting salvation.

Christ is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world. The shedding of his blood was the satisfaction rendered to the violated law of God in the sinner's place. Now God can be just and justify the penitent believer: by his incarnation, death, resurrection, and intercession, Christ has purchased and secured the right of redemption, both of the inheritance and the heirs. So the believer is "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession." The world in the beginning was given to Adam to replenish and govern, Gen. 1: 26-28; Psa. 8: 4-8. The earth was cursed for Adam's sin, Gen. 3: 17-19.

The earth and its dominion given once to Adam, and lost, are to be restored in "the world to come," to Christ, "the Son of man": Psa. 8: 4-8, as explained by Paul, Heb. 2: 5-10.

The promise of God to Christ of the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession (Psa. 2: 8) is most explicit: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen
for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

This earth, the kosmos, the whole globe, is to be Christ's kingdom, or empire. Rev. 11:15, "And there were great voices in heaven saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever."

Christ, having borne our sins in his own body on the tree, and died for our sins, was buried, rose again the third day in the same body in which he died, and proved it, (1), by leaving his tomb empty; (2), by showing himself to his disciples and calling on them to handle him and see that he had flesh and bones, as a spirit has not; and (3), by taking from their hands "a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb" and eating before them. This material body, identified by such tests, left the mount of Olives from their midst and in their sight: they watching him as he went up, until a cloud received him from their sight. On the instant two in bright apparel stood with them and confirmed what Christ had told them—"If I go away I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also,"—by saying: "This same Jesus which is now taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (Acts 1:11). Jesus, then, shall so come as he went: yes, come again. A cloud received him, and a cloud will reveal him; so said Jesus (Luke 21:27), "And they shall see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory."

When he comes again it will be to manifest who are his, by taking them all from earth to meet him in the
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air to be forever with him. 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And so shall we ever be with the Lord." Some rely on this passage in proof that the saints are to go with Christ to heaven as their everlasting home. But if this proves anything in that direction it only raises them to meet Christ in the air, not in heaven. But if we trace them further, we find in Rev. 19th, that after the marriage of the Lamb (his eternal union with his people in the New Jerusalem, thus organizing his kingdom), Christ and all the armies of heaven attending him with martial pomp come down to earth again, conquer the combined armies of earth, get the victory, possess the earth, and reign a thousand years before the wicked rise from the dead, and then reign on forever, even forever and ever, while the devil and all whose names are not written in the book of life, are cast into the lake of fire—the second death.

THE SOUL

is that element of the human being which animates the body, and is in the Bible rendered interchangeably, life, or soul; sometimes in the same passage it is rendered by both words. It is a great question with philosophers in what part of the body it has its seat. But the Being who made man has given its location: "The life of the flesh is in the blood."—Lev. 17: 11. As the blood is the seat of the soul, the vitalizing agent, as soon as the
soul leaves the body the blood decomposes and coagulates. Or if the blood be drawn off the soul leaves and the body decomposes.

**THE SPIRIT**

is the sentient agent and is spoken of as that which *knows*. "What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him." —1 Cor. 2:11.

The brain and nerves being the seat of sensation, the spirit has its seat in that structure. Hence in a state of trance, as when the Revelator was called up to heaven and to a high mountain, &c., he says: "Immediately I was in spirit," that is, entranced. In that state although the vital functions proceed, such as respiration and circulation dependent on the soul, yet the sensation is wanting, so that you may cut, tear, strike, prick, &c., and the subject has no knowledge of it. And yet such a trail is left behind connecting the spirit with soul and body that if a communication can be instituted with the spirit, it will communicate its place, its surroundings and its sight, and doings. But when the *soul departs*, that constitutes death. These two combined constitute what Paul calls "the inner man"; while the body constitutes "the outer man," "the tabernacle," Peter called it:—"put off my tabernacle." The *soul* and *spirit* being both of spiritual non-atomic substance, to constitute the inner man, they adhere even in a state of separation from the body; and hence are called interchangeably, soul, or spirit, the one being used for both. Of Rachel, Jacob's wife, it is said, "As her soul was departing from her, for she died," &c. So when Elijah prayed for the restoration of the child to life, he said, "Let this child's
soul come into him again." "And the child's soul came into him again." But when Christ raised the ruler's daughter, it is said, "her spirit came into her." Stephen prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and he gave up the ghost, or spirit. In all these instances the one or the other is used for both. Leaving the body at death they exist so conjoined as to constitute the man. As after death, when the body was dormant, Christ recognized the rich man and Lazarus as living consciously in torment and comfort: so Paul recognizes the person as existing—"absent from the body but present with the Lord." "I shall put off this my tabernacle."

NERVES AND BLOOD-VEVSELS.

The nerves and blood-vessels each having their ramifications throughout the whole body,—so that the finest needle cannot penetrate any part of the skin without touching a nerve, or a blood-vessel,—so the soul, or life, which is in the blood must pervade the whole man and have his perfect form. And the same is true of the spirit in the nervous structure.

THE RESURRECTION.

The word resurrection in every instance in the New Testament, when used in reference to the dead, implies a raising up of the man in a material body. (1) Christ's resurrection was the raising up and restoring to life of his material body of flesh and bones. (2) So of Lazarus. (3) So also Paul speaks of the raising of the two children, one by Elijah, the other by Elisha, as their anastasis.—Heb. 11: 35. (4) Christ is "the first fruits" of the resurrection, and therefore the harvest must be like
it. (5) Paul, in 1 Cor. 15, says, "it,"—the body,—"is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption."

UNION OF SOUL AND BODY.

If the identity of man ceases at death, so that he has no personal recognition of himself, there can be no resurrection. For the body is inert and unconscious in death. If God should raise the body or make a new man, he would have no cognizance of sin or righteousness as to the former man. This was the trouble with the Sadducees; they said there is no spirit, hence there can be no resurrection. And in this they reasoned justly: for their premise granted, this logical sequence followed. Christ met the difficulty by denying the premise, showing from Moses, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob still existed, and therefore there is to be a resurrection. The soul of the child whom Elijah raised came into him again. The spirit of the daughter of Jairus came into her. Christ's "soul was not left in hades, neither did his flesh see corruption." "This Jesus God hath raised up." So, also "them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." Thus the inner and outer man are reunited, to be eternal companions.

The new birth affects the inner man: "for that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Thus Christ taught Nicodemus. And thus also Paul taught: "If Christ be in you the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness."

But the body also is to be regenerate in its appointed time. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the
dead shall also quicken your mortal body by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.” Thus will exist in a state of immortality, the perfect man, soul, body and spirit, the first Adam’s offspring regenerate entirely in the last Adam, the quickening Spirit. As the first Adam’s body, together with all his children, was psychikon, or (for the want of a better word) psychical, because quickened by a soul; so the last Adam’s body is pneumatical, because quickened into a new life by the last Adam’s quickening Spirit. Thus there is a psychical body, and there as a pneumatical body. And “as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.”

**THE RESURRECTION INSTANTANEOUS.**

So far as the saints are concerned, they will have an united, instantaneous resurrection at Christ’s parousia, or erchomenon,—for what the disciples called in their question, Matt. 24: 3, his parousia, he in his answer expressed by the participle, erchomenon, coming. The statement of Paul is—“In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.” “The dead in Christ shall rise first.”

**THE FINAL ABODE OF THE SAINTS.**

As disembodied spirits, before Christ came all the old patriarchs and kings who referred to the subject of their abode after death, spoke of going down down to Hades, or in Hebrew, Sheol, so Christ’s soul went there. There, according to Christ, the rich man and Lazarus
were. But since Christ went there and came forth with the keys of death and hades, "having vanquished him who had [not has] the power of death," no dying saint has ever spoken of going there. It is now, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." "Depart and be with Christ, which is far better." "Absent from the body, and present with the Lord." "The spirits of just men made perfect," in "the heavenly Jerusalem." So that whether it be in hades or the heavenly city, the abode is temporary, to end at the parousia of Christ when he comes to abide forever.

For the wicked there is no intimation that any change in their location took place at Christ's resurrection, they remain in hades, or the under-world.

1. But as to the future inheritance of the saints, no doctrine of the Bible is more emphatically stated. Christ settles it by saying: "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth."

2. When he assigns the righteous their portion (Matt. 25: 31-34) he says: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world,"—kosmos—this earth, given to Adam then, but now promised to Christ.

3. Christ's everlasting kingdom is to be this kosmos. Rev. 11: 15, "There were great voices in heaven saying: The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever."

4. "If ye do these things ye shall never fall. For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."—2 Pet. 1: 10. If, as the heavenly voices
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declare, that "everlasting kingdom" is this kosmos, and the entrance into it is abundantly ministered to the faithful in Christ Jesus, then this earth is to be fitted up for their final home.

THE NEW OR RENEWED EARTH.

Dr. Robinson, in his Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, contends that the word new heavens, &c., signifies "renewed,"—"I saw a renewed heaven and a renewed earth." And so God has promised (Isa. 65:17), "Behold I create a new heaven and a new earth." "We," says Peter (2 Pet. 3:13), "according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." It will come after shaking once more—not the earth only but also heaven. Then comes eternal permanence; "a kingdom which cannot be moved" (Heb. 12:28). And thus John heard the redeemed exultingly sing: "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and we shall reign on the earth." Glorious consummation for the ransomed host!

THE FINAL DOOM OF THE WICKED.

"And the devil which deceived them was cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet are; and they shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." "And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire—the second death." The first death, separation of soul and body, is no more forever.

Christ's triumph in presenting to his Father a restored dominion on earth, with all enemies subdued, will be complete and eternal. "And he shall reign" on the
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"throne of his father David, over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." David's throne and kingdom were only on earth, and here his Son shall reign.

My summary is brief, but sufficiently full for a clue to those who desire to learn more. It brings together the beginning and end, and shows the unity of God's plans, and the accomplished result.
APPENDIX.

REJOINDER TO DR. WARREN'S REPLY.

Dr. Warren, in Messiah's Herald of March 3rd, in his reply to my review of his book, complains that I did not give my readers his "summary of doctrine," but took his positions and arguments singly. Well, I do not think I did him any great injustice in the matter; but be that as it may, he has given it to my readers with his comments, and should remember that—

"From nature's chain whatever link you strike, Tenth, or tenth thousandth, breaks the chain alike;"

also, that no chain is stronger than its weakest link. If his theory is a chain, then the whole depends on each part, and one point or argument broken the great whole is broken. I flatter myself that I have broken more than one link so effectually that he will not be able to mend them.

In reference to his remark, that "the term employed in the New Testament to denote the second coming of our Lord, is in the original, the parousia," I said, in my review: "That is not the term, but one of the terms
so used;" and then instanced the verb erchomai,—to come, and its participle erchomenon, coming. After his starting out with this declaration concerning parousia as the term employed to denote "the second coming of our Lord," the Doctor devotes his book to the work of showing that the word does not mean coming at all, but presence: "The presence." Why, then, does he complain of me, that after conceding the correctness of his criticism on the word, that I immediately ignore it? He himself ignores it in his very first statement. But I do not ignore his definition; on the contrary I insist that the presence of an absent person implies a coming in order to that presence; and that our Lord sanctioned that view by answering the question, "What shall be the sign of thy parousia?" by the participle erchomenon—coming. He admits in his reply that "a presence" does imply a previous coming in order to that presence; but insists that "the formative idea" of the word is presence. Very well, I have never disputed it. Dr. Warren knows that speakers and writers, the best of them, use words in many senses other than their exact etymological sense; and hence in determining what a writer really means by a word we are to consider its etymology, the subject, the context, the general belief of the author on the subject, and his usus loquendi in reference to the word. These considerations combined determine the sense in which the word is used. It is by this rule lexicographers determine the various definitions and uses of words. What help to an understanding of all the various authors would any dictionary be to us if the lexicographer simply gave us the exact etymology of the words he defines and left out all other definitions and uses?
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Two things are certain about the term, the *parousia*: the translators of our Bible fully believed that when used in reference to the return of our Lord, it embraced the idea of a coming; and the Christian church from the beginning has acquiesced in that view. And now Dr. Warren admits its correctness,—that in order to the presence of an absent person he must come. The seeking out and defining that radical and "formative idea" of the word may do very well to amuse critics, but little do the people care about that so long as they can know that they have not believed in vain *in the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory*, an abiding presence.

Try as hard as he may to get out of his labored effort to show that the word *parousia* does not embrace the idea of a coming, but simply the presence, I meet him with his own words (*Parousia*, p. 15): "Had our translators done with this technical word, *parousia*, as they did with 'baptisma,'—transferring it unchanged,—or if translated, using its exact etymological equivalent, presence, and had it been well understood as it then would have been, that there is no such thing as 'a second presence,' I believe the entire doctrine would have been different from what it now is. The phrases 'second coming' and 'second advent' would never have been heard of." If the Doctor does not in this passage do his best to eliminate the idea of a *coming* in order to the presence of our Lord, I confess my inability to comprehend the meaning of very plain words. But he says again:

"This brings us to a still graver error of the reviewer. He wholly suppresses the reason I gave for making this distinction,
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[between the idea of the presence and the coming and its great importance. There are many different things which the Scriptures expressly say should take place in, or during the parousia. Such were the end of the aion (the Mosaic age), the establishment of the new kingdom of heaven, the destruction of the man of sin, the resurrection of the dead and day of judgment."

Indeed! The reader will have the kindness to turn to the fourth chapter of my review, and he will find that the whole chapter is devoted to this very subject. This is all I have to say to this charge.

Believing, as myself and all Adventists do, in the eternal presence of Christ with his saints on earth, we certainly have as long and wide "a blanket" for our bed as the Doctor can have: for he can have no more than eternity for the accomplishment of all God's purposes. But we do deny most emphatically, that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans was one of the events to transpire in the parousia. Let this point be tested by a grammatical analysis of Matt. 24; Mark 13 and Luke 21.

When a writer quotes approvingly Vitringa, Stuart, &c., he makes their words his own, and is responsible for them. To rid himself of the charge of denying that Christ is said to come and go, he says:

"I admitted as fully as Dr. Litch does, that the Scriptures very frequently attribute that act to Christ, but I remarked that when spoken of a divine being it could only have the sense of manifestation."

That is, that Christ, being a divine being, did never really go or come anywhere. "He was manifested"—now here, now there, without coming or going! What does the reader say to that? Christ was the God-man when here, and is in heaven, and comes and goes as other men; and is as God omnipresent.
In chapter II. of my review Dr. Warren finds this passage: "Was there an interval of some forty years after Christ left his disciples on the mountain in Galilee, saying, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,' to the time of Jerusalem's overthrow, when Christ's presence was not with them? I press this point and urge an answer." Dr. Warren says:

"Well, the answer is at hand, in the very paragraph preceding the last one quoted: 'It is the presence of Christ in the exercise of his mediatorial offices,' viz., King, Life-giver and Judge. I did not say it was his omnipresence."

Indeed! Let us see (Parousia, p. 22): "That omnipresence, as a personal attribute, belongs to Christ will not be questioned by any who believe in his deity. Even when dwelling among men in his flesh he could say, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them,' &c. See also John 3:13. Much more, then, may it be affirmed that in his glorified state he possesses the prerogative of deity, and can no more come, in the sense of literal approach, than he can depart, leaving some portion of the universe empty of his divine essence. The only conceivable sense, then, in which Christ in his divine offices of King, Life-giver and Judge, can come to men, is that of manifestation."

If this does not teach that it is in Christ's omnipresent character that he is present with men "as King," etc., what does it mean?

"This Generation."

Dr. Warren's objections to my construction of Luke 21:32, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," now claim attention. I argued that
the phrase, "all these things," embraced, in addition to the events which should precede Jerusalem's overthrow, that overthrow itself; the times of the Gentiles which should follow it; the signs which shall follow those times; to culminate in their seeing "the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." And hence, that as the Gentiles still hold and tread down Jerusalem, their times are not out; nor has anybody ever seen the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. Therefore, "this generation" did not mean the generation to whom Christ spoke, but the one of whom he spoke, which should see these signs,—a generation either now living, or else yet to come; for certainly it is not in the past. This view Dr. Warren calls "an original theory." But I assure him that it is very far from that. I claim no originality in the matter; it has long been public property, and the marvel is that he never met with it. Several objections he makes to it—some of which I will notice. He says:

"1. It is not the natural interpretation of the words."

To be a little dogmatical like my friend, I may say, that taking the whole scope of the discourse, with all the associated facts, it is the only natural interpretation.

"2. It is contrary to the grammatical structure of the words. Every schoolboy knows that this must refer to something near." [Let the reader mark this admission]. "If any generation or time had just been mentioned, such generation or time, as supposed to be at the moment fresh in mind, might be referred to as this generation," &c. "But none such had been mentioned."

Now he cannot deny that Christ according "to the grammatical construction of the words" predicted the
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destruction of Jerusalem as an event to precede his coming; that "the times of the Gentiles" were to run their course after the desolation of the city; that Christ gave a series of signs to follow those times and to conclude by men seeing Him "coming in the clouds of heaven;" and that after relating the signs he said, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh;" again, "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." Here we have the exact conditions which Dr. Warren says justify the use of "this," and yet in the face of it all he asserts that no such generation or time had been mentioned! I will leave our readers to judge of the facts in the case.

But what does he mean when he says:

"3. The construction claimed is contrary to what we know was their understanding of it."?

I know of no way by which to determine what their understanding was but by their words. "We know" that this was Luke's understanding of it, for he wrote it. "We know" that the church had the same understanding of it, for Luke records the fact. "Those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." (Luke 1:1,2). We cannot well have better testimony as to "their understanding of it."

"4. Such construction is contrary to all exegetical author-

ity."
CHRIST YET TO COME.

If no commentator has hitherto given that construction, it is time some one did. And I invite an analysis of the chapter by some unbiased and competent grammarian, taking in the whole scope of the chapter, and have no fears of the result. Dr. Warren may appear before such an umpire either personally, or by writing, and I will do the same.

"5. Let it be conceded that Luke 21 belongs here. [With Matt. 24, I suppose he means.] But what was that treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, but the fearful destruction by fire and sword inflicted by the Roman armies?"

I reply, it was not the destruction of the people, or city, (that is specifically foretold and had its literal accomplishment), but what should the condition of the city after that desolation, during "the times of the Gentiles." Is not that "the grammatical construction?" But Dr. Warren asks: "What earthly reason is there for affirming that it continued after that catastrophe except merely that the Jews no longer held possession of the city, and that it was under the government of the Gentiles?"

Well, besides "merely" these two good and substantial "earthly reasons," there is this, that Christ placed that treading down after not before that catastrophe. Thus we have three unanswerable reasons for "affirming" it.

"6. The theory of this long duration of the treading down of Jerusalem is contrary to Rev. 11:2, where its period is expressly declared to be forty-two months. . . . Forty-two months are three and a half years, and correspond very closely to the time occupied by the Roman invasion under Titus before the capture of the city."

For a man who is a great stickler for the grammatical construction of words, this is amazing: (1) "Very
closely corresponds.” How closely he does not say; nor can he by any “authority.” (2) “The invasion under Titus to the capture of the city.” By what “grammatical construction” does Dr. Warren place that treading down before the capture which Christ placed after it? Until Dr. Warren can prove that period to have been definitely fulfilled (which he cannot) his position is baseless.

“7. The long postponement of the parousia is contradicted by the repeated and positive declarations of the New Testament.”

I shall reserve what I have to say on that subject till I come to his letter on that point. But I will notice one remark: “It [the Parousia] is in express terms said to be nigh. Yet Dr. Litch after this lapse of more than eighteen centuries ventures to assert that it has not come yet.”

Yes; and so has the universal Church in the Apostles’ Creed, from so near the apostles and Jerusalem’s overthrow, that then if ever they should have known that Christ had come. Yet from then till now they have gone on affirming, “I believe in God the Father . . . and in his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. . . that he was crucified and dead and buried, that he descended into hades and rose again the third day and ascended into heaven, where he sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead.” Yet Dr. Warren, eighteen centuries after, ventures to affirm in the face of all this that it did take place before the Creed was formulated!
CHRIST YET TO COME.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

In his paper of March 10th Dr. Warren devotes himself to the subject of "the kingdom of heaven," and replies to my argument, that the kingdom of heaven which John, Christ, the twelve and the seventy proclaimed as at hand, was the reign of Christ conditionally promised to the Jews,—for they had such a promise. See Zech. 6: 9–15. The Lord directed the prophet to make crowns and set them upon the head of Joshua the high priest, and address him thus: "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and he shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne." The man whose name is the Branch, is Christ, the Son of David (Jer. 23: 5, 6). He was to be a priest-king, on certain conditions, named in verse 15 of Zech. 6: thus, "And this shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of the Lord your God."

There is not a more distinct condition attached to a promise in the whole Bible. But the Jews failed to fulfill the condition; hence he never took the throne of David.

Zechariah foretold that he should grow up. Then he foretold the form and spirit in which he would make his royal manifestation to Jerusalem as her king (chap. 9: 9): "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and
riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal an ass." Now let it be remembered, that he did come as here described amidst the shouts and royal acclamations of Jerusalem's children. So far it was for him to do independently of their action. Here comes in the condition. He will rule as an enthroned priest-king, provided the Jews comply with the condition—"diligently obey the voice of the Lord your God,"—which they did not and therefore lost the blessing. He came and offered them the kingdom and they refused it, and he said: "Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. 21: 43). What kingdom did he mean if not the one he brought to them and offered them?.

**THE SECOND ROYAL ADVENT.**

Christ being rejected by his people has gone as a "nobleman" to that far country called heaven, "to receive for himself a kingdom and to return" "having received it." So he taught in parable, Luke 19: 11–27. He has gone; he has left his interests in this world with his servants; and will reckon with them when he returns, rewarding the faithful, casting out the unfaithful, and destroying his avowed enemies. And he has left word that he will come as he went, in a cloud. He never has come in that way, and therefore he will so come in the future.

This answers the most of Dr. Warren's points in his second letter. A few I will notice in detail. He says;

"When Pilate asked Jesus about his kingdom to which he was accused of laying claim, he replied, 'My kingdom is not of
this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now [as things are.] is my kingdom not from hence.'"

That is what Christ said; but it is not all he said to Pilate. He was arraigned on this charge found and preferred by the Jewish council—"We found this man perverting the nation." Specification 1. "Forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar;" Specification 2. "Saying that himself is Christ a king." To this the court called on the prisoner to plead. The question was squarely put: "Art thou the king of the Jews?" It was as squarely answered: "Thou sayest," that is, I am (Luke 23:1-3). It was only as king of the Jews, that he came as king. It was only to the Jews, "the lost sheep," he and his co-laborers heralded the kingdom at hand. It was only as claiming to be king of the Jews, that he was tried, sentenced and crucified. Pilate wrote the superscription of accusation, thus: "The King of the Jews" (Mark 15:26). Of this the Jews demanded a revision, which Pilate refused. He was foretold as king of the Jews; he was born king of the Jews; he was proclaimed king of the Jews; he was tried as king of the Jews; he was crucified as king of the Jews. And because the Jews rejected him when he offered the kingdom to them, he took the kingdom from them. Being rejected by his people he said to Pilate, "But now my kingdom is not from hence," &c. The Father has called him to sit at his right hand for a season, as an everlasting priest,—until he should make his foes his footstool; when he will "send the rod of his strength out of Zion" and he shall "rule in the midst of his enemies" and "fill the places
with the dead bodies." Then he will find a willing people who will say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." See Psa. 110.

Once more Dr. Warren says:

"John warned the people that the coming kingdom was coming wrath to them, &c. ... Did Christ do all this on that Palm Sunday?"

No, my friend; because he was refused "the throne" and his life sought. He said, "Now is the krisis of this world"—its future is fixed. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all to me." To that time the Jews had the oracles of God. From then, they having rejected the kingdom, the world was to have the glad tidings. See John 12: 31, 32. Christ no more reigned than did Charles II. of England after his father's death. He made his claim to the throne at the head of his army, but being overcome by superior force fled and awaited his time, when he returned to find a willing people. So with Christ. Had he been permitted by his people to reign he would no doubt have gone on as he begun in the temple (by purging it, until his authority was challenged). And he will as certainly come back and be a crowned and enthroned king on David's throne, as did Charles II. to reign on his father's throne.

Dr. Warren asks what there was in the parables of Matt. 13, corresponding with the first royal advent? Nothing. Those parables all related to the everlasting kingdom. But the parable of the husbandman (Matt. 21: 33-43), and the parable of the marriage of the king's son (Matt. 22: 1-14) illustrate most forcibly this whole proceeding.
The Doctor insists that if there are two royal comings then this was his second coming, and when he comes in clouds, it will be his third—for his first coming was when he was born. Not so. His whole earthly life up to that time was a preparatory process for this culmination. So he said when Pilate asked him, "Art thou a king then?" He said, "To this end I was born; and for this cause came I into the world." He could never have come to Zion had he not been born, as Isa. 7:14 foretold; nor unless He had "grown up out of his place." This birth was an an incarnation; his coming to Jerusalem his royal advent.

DR. WARREN'S REPLY ON MATT. 16:27, 28, CONSIDERED.

Dr. Warren says: "Dr. Litch concedes that" verse 27 "predicts the coming of Christ in his glory."

Yes, that is so; and moreover I deny that there is any historical fact, or facts on record corresponding with that language, showing its fulfillment. The scene described in chapter 17, as having transpired on "the holy mount," was a vivid illustration of the import of the language, but he did not come at that time to "reward every man according to his works," as he will at the parousia. That it was a sample of the power and glory of the parousia we learn from Peter (2 Pet. 1:16-18), "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnessees of his majesty . . . when we were with him in the holy mount." Either Peter and his associates saw the parousia which several days after they were on "the holy
mount” the disciples enquired about (Matt. 24: 3), or a sample or illustration, by which they were able to judge what the full and final glory will be. They saw the glorified man—Christ in glory on earth. If it had been that ultimate glory they would not afterward have asked what would be the sign of it; therefore it was a sample. If the final, then Dr. Warren’s theory of its transpiring at the destruction of Jerusalem falls to the ground. He will be equally compelled with myself to accept it as only a sample; for it was, as Peter declares, “the power and parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ” of which they “were eyewitnesses.” And being a sample, and as the scene has never been repeated, it remains to receive its accomplishment after the foretold signs which are to succeed the close of “the times of the Gentiles” (Luke 21: 24–27).

But says Dr. Warren: “Dr. Litch denies that it is connected with, or limited by, the time specified in the latter,”—that is in verse 28.

That is so. They are two distinct events. There was promised, as I have shown, by Zech. 6: 9–15, a conditional reign of Christ; and the same prophet foretold how king Messiah would come as king to Jerusalem (chap. 9: 9). He did so come; was proclaimed king of Israel; was rejected as such by the rulers who said: “We have no king but Cæsar;” and the kingdom was announced as taken from them to be “given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.” Now I venture to say, that not one of the authorities quoted by Dr. Warren has ever undertaken to harmonize all this array of divine promises, predictions, fulfillments, and procedures, nor until they do are they competent wit-
nesses in the case. Forty-two years of the strength of my life, I have given to the study of this subject. During that period I have read and well considered the writings of a vast number of commentators, expositors, exegetists, lexicographers, preachers and lecturers; besides conversing on, and discussing the questions involved with many eminent and learned men; and I here boldly affirm, that the teachings of the Bible on the question of the kingdom of God can never be harmonized and explained, while the promises and predictions of the Scriptures in reference to the first advent of Christ, embracing his royal claims as king of the Jews, are ignored, or lost sight of. It is for this reason that when I am confronted with an array of assertions from great names, men of learning as they are, but who have never noticed in their theory these numerous and important facts they make no impression upon my mind. I have long and well considered what they have said, but while their premises are so defective their conclusions are of no force. I would as soon take Dr. Warren's assertion as I would any of his vouchers; I plant myself on the strength of my argument, not on authorities.

Dr. Warren well says:

"Some difference of opinion may be found among commentators as to what verse 28 refers to, some saying the transfiguration, some the destruction of Jerusalem simply, and some as typifying the second coming of Christ in glory."

Very true: "neither so did their witnesses agree together" in another case. Why ask me to accept a list of contradictory witnesses, when I have a theory in perfect harmony with itself and the whole tenor of the word of God? But Dr. Warren continues:
"I have never seen or heard of one till now who denied that the two verses were to be taken together as referring to the same thing."

That is just what I have been saying,—that all his authorities have entirely ignored those conditional promises made to the Jews and fulfilled on Christ's part until his people refused him the throne and denied him as being their king. For this very reason I reject their dictum.

"HEREAFTER"

is a word which Dr. Warren criticises, and quotes authorities to sustain him. The criticism is: "The Greek phrase translated 'hereafter,' means literally from now."

Yes, that is so; therefore, no matter about the authorities as we are agreed. But the Doctor says: "Of course such an expression does not bind us to the exact minute, or day on which it was spoken."

So our translators thought, and therefore called it "hereafter," both in Matt. 26: 64, "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven;" and John 1: 51, "Hereafter ye shall see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." Clearly the word has the sense of hereafter—unlimited hereafter. The usus loquendi of Christ, then, gives to the word the sense of "hereafter." And when Dr. Warren (as he does in the foregoing quotation) unmoors his bark from the exact literal sense—"from now," he is at sea and cannot define the time of his hereafter. This he is compelled to admit. All the limitation he can give it is: "It must be taken as coming within the range of those momentous series of events then passing,
which began with Christ's arrest and was completed at his ascension."

Not being able to say when "from now," did begin, he affirms "it must be taken," &c. Why "must be taken?" Only to suit Dr. Warren's theory. Why not admit what Christ evidently intended and what the council understood him to mean; that he, the Messiah, being there and then rejected for claiming his kingship of Israel, would attain his kingship over all nations as foretold Dan. 7:13, 14? The assertion filled the high-priest and all the council with rage, as being a blasphemous claim. And this also corresponds with Rev. 1:7, "Behold He cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him." It was at the instigation of the Jews who condemned him to be killed immediately, that the soldier pierced his side. This is simple, literal and obvious, seeing it is hereafter.

This is a sufficient reply to Dr. Warren's remark, that "these two passages [Luke 22:69 and Matt. 26:64] explicitly contradict Dr. Litch's assertion that Christ did not say when his coming in the clouds of heaven should take place." He did say it would follow the times of the Gentiles and the signs to follow that ending; and not until Dr. Warren retracts his admission that the word is not to be taken in its "exact literal sense," or fixes the time when the "from now" did begin, can I regard them as contradicting my assertion.


Dr. Warren says:

"Peter expressly declares that the events of the day of Pentecost were what were meant by the prophetic language, 'I will
show wonders in heaven above and signs in the earth beneath: blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke: the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come."

Peter said no such thing. He did say that the phenomena attendant on the pouring out of the Spirit was a fulfillment of the first part of the text in Joel, with which what the Doctor quotes stands connected. No such things as he quotes did then take place and Peter does not say they did. Besides, years after, when John wrote the Apocalypse, he describes them as future events, to take place in "the great day of God's wrath," under the sixth seal. So "Dr. Litch's" admission "that these were to be signs attending the coming of Christ," and yet future events, stands good.

"What is this," says the Doctor, "but an unconscious admission that Christ's coming took place on the day of Pentecost?" If it did then take place, Dr. Warren's former argument to prove that it took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, falls to the ground. Those signs foretold by Joel, including the pouring out of the Spirit, which Dr. Warren does not notice, and the other strange phenomena, were all to take place "in the last days," but not necessarily all on the same day. The first part of the prediction then began; and thus proved that the last days, the Christian dispensation, had begun. But before they end by the coming of "the great and notable day of the Lord," these strange phenomena will transpire. The last days in this text evidently cover the Christian dispensation.

Dr. Warren says:

"But Dr. Litch still persists that Christ's exaltation at the right hand of God was only the attainment of an inferior dignity."
Dr. Litch persists that Christ's throne and kingdom promised him, is the throne and kingdom of David, not God's throne (Isa. 9:6, 7; Luke 1:32, 33; Acts 2:30, 31). He persists that David's throne and kingdom never were in heaven. He persists that God called Christ to heaven to sit on his right hand as a priest, not king (Psa. 110:1-3); and that when his session in heaven ends, God will send him again to earth to take his throne and reign. He persists that Christ is in heaven "a prince and a Saviour." He persists that archegos (the word here used to designate Christ's office) is never used in the New Testament for king. It is used Acts 3:15; 5:31; Heb. 2:10; 12:2; but in none of them in the sense of king. Dr. Warren may call it what he pleases, such are the facts. "The nobleman" in the parable (Luke 19:11-27) only receives his kingdom at the period of his return, not when he goes away,—"When he was returned, having received the kingdom," &c. Christ as the seed of Abraham, has an eternal inheritance on earth promised him (Gen. 17:8; Gal. 3:13-18). As the Son of David he has confirmed to him by God's oath and promise, David's throne without end. That throne, inheritance and possession Christ has never yet received: nor is there the least intimation in the Scriptures that he has. His present condition is one of expectancy—"from henceforth expecting, until his enemies be made his footstool" (Heb. 10:12, 13).

As to that highest of all names to which Christ by inheritance has attained—"Son of God," and the honor, power, glory and authority over all worlds and beings, Dr. Warren cannot use or quote too strong terms to suit
my ideas and feelings of veneration and admiration. But when he undertakes to substitute these for the distinct and multitudinous promises of an inheritance, possession, throne and kingdom on this kosmos, as “the Son of man,” I enter my most solemn and earnest protest. “Let God be true and every man a liar.”

Why does Dr. Warren ignore all God’s promises and Christ’s claims under them as “the Son of man,” to “inheritance,” “possession,” “throne” and “kingdom,” on earth? Why? In doing so he has become bewildered and mazed.

It is this ignoring of the conditional promises of a reign on the throne of Israel, which has led the larger portion of the Christian world to charge the Jewish people as well as Christ’s own disciples, with an entire misapprehension of the nature of Christ’s kingdom, because they looked for a literal fulfillment of those prophecies and promises.

“THIS GENERATION.”

Dr. Warren says: “I wish to add a few words to what has been said, as to Christ’s meaning in the phrase ‘this generation.’”

Very well, that is an important point in this discussion. Let us hear what it is.

“He [Christ] had often used the phrase before. ‘Whereunto shall I liken this generation?’ . . . What generation was it but the one contemporary with John and Christ?”

How does Dr. Warren know it was so? By the connection in which it is used. It stands on its own merits. So of Matt. 12: 41, “The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation.” And thus in
fact of each passage quoted. If pressed for a reason for determining it to be the existing generation he would determine it in the same way. That is right. But he would hardly admit that when he uses (as he does in his book) the phrase "this period"—referring to a period 1,800 years in the past—that because Christ used the phrase "this generation" several times for the then existing generation, therefore he must be understood as meaning the period of writing his book. Interpret the words of Christ, Luke 21:32, by the same rule I interpret his phrase, "this period," and all is plain. Christ gave a distinct series of signs to precede his coming, and said: "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up," &c. Dr. Warren is no novice in grammar, and he knows such language can only mark a distinct time from which to look up, and to know that those who should see the signs begin were the generation who should not pass till all were fulfilled. There is not one half the distinctness in Dr. Warren's use of "this period," as in Christ's use of "this generation." While his is very obscure, this of Christ is as distinct as language can make it. It was a generation to follow the close of the times of the Gentiles, and begin with the following signs, of verse 21.

TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES.

Dr. Warren wishes to show his readers that the apostles believed Christ would come in their day. If they did, they did so without Christ's authority. For he told them distinctly, "Ye know not when the time is," Mark 13:33; also, verse 32, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, nor
the Son, but my Father only.” So also he said: “It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power.”—Acts 1: 7. This answered their last recorded question. But he did tell them a multitude of things which would take place before his coming in the clouds of heaven. And when he came to a certain series of them, he said: “When these things begin to come to pass, then lift up your heads for your redemption draweth nigh.” So Paul taught his brethren (2 Thess. 2: 1–8), that three things must first come: (1) A falling away; (2) The removal of the hinderance to the revelation of the man of sin; and (3) The revelation of the man of sin and his work. Then the Lord would come to destroy him by “the brightness of his coming.” Till these all took place Christ would not come. For Nero to “die like a dog in one of the sewers of Rome,” was not to be destroyed “by the brightness of his coming,” as the man of sin is to be destroyed, and Dr. Warren knows it; and I marvel that he will impose on his own common sense by attempting to persuade himself that he believes any such thing. Christ left his church with the most positive assurances that if he went away he would “come again,” come as he went; and that they should “see him coming in a cloud;” but for the reason that they did not know the time, they must live in an attitude of watchful expectancy and prayer. With such instructions, that has been the attitude of God’s people; and in that spirit they spoke and wrote; and have continued to do so down the ages till now.
CHRIST YET TO COME.

HOW DID THOSE WHO LIVED AFTER NERO DIE D LOOK ON THE SUBJECT?

Did Christians say, "Well, the coming has transpired; it is all over, and Nero, the man of sin, has 'died like a dog in a sewer of Rome'? We will look no longer." Not at all—at least none but the class of Hymenæus and Philetus. How did the beloved disciple, who lived and wrote between twenty and thirty years after Jerusalem's fall, write? "Behold, he cometh with clouds." "He that testifieth these things saith, Surely, I come quickly." "Amen, even so, come Lord Jesus." This was written about A.D. 96. Mind, this was what Jesus himself said to John, "who bare record." How did John's successors and disciples regard it,—that he had come? Hear them:

CLEMENT, Paul's fellow-laborer and "whose name is in the book of life" (Phil. 4:8) wrote about A.D. 96, "Let us be followers of those who went about in goat-skins and sheepskins preaching the coming of Christ." —1 Epistle. In his second epistle he wrote: "Wherefore let us every hour expect the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, because"—mark this—"we know not the day of God's appearing." Then as late as A.D. 96 this companion of Paul had no idea Christ and his kingdom had come, but looked for it.

BARNABAS, fellow apostle of Paul (Acts 9:27), whose epistle is set down at A.D. 71, writes: "The day of the Lord is at hand, in which all things shall be destroyed, together with that wicked one." "The Lord is near and his reward is with him." Mark this, Dr. Warren: Nero had been dead three years and Jerusalem de-
stroyed one year; but this apostolic man did not think
the day of the Lord had come, nor "that wicked one"
destroyed.

Ignatius, a.d. 100, wrote to Polycarp, a disciple of
John: "Be every day better than another; consider
the times and expect Him who is above all time, etern-
inal, invisible, though for our sake made visible." Thus
wrote Ignatius thirty years after Jerusalem was de-
stroyed. Expecting him yet.

Polycarp, John's disciple, about a.d. 108, wrote:
"That God had raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the
dead, and that he will come to judge the world and raise
the saints; and that if we walk worthy of him we shall
reign together with him." This Polycarp is rather se-
vere on heretics. He says: "Every one that confesses
not that Jesus Christ is come in flesh is antichrist; and
he who does not acknowledge his martyrdom on the
cross, is of the devil; and that whosoever shall pervert
the oracles of God to his own lust and shall say that
there is neither resurrection nor judgment to come, that
man is the first-born of Satan."

Papias, about a.d. 116, wrote: "There will be a cer-
tain thousand years after the resurrection of the dead,
when the kingdom of Christ will be established visibly
on this earth." Daniel Whitby, the founder of the
spiritualizing school of modern Millenarians, admits that
Papias taught, "it shall be a reign of Christ bodily on
earth."

Irenæus flourished as a writer about a.d. 178. Eu-
sebius and Jerome affirm that he believed in the thou-
sand years reign of Christ on earth, according to the
letter of the Revelation of John. And Daniel Whitby
allows that he taught that "Christ will everywhere be
seen," and "that this cannot be done by him while he
remains in the celestial regions." And in his creed,
Lib. 1, chap. 2, he confesses faith in "the advent, birth
of a virgin, passion, resurrection from the dead, and
bodily ascension into heaven of the beloved Jesus Christ
our Lord; and his coming from heaven in the glory of
the Father, to restore all things, and to raise up the
flesh of all mankind." In chapter 3, he speaks of this
as "the one voice of the church over the whole earth."
This was only 110 years after Nero's death. Strange
that if Christ had come more than a hundred years be-
fore, that the universal church still looked for him! Is
it not?

The Apostles' Creed, so early as to have no date; the
Nicene Creed of A.D. 325, the Athanasian Creed, of
about the same age, all attest the same faith of the uni-
versal church:

APOSTLES' CREED:—"He sitteth on the right hand of
God, the Father Almighty; from whence he shall come
to judge the quick and the dead."

NICENE CREED:—"And he shall come again with
glory to judge both the quick and the dead, whose king-
dom shall have no end."

ATHANASIUS CREED:—"From whence he shall come
to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all
men shall rise again with their bodies."

And thus through the ages the universal church has
kept affirming her faith in the language of these earliest
formulas, to the present time. When, lo! Dr. Warren
has come on the stage to say to these "apostolic fathers"
and those who came after and were taught by them:
"Gentlemen, you are all mistaken: for Christ came the second time—well, somewhere from one to forty years (I am not certain precisely which) before the earliest of you wrote your testimony that he was yet to come!" And why? "Oh, because the apostles spake of it as near, at hand, in a little, little while; and bade men watch for it, wait for it, be patient for it, &c." Now this is just what these Christians did from A.D. 70 onward, and what the church has done in all the centuries, and does still; and what those "who look for him" will do to the end; because they "know not when the time is." But they will watch the signs and pray, "Thy kingdom come." The church has kept praying thus these more than 1800 years: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

I have taken the foregoing quotations from Taylor's Voice of the Church. These testimonies are a sufficient answer to all Dr. Warren's quotations, as to how the church regarded them.

Not a soul of the most intimate friends and disciples of the apostles ever gave the most distant hint, from A.D. 71 onward until they passed off the stage and others took their place and reiterated their testimony of his coming and reign being still in the future, that either Christ or his kingdom had come. What does all Dr. Warren's array of modern "authorities" amount to in the face of such testimony as to the universal faith of the church from Nero's death and Jerusalem's fall downward? What consummate stupidity on the part of the church to receive admonition from and take comfort in Dr. Warren's quoted texts, for more than 1,800 years, since they had all been realized, and to suppose they
were still of force when they were all “bygones,” and should be treated as “bygones,” if Dr. Warren’s construction of them is true!

“For yet a little and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry.”—Heb. 10: 37. This is a quotation from Hab. 2: 3, “For the vision is yet for an appointed time but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come and will not tarry.” Paul introduced this passage by an exhortation to patience in waiting for the promise. So the church has been doing; as it tarried, she has waited. Thus Peter wrote, 2 Pet. 3. He foretold that “in the last days,” after so long waiting, men would scoffingly ask, “Where is the promise of his parousia?” Then he lays down a first and fundamental principle in seeking to understand this mystery of the long-deferring of the parousia and “day of the Lord:” “Be not ignorant of this one thing.” Well, Peter, what is that? “That one day is with the Lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day.” Take God’s standpoint, not man’s, and all will be plain. “The Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness” [Dr. Warren, for instance]; “but is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish.” So he waits for the harvest to ripen and all the elect to be made up. “But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night.” However long he may lengthen out his long suffering, the day will come at last. “Beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also being led away with the error of the wicked fall from your own steadfastness.” Remember what the apostles and prophets have told you of these last-day scoffers, and be not moved by them. For He will come.
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In reference to my remarks on Rom. 13: 11, 12, Dr. Warren says:

"I do not desire to disprove this except in a single respect. . . . The day was to be the revelation of Christ, the Sun of righteousness, the Light of the world, first as a sacrifice for sin, and then as a king and judge. This revelation of Christ in his glory to establish his kingdom among men and to reward his faithful people a hundred-fold in this world, and in the world to come everlasting life, was now just at hand: it was nearer than when the Christians first believed."

I really thought Christ had come a long time before Paul wrote the text, as the "Sun of righteousness, the light of the world, the sacrifice for sin." It was no nearer when he wrote than it had been many years. No new dispensation has been introduced since the day of Pentecost. But let us attend to Dr. Warren's commentators whom he introduces as witnesses:

ALFORD.—"A fair exegesis of this passage can hardly fail to recognize the fact that the apostle here, as elsewhere, speaks of the coming of the Lord as rapidly approaching."

That is a good testimony; perfectly just.

OLSHAUSEN.—"These words evidently point to the second coming of Christ."

Capital: it is even so.

MEYER.—"The Messianic salvation, viz., in its completion as introduced by the Parousia."

I can ask for no better witnesses of the correctness of my position. Thanks, Doctor; many thanks. But "the times of the Gentiles" are not out; the signs to follow them therefore have not appeared, and no one has seen "the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory," as Christ declared they shall. So the second coming has not transpired yet, nor did the successors of the apostles understand that it had. They all looked for it in the future. Dr. Warren continues:
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"Here then shall we sum up this mass of apostolic utterances? [Yes, sum them up.] We are to remember that these sacred writers speak in a two-fold capacity, as reporters of the words of the Lord, and as inspired, independent authorities. In the former, they tell us how they understood the matter."

Yes; that he was to "appear" and "we shall see him as he is;" "we shall be like him;" that "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven," &c.

"In the latter they assert truths as the mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit."

This is correct. But the Holy Spirit never inspired any one of the apostles to write that Christ would come before his own foretold signs had taken place, on the seeing of which his people were to "know that it was near even at the door." He did inspire Paul to write and teach that there must first come an apostasy; the removal of the hindrance to the coming of "the man of sin;" the revelation of "the man of sin;" his dreadful work; and the epiphany of His Parousia to destroy him: "Let no man deceive you by any means as that the day of Christ is come; for that day shall not come except there come" the events I have before enumerated. This is positive instruction.

Dr. Warren goes on:

"Dr. Litch has told us his estimate of their words. Let me set beside it the opinions of the great scholars and commentators who, writing with no end in view but to develop most exactly the true meaning of the divine word, are our best uninspired helpers in the science of interpretation."

I wish to say just here, that I am not conscious of having written one line in this discussion in any partisan spirit; or to subserve any partisan object. It has been my sole object for Christ’s sake alone to elucidate
the truth and expose error. And as to "his own simple assertion," I ask no man to take anything I may say or write on any such basis. If I am not sustained by the plain, literal statements of the word of God taken in its obvious sense, let my positions go to the winds, for they are of nothing worth.

Now what I have to say about the opinions of Tholuck, Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Meyer, Olshausen, Ebrard, Van Oosterzee, and Auberlin, is this, that there is no doubt but what the apostolic churches believed the Lord's coming to be an impending event. They did after the destruction of Jerusalem as much as before, as I have already shown from the testimony of the apostolic fathers themselves. Therefore they did not hold it in any such positive sense as to lead them to abandon their constant expectation, or as to lead them to contend that Christ had already come, especially after Paul set the Thessalonian church right on the subject. They from that time continued to look for the removal of the Roman empire as the hinderer to the man of sin; and after that his revelation. Says Dr. Warren:

"It is the opinions of the apostolic churches, then, that are valuable as evidence on the question before us. And of these we have ample historical evidence."

Let us then hear the creed of the Corinthian church, A.D. 81,—thirteen years after Nero's death, and eleven after Jerusalem's fall:

"Tenets: 1. There is one God, the maker and preserver of all things.  
2. That Jesus Christ united both manhood and divinity, and is thereby able to reconcile all willing souls to God.  
3. That as Deity was six days creating all things, and one
day being as a thousand years with God, so in six thousand years will all the wicked, with all that is cursed on the world be destroyed forever.

"4. That the seventh thousand years shall be the rest of millennial glory, wherein the world shall be restored to its Eden state, and the righteous inherit it forever."—Jeffries' Chart of the Churches, quoted in Voice of the Church, p. 349.

This is a good Evangelical Advent creed. It is grand. Now let Dr. Warren quote the testimony of one apostolic church, or father, if he can, who in the first century denied the doctrine of Chiliasm? Will he do it? This, he must remember, was A.D. 81, even before John wrote the Apocalypse, and must have been taken from Peter's teachings. The testimonies of the Apostolic Fathers, I have already given.

But Dr. Warren has furnished me with another witness, (Gibbon, Dec. and Fall. chap. 15): "In the primitive church it was universally believed that the end of the world and the kingdom of heaven were at hand. The near approach of this wonderful event had been predicted by the apostles; the tradition of it had been preserved by their earliest disciples, and those who understood in their literal sense the discourses of Christ himself, were obliged to expect the second and glorious coming of the Son of man in the clouds, before that generation was totally extinguished, which had beheld his humble condition on earth, and which might be witnesses of the calamities of the Jews under Vespasian or Hadrian."

Why, then, in the face of his own witness does Dr. Warren deny that Christ and his apostles taught such a literal coming and kingdom as the primitive church were compelled to believe? And this faith was "preserved by their earliest disciples." Then, according to
Gibbon the apostolic churches were premillennialists,—having no faith in the universal spiritual reign before Christ's coming.

Will Dr. Warren tell us of one church or of one of the fathers who in the first two centuries ever taught that Christ had come in his *parousia* or foretold *erchomenon*? If he can do so let him do it. And why in the face of Gibbon's testimony did he say in his book that he did not know of a word in the Scriptures authorizing such a faith?

As to "this generation," referred to by Gibbon, I have shown its true grammatical import sufficiently to answer that part of the testimony of his witness. And now I await the *grammatical analysis* of the 21st of Luke.

**THE COSTUME OF THE PAROUSIA.**

Dr. Warren, in *Messiah's Herald* of April 7th, says:

"1. As to the costume of the Parousia, I argued (in my book) that physical phenomena were used to set forth spiritual ideas, especially such as relate to the power and majesty of the divine manifestations to men called in Scripture phrase, *comings of the Lord*."

In support of this proposition he referred to the inauguration of the old kingdom of Israel at mount Sinai, to the 18th Psalm, Isa. 13: 9–11, and 34: 4, &c., and from these descriptions of what he regards as the divine manifestations in the destruction of Babylon, and Edom, and the majesty of Sinai, he argued, without a word of proof, that the words of Christ were equally figurative,—"that when such phenomena are associated with Christ's coming, we are to see in them simply the destruction of Jerusalem and the Mosaic dispensation."

To this I replied by a quotation from Exodus 19th
and 20th chapters, that sublime as was the description God gave beforehand of his coming down on mount Sinai, it was fulfilled to the letter; and to those passages I refer the reader. I showed from Jer. 51: 59–64, that the final doom of Babylon has never been executed,—that it is to sink, as Jeremiah’s book with a stone tied to it, sank in Euphrates. And that that final ruin is (as Isaiah, chap. 13, puts it) in “the day of the Lord.” But as to Christ’s description I showed that it was a didactic answer to a didactic question. Perhaps it would be better to say, a categorical answer to a categorical question. “What shall be the sign of thy Parousia?” So asked the disciples. Christ after describing a great variety of events to precede it,—among them the “great tribulation”—then said: “Immediately after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened, the moon shall not give her light, the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory.” But this is not all. “And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.”—Matt. 24: 29–31.

In all this Dr. Warren would have us “see simply the destruction of Jerusalem and the Mosaic dispensation.” Did not Christ in addition to these signs of his coming give explicit and literal descriptions of Jerusalem’s destruction and the signs to precede it? And did he not continue afterward to speak of the signs to
precede his "coming in a cloud with power and great glory?"—Luke 21: 20–27. Everything must be literal and exact in the fulfillment except the answer to a plain question! "What shall be the sign of thy Parousia?"—the answer to that must only mean the destruction of Jerusalem!

If Dr. Warren could find the least ground in the passage itself on which to found his argument that we are simply to see it in the destruction of Jerusalem, we may be sure he would never have resorted to the expedient of ransacking the Old Testament to find what he regards as precedents for such a construction. Why did he not deduce his argument from the passage itself, showing that the subject, the question, and entire context, not only warranted but demanded such a construction? Because it cannot be done.

Every passage of Scripture is to be explained in the light of its own subject, concomitants and contexts, not by something entirely foreign to it. Every prediction relating to Christ's incarnation, course of life, anointing, reception, royal manifestation, indignities of his trial and death, burial, resurrection, ascension, &c., had an exact and literal accomplishment. When therefore he says, "If I go away, I will come again and receive you to myself," and his disciples ask him for the sign of his coming, and he answers them in the most simple manner, why are we to "see in it simply the destruction of Jerusalem"? And when he says: "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet and they shall gather together his elect," why "see in it simply the" flight of the Christians to the mountains? Is there no reliability to Christ's words?
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In the *Herald* of March 31, Dr. Warren says: "It is the opinion of the apostolic churches, then, that are valuable as evidence on questions before us, and of these we have ample historical testimony." This I have admitted and have showed that three years after the death of Nero, and one year after the destruction of Jerusalem, Barnabas, "an apostolic man," who must have known Paul's views, still looked for Christ's coming and the destruction of that wicked one. And so did all the early Christians. But in this letter, without reference to the view of the apostolic churches on the subject, Dr. Warren leaps over to St. Augustine, A.D. 390, Chrysostom, A.D. 400, Cyril, A.D. 350, and Tertullian, A.D. 200, as the witnesses to be placed on the stand. How is this? But let me cross question them a little.

AUGUSTINE.

Who do you say were represented by Daniel's four kingdoms? *Answer.* "Babylon, Chaldea, Macedon, and Rome."

Who is the little horn of his fourth beast, and what his character? *Ans.* "The little horn is Paul's man of sin." (How this agrees with the allegation that Nero was the man of sin the reader may judge).

What are your views of the coming of Christ? *Ans.* "His kingdom will come when the resurrection of the dead shall have taken place; for then he will come himself."—*Voice of the Church*, *pp.* 98, 99. Good evangelical Adventism.

CYRIL.

Who do you say were symbolized by Daniel's four
beasts? Ans. "The Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian and Roman empires."

Who is anti-Christ? Ans. "Some great man, raised up by the devil" after the Roman empire is divided into ten kingdoms.

What do you think of Christ's coming? Ans. "Do thou look for the true Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten, who is henceforth to come, not from earth, but from heaven, appearing to all more bright than any lightning, or other brilliance, with angels for his guards, that he may judge the quick and the dead, and reign with a kingdom heavenly, eternal, and without end."—Voice of the Church, p. 90, quoted from Elliott's Horæ Apoc., Vol. 4. He could not believe Nero the man of sin and yet look for Christ in the future. Nor could he look for "the man of sin" to follow the division of Rome into ten kingdoms and hold Nero the man of sin. Could he, Dr. Warren?

CHRYSOSTOM.

Please tell us what your view is concerning Anti-christ. Ans. "As Rome succeeded Greece, so Anti-christ is to succeed Rome, and Christ our Saviour, Antichrist."

What have you to say of Nero? Ans. "Nero was the 'mystery of iniquity' already working in Paul's time in the form of Nero's persecuting spirit."—Voice of the Church, p. 93.

TERTULLIAN.

Please state how you regard the destruction of Anti-christ? Ans. "We confess that a kingdom is promised us on earth, before that in heaven, but in another
state, namely,—after the resurrection. For it will be in a city of divine workmanship, viz., Jerusalem brought down from heaven.” Dr. Elliott says he held that this city “would come from heaven on the destruction of Antichrist.”—Voice of the Church, p. 67.

So much for Dr. Warren’s four witnesses, every one of whom testifies to faith in the future revelation of Christ for the destruction of Antichrist, and none of them could hold Nero to be him. With these quotations I will dismiss poor Nero unless Dr. Warren brings him again on the stage.

Dr. Warren asks in reference to the binding of Satan by Constantine:

"Why did not Dr. Litch at least allude to the very interesting fact that Constantine himself so regarded it, and erected in memory of the event a monument before his palace door, bearing the image of the serpent cast out and falling into the abyss?"

I answer, because I did not regard it as of any manner of importance as bearing on the subject in hand. It is no uncommon thing for kings and emperors in the vanity of their mind to attach more importance to their actions than facts warrant.

DR. WARREN’S RE-STATEMENT OF HIS VIEWS.

There is but a small portion of the article on this point to which I wish to make any reply. I notice first his agreement with me, that the Mosaic dispensation did properly end at the death of Christ, as I showed from various Scriptures. Hence as he suggests, whenever Christ, or the apostles afterward referred to the end of the age it must be taken as the Christian age. If so, from the time of Christ’s promise, “Lo, I am with
you alway even to the end of the world” (age), he was always spiritually present with them, and never went away. Therefore in that sense, if not absent he could not come. As an omnipresent being he was never absent and could therefore never come. As “a man,” “the Son of man,” he did go away, and promised in the same sense to come. He told the disciples in simple terms how he would come—viz., “In a cloud, with power and great glory.” And thus he will come at the end of the age.

I agree with the Doctor that the passing away of the Jewish system was most gradual: but deny that the new dispensation has ever changed since the day of Pentecost. The disciples grew in grace and understanding and enlarged their sphere of labor. But it was only carrying out the commission, received before Christ left them, to “preach the gospel to every creature,” in “all the world.”

His 14th section contains these words:

“Taught as they were in the impassioned symbolism of the prophecies, this [the destruction of Jerusalem] was to them the end of the age; the heavens and earth passing away with a great noise, and the earth and all things in it being burned up, as when Babylon and Idumea and other cities fell of old. And as they remembered the Lord, when forty years before he described this event as something that should occur in their own generation, they would be at no loss to see in it the Son of man coming in the clouds with his holy angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them who know not God and obey not the gospel.”

All this is very fine, if facts did not say that it is “the baseless fabric of a vision.” The apostle John lived thirty years, or so, after this; and to the last bore testimony that Christ and his kingdom were yet to come. And so do all the fathers, as I have quoted, both
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of the first and second centuries testify to the same thing.

Dr. Warren says concerning the apostolic churches, "Of these we have ample historical testimony." Will he produce one from an apostolic church, or from apostolical fathers of the church, in which is given the most distant intimation that either the parousia, or coming of Christ, or end of the age, had come at the fall of Jerusalem? Dr. Warren knows it does not exist. I hold him to the proof if it does. And if there is no such proof why does he present such a series of assertions? Is it honest?

Again he says:

"In absolute strictness the parousia began with Christ's resurrection."

On this position I confront him with Paul's declaration, 3 Thess. 2: 1-8, "Now we beseech you, brethren, concerning the parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering together unto him; that ye be not soon shaken in mind or be troubled . . . . as that the day of Christ has come." I give the generally approved reading of modern criticism, "has come," as the Doctor seems to approve that rendering. What does Paul here teach? That it was a deception for any one to say that the day of Christ's parousia "had already come." Why? Because "that day shall not come except there come an apostasy first, and that man of sin be revealed." Both apostasy and man of sin were in the future in Paul's time. Yet Dr. Warren has the boldness to affirm that the Parousia had come. Paul wrote his Epistles to the Thessalonians somewhere from A.D. 52 to 54, say thirty years after Christ's resurrection—the
time, as Dr. Warren has it, of the actual *parousia*. Whose testimony shall we accept, Paul's or Dr. Warren's?

**THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.**

In *Messiah's Herald* of April 28th Dr. Warren addresses himself to the subject of the resurrection of the body. It can hardly be called a reply to my argument on the subject in reviewing his book, for it is very little he notices it. It is rather a labored statement of his own view, which is, strictly speaking, an elimination of a body. He says:

"In no part of my work on the Parousia have my ideas been more misapprehended than in what pertains to the resurrection. I will not deny that this may be owing, at least in part, to my own defective presentation of a very difficult subject."

In view of this fact he wishes to present in this his closing article a more full exhibition of the subject. And if a labored effort can redeem his theory from difficulty and obscurity, I will do my friend the justice to say—he has done it. But my conviction is that the defects of his theory are so deeply inwrought that neither etymology, logic, rhetoric, nor Scripture can extricate it from defective presentation. Before he can make it clear he must radically change his theory.

Dr. Warren presents his views under four heads, or parts: "1. Of the Spiritual Body. 2. Of the Natural Resurrection. 3. Of the Better Resurrection. 4. Of the Change of the Living."

"**THE SPIRITUAL BODY.**"

Of this Dr. Warren says:

"1. The body of the resurrection is not the material body which is laid in the grave."
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To this I reply: 1. Christ's resurrection body was the identical body which was laid in Joseph's new tomb. It was a veritable body of "flesh and bones;"—not of blood, for that he left behind at the cross. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and is become the first fruits of them that slept." "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." The first fruits are a sample of the full harvest. The man who should gather from his wheatfield a sample and take it to market for exhibition, and make sale of his crop from that sample, and after harvest should return to the dealer and deliver something else as that which his sample represented, would not secure a very good reputation for honesty.

2. Christ's visible and material body which the disciples had identified "by many infallible signs" went from their midst into heaven. There is not one word in the New Testament even hinting that the body of Christ ever changed after it left the earth.

3. God promised "of the seed of David according to the flesh to raise up Christ to sit on his throne." "This Jesus God hath raised up, whereof all we are witnesses." See Psa. 132:11 and Acts 2:29-32. Also Rom. 1:3, "Concerning his son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." "Thou wilt not leave my soul in sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (Psa. 16:10). "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hades, neither did his flesh see corruption."—Acts 2:31. If all these testimonies are to be trusted, Christ's flesh remains intact, and is yet to sit
on David’s throne; for so God swore with an oath to David. So he promised by the mouth of Gabriel. So he declared by his servants the prophets.

3. The resurrection of Lazarus, the widow’s son, Jairus’ daughter, the two children raised by Elijah and Elisha, of those who came out of their graves after Christ’s resurrection: for it is said of them, “The graves were opened and many bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of their tombs after his resurrection” (Matt. 27:52); in short, every instance recorded of the resurrection of a dead person is that of the body.

4. God covenanted with Abraham to give to him and his seed after him an eternal inheritance, of all the land of Canaan for a possession, Gen. 17:8. This promise has never been fulfilled either to him or “his seed, which is Christ,” Gal. 3:16. Stephen, almost with his dying breath, testified—after reciting Abraham’s call and obedience: “He removed him into this land wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him none inheritance in it: no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet had no child.”—Acts 7:4, 5.

But Paul is as emphatic as was Stephen: “By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise. . . . These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but hav-
ing seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."—Heb. 11:8, 9, 13. (1) The promise was to Abraham personally—"to thee." (2) It was to Isaac and Jacob personally. (3) It was to their seed, "which is Christ." (4) It was the identical land, Canaan, where Abraham sojourned. (5) God never gave him while living so much as to set his foot on. (6) "Yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession." (7) "These," the heirs of promise, "all died in faith not having received the promises," still believing in the promise and the faithfulness of the Promiser. If God ever fulfills the promise to those worthies he must raise their material bodies to life again as he did that of Christ. The promise of Christ, Matt. 5:5, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," demands the resurrection of a material body in order to its fulfillment; and the triumph of the redeemed (Rev. 5:9, 10), "We shall reign on the earth," demands a physical resurrection.

Dr. Warren continues:

"2. The body of the resurrection, though not the same as the present material body, is derived from it."

But Paul wrote: "This corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality." It is not Joseph Cook's "non-atomic enswatement of the soul" that dies, or is corruptible, or mortal, but this mortal body. Dr. Warren does not pretend that the non-atomic body was ever dead, or subject to death.

The Doctor's third proposition is involved in his second, and therefore is answered in the reply to that. He continues:
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"4. The body of the resurrection being derived from the living earthly body, must have *germinally originated* in that body under its proper laws of life."

Nay, but Paul affirms, not that it is derived from the living body, but that it is the "*mortal*" itself which puts "on immortality." Where Scripture speaks let philosophy be silent. As to Joseph Cook's "axiomatic," "clear, cool precision," &c., I have said already, in my review of Dr. Warren's book, about all I care to say. I will therefore content myself at this point by quoting from Rev. J. T. Tucker, D.D., in the *Congregationalist* of March 31st, page 98: "Mr. Cook deals with nothing on the surface merely, but with the elements and foundations of things. He makes an elaborate, an almost ostentatious, display of analytical and logical exactness. He plumes himself upon his fulness and definiteness of statement. His pages bristle with numbered propositions—linked chains of argument,—which carry the look of strength and demonstration beyond the challenge of audacity itself. He is a devotee of axiomatic terseness and certainty; and yet the links of these catenae are sometimes duplicates, making no advance, and their joinings are not always to bear, without separating, the rap of the hammer." "This incompleteness and obscureness is observable in some of the more profound theological and ethical discussions." This criticism is just.

Dr. Warren says farther:

"5. That the resurrection body emerges from this natural body at death."

Does the body which "emerges," &c., ever die? Is it mortal, or immortal? If not mortal, it is not that
which puts on immortality. Is it corruptible, or incorruptible? If incorruptible, it cannot be it which puts on incorruption. But the natural body is "sown in corruption." Then it is the one which "puts on incorruption."

Dr. Warren says:

"It shocks all our instincts as well as our reason, to conceive of Him as going into the charnel house for the materials of our future bodies."

I never read or conceived of Jairus being shocked, or the widow of Nain, or Mary and Martha, or the people of Jerusalem at the sight of the "many" saints whose bodies came from the charnel house. The representations of Scripture are the reverse of Dr. Warren's sensibilities. The saints of God of all the ages have rejoiced with exceeding joy, at the thought of embracing again the material bodies of their "loved lost." All that is mere sentimentalism for effect.

ANASTASIS.

A few words on this subject are next in place. Dr. Warren says:

"The first fact which they [the Scriptures] disclose, is, that there is a future life. This, strictly speaking is, the signification of anastasis, literally a 'standing again.' Death in all ordinary cases is a 'lying down.' . . . To rise up, therefore, after such a prostration and stand again, would be a natural way to express a restoration to life."

This is true. But does "the non-atomic enswathe-ment of the soul" ever lie down? If not, how is it to rise, or "stand again"? If it never died, how can it have "a restoration to life"? Only that which falls, or is down can rise. Only that which is dead can be "restored to life."
Dr. Warren asks:

"Did not Dr. Litch know that I held that the resurrection of that body always occurs at death?"

Yes, he did. But he showed the position to be utterly groundless, by giving the testimony of Scripture, chapter and verse, to prove that Christ's resurrection body only came forth, or "stood again" the third day after death. Did Dr. Warren know that? What he says of sheol and hades is all well enough, and I do not care to dwell on the subject.

II. THE NATURAL RESURRECTION.

This, Dr. Warren says, is what all men experience alike irrespective of character. It is "inevitable and universal." To this I give my hearty assent.

III. THE BETTER RESURRECTION.

This, he says, "is a special object of attainment, to be sought for as a heavenly reward." Here we are at one again. No unconverted person will ever attain that better resurrection. It is what Christ calls "the resurrection of the just," when those who feed the poor in his name shall "be recompensed." Under the head of this better resurrection, he says:

"When our Lord on the cross said, 'It is finished,' he entered in spirit into the realm of the dead. In the language of the most ancient of our creeds, he 'descended into hell,' into hades, the place where all souls had gone before him.... On the third day he rose from the grave and became 'the first fruits of them that slept.' He appeared in bodily form to his friends and disciples, and was seen of them forty days.... and then ascended in the sight of the twelve from the summit of Olivet to heaven."

This is sensible, reasonable, and Scriptural. Why will not Dr. Warren leave it there just as the Scriptures
do? I think with him, that "all speculations are futile," for the reason that "He is to possess the uttermost parts of the earth, and sit on the throne of his father David, and reign over the house of Jacob forever," and the kingdoms of this kosmos are to be his and he "reign forever and ever," as say the Scriptures,—all of which requires the eternal perpetuity of just such a body of David's flesh as the Scriptures ascribe to him after he came out of the tomb. And where God has spoken, "all speculation" is out of place.

In the foregoing quotation, Dr. Warren abandons his position taken in his book and re-affirmed in the article under consideration, of the resurrection at the moment of death; and the utter impossibility of the existence of a soul without a body; and teaches that Christ did go "in spirit into the realm of the dead" and that as the most ancient of our creeds has it, "he rose the third day." I wish he would keep on in his course of improvement. But after admitting as he does the material manifestation of Christ, and the physical tests which he gave, he apostasizes and says, that to his "mind it seems most probable that it was really his spiritual body, temporarily taking upon itself such capacities as were necessary to render it an object of perception to the senses of the appointed eye-witnesses."

Now Dr. Warren's trouble lies simply in his failure to recognize the fact that in the language of Scripture, physical things are very frequently called spiritual. For instance, the Israelites in the wilderness, "did all eat of that spiritual meat; and did all drink of that spiritual drink." The meat was manna and quails; the drink was water. The contrast which Paul draws
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in reference to the natural and spiritual body is this: There are two Adams; the first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Now both soul and spirit are, as to their consistence, alike "non-atomic," impalpable, spiritual. Adam the first has transmitted the psychical element of life to all his posterity. Every human being possesses the soul, or psychical quickening element derived from Adam; the body quickened by this Adamic soul, Paul calls a psychikon body, or a soul-body. The Lord from heaven, the quickening Spirit, proposes to quicken our "mortal bodies" by his Spirit, as Adam did by his quickening soul. This body so quickened Paul calls a pneumatikon, or spirit-body. Now if soul and spirit are alike spiritual as to their consistence, and that body which was quickened by the soul, called the psychikon body, was and is material, what shall hinder the pneumatikon, or spirit-body from being equally material? Taking this view of the subject, Christ's resurrection body at the moment of returning life, was as spiritual as it ever will be, and yet material; and composed, as he declared, of "flesh and bones." So there are now existing the two kinds of body, the psychikon and the pneumatikon. "As we have borne the image of the earthy we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." A body of "flesh and blood" is an Adamic body, quickened by the soul whose medium is the blood. This cannot enter the kingdom of God. "Ye must be born again,"—have a new life-element imparted, the quickening spirit of Christ. "And if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal
BODIES by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."—Rom. 8: 11. That Spirit now dwells in the believer, but it will quicken the mortal body in which it dwells, as it did Christ's, at "the resurrection of life." It was Christ's mortal (dead) body which that Spirit quickened and raised; it will do the same for our mortal bodies if he dwells in us.

Dr. Warren wishes his readers to read 1 Thess. 4, and 1 Cor. 15: 51, 52,—only what the language says, "without reading into it ideas which we think ought to be there, but are not." A grand idea, let us try it. Dr. Warren will please proceed. "(1.) Those persons mentioned are those who when Paul wrote were 'alive and remained unto the Parousia,' including of course all who should live under the Parousia. Or in other words they are all Christian believers at and during all the ages after Christ's coming so long as his kingdom shall endure." I see plainly the Doctor is making progress. In his book he contended that the persons to whom Paul wrote must be restricted to the persons, at least to the generation, then living. The force of his argument lay in that. But now he spreads it out to all eternity—"as long as" Christ's "kingdom lasts," and we are assured (Luke 1: 33), that "of his kingdom there shall be no end." Quite a change and quite a stretch.

"The persons to whom Paul wrote were alive and remained unto the Parousia." Then the Parousia was future when Paul wrote. But as recently as in his former article, in his new departure, Dr. Warren tells us that it began at Christ's resurrection. How is that?

Now let us have exactly what Paul did say: "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which
are alive and remain unto the parousia of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

As this is exactly what Paul wrote and was all to be done at the Parousia of the Lord, and as there has occurred no such resurrection of "the dead in Christ" and rapture of those who "are alive and remain,"—both classes going into the air "together,"—it unmistakably follows that the parousia of the Lord is yet future. And as the Doctor has extended the force of the words addressed to all who live on earth to all eternity, we may still continue to look "for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ." The Doctor continues: "2. These shall not sleep." Paul, what did you say? I said, "We shall not all sleep." But the Doctor proceeds: "Now we know perfectly well what those of that day meant by the sleeping of the dead." Yes, we do. When Jesus said, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," he meant as he "said plainly; Lazarus is dead." Then those who "sleep in Christ" are "the dead in Christ." If Dr. Warren wanted to get the words of Paul, why such verbosity to cover up his words and ideas? The Doctor continues: "3. The living shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." That is all scriptural.
"4. The apostle does not say that this instantaneous change and rapture of all Christ's saints who shall live during the Parousia shall take place at the same moment."

Does he not? Let us see. "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." Well, what will take place in a moment? Paul answers for himself: "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed." If this does not mean that all here enumerated is to take place in a moment, defined by the "twinkling of an eye," then we may as well dismiss our grammar schools. But what is the destiny of those thus immortalized? Paul shall answer for himself again: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven... with the trump of God... and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive... shall be changed and caught up together with them [the resurrected] to meet the Lord in the air." It is, then, all in the same moment; and that moment is "at the last trump."

The Doctor says: "All that is said here, is, that the change in question shall be in, or during the Parousia." Then "in a moment," "at the last trump" means, "during the Parousia!"

Again, "The only reasonable meaning is that from that time onward, Christians should at their death... pass immediately from the earthly to the heavenly life." Well, I can only say, he dies hard.