T1249

THE

THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

OF OUR

LORD JESUS, THE CHRIST,

AS COVENANTED IN

THE OLD TESTAMENT,

AND PRESENTED IN

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

REV. GEO. N. H. PETERS, A.M.

"Buy the truth and sell it not; also wisdom, and instruction, and understanding."—PROV. 23:23.
"The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him; and He will show them His covenant."—Ps. 25:14.

VOL. I.

FUNK & WAGNALLS

NEW YORK 10 AND 12 DEY STREET — 1884 — LONDON 44 FLEET STREET

All Rights Reserved

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884, by
FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

Pappas Res. Assoc'n.
gr.
5-8-1924
3 vols.

E 3.4. 9-35-26

TO

MY WIFE

THIS VOLUME IS MOST AFFECTIONATELY

Dedicated.

MY DEAR WIFE: *Be not surprised when you see this Dedication—this token of my high esteem. You, above all others, deserve this mark of heart-felt regard. When often discouraged in my labors, you sustained me with your affection; when bowed down under the attacks of bigotry, your love raised me up; when sorely depressed by the neglect of others, your sympathetic attention revived me. You have ever taken a deep and abiding interest in my work. Surely, in view of your faithfulness to me and the communion of a common faith in the doctrines following, it is proper for me to express the constant desire, that you may abundantly realize, in a future happy experience, the blessings of the Kingdom here delineated.*

THAT YOU, WHO HAVE LIVED SO MUCH IN MY HEART,

May enjoy the privileges of "the first-born," and thus reign with Christ; that our relationship here may qualify us the more for the fruition of each other's society in the predicted Theocracy of our Lord Jesus, the Christ, is the ardent prayer of your devoted

HUSBAND.

"There is no safe certaintie but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe; this I will professe; according to this I will live, and for this I will not only willingly, but even gladly, loose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and secure it never so incomprehensible to humane reason, I will subscribe it hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this, God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things I will take no man's libertie of judgment from him; neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian. I will love no man the lesse for differing in opinion with me. And what measure I meet to others I expect from them againe. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men out not to require any more of any man, than this: to believe the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavor to finde the true sense of it, and to live according to it."—CHILLINGWORTH.

"That portion of Heavenly Wisdom which, under such circumstances, surbives and is cherished, will be just the first articles of belief,—the Saving Rudiments of Spiritual Life. Of these the Head of the Church himself takes care, lest faith should utterly disappear from the earth. But beside the inestimable jewel of elementary knowledge—the price of which can never be told—does there not rest within the folds of the Inspired Book an inexhaustible store, which the industry of man, piously directed, ought to elicit; but which if men neglect it, the Lord will not force upon their notice? It is this hidden treasure which should animate the ambition of vigorous and devout minds. From such at second hand the body of the faithful are to receive it, if at all; and if not so obtained for them and dealt out by their teachers, nothing will be more meager, unfixed, almost infantile, than the faith of Christians."—ISAAC TAYLOR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION 13

PROPOSITION 1.—The Kingdom of God is a subject of vital importance 29

PROP. 2.—The establishment of this Kingdom was determined before, and designed or prepared from, the foundation of the world 34

PROP. 3.—The meanings usually given to this Kingdom indicate that the most vague, indefinite notions concerning it exist in the minds of many 39

PROP. 4.—The literal, grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures must (connected with the figurative, tropical, or rhetorical) be observed in order to obtain a correct understanding of the Kingdom 47

PROP. 5.—The doctrine of the Kingdom is based on the inspiration of the Word of God 68

PROP. 6.—The Kingdom of God is intimately connected with the Supernatural 80

PROP. 7.—The Kingdom being a manifestation of the Supernatural, miracles are connected with it 88

PROP. 8.—The doctrine of the Kingdom presupposes that of sin, the apostasy of man 102

PROP. 9.—The nature of, and the things pertaining to, the Kingdom can only be ascertained within the limits of Scripture 110

PROP. 10.—This Kingdom should be studied in the light of the Holy Scriptures, and not merely in that of Creeds, Confessions, Formulas of Doctrine, etc 122

PROP. 11.—The mysteries of the Kingdom were given to the apostles 141

PROP. 12.—There is some mystery yet connected with the things of the Kingdom 144

PROP. 13.—Some things pertaining to the Kingdom intentionally revealed somewhat obscurely 148

PROP. 14.—Some things pertaining to the Kingdom not so easily comprehended as many suppose 151

PROP. 15.—The doctrine of the Kingdom can become better understood and appreciated 154

PROP. 16.—This Kingdom cannot be properly comprehended without acknowledging an intimate and internal connection existing between the Old and New Testaments 157

PROP. 17.—Without study of the prophecies no adequate idea can be obtained of the Kingdom 163

PROP. 18.—The prophecies relating to the establishment of the Kingdom of God are both conditioned and unconditioned 176

PROP. 19.—The New Testament begins the announcement of the Kingdom in terms expressive of its being previously well known 181

PROP. 20.—To comprehend the subject of the Kingdom it is necessary to notice the belief and expectations of the more pious portion of the Jews 183

PROP. 21.—The prophecies of the Kingdom interpreted literally sustain the expectations and hopes of the pious Jews 190

PROP. 22.—John the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples employed the phrases "Kingdom of Heaven," "Kingdom of God," etc., in accordance with the usage of the Jews 195

PROP. 23.—There must be some substantial reason why the phrases "Kingdom of God," etc., were thus adopted 198

PROP. 24.—The Kingdom is offered to an elect nation, viz., the Jewish nation 207

PROP. 25.—The Theocracy was an earnest, introductory, or initiatory form of this Kingdom 216

PROP. 26.—The Theocracy thus instituted would have been permanently established if the people, in their national capacity, had been faithful in obedience 222

PROP. 27.—The demand of the nation for an earthly king was a virtual abandonment of the Theocratic Kingdom by the nation 226

PROP. 28.—God makes the Jewish king subordinate to His own Theocracy 228

PROP. 29.—This Theocracy, or Kingdom, is exclusively given to the natural descendants of Abraham, in their corporate capacity 230

PROP. 30.—The prophets, however, without specifying the manner of introduction, predict that the Gentiles shall participate in the blessings of the Theocracy or Kingdom 232

PROP. 31.—This Theocracy was identified with the Davidic Kingdom 234

PROP. 32.—This Theocratic Kingdom, thus incorporated with the Davidic, is removed when the Davidic is overthrown 237

PROP. 33.—The prophets, some even before the captivity, foreseeing the overthrow of the Kingdom, both foretell its downfall and its final restoration 240

PROP. 34.—The prophets describe this restored Kingdom, its extension, glory, etc., without distinguishing between the First and Second Advents 242

PROP. 35.—The prophets describe but one Kingdom 245

PROP. 36.—The prophets, with one voice, describe this one Kingdom, thus restored, in terms expressive of the most glorious additions 248

PROP. 37.—The Kingdom thus predicted and promised was not in existence when the forerunner of Jesus appeared 250

PROP. 38.—John the Baptist preached that this Kingdom, predicted by the prophets, was "nigh at hand" 253

PROP. 39.—John the Baptist was not ignorant of the Kingdom that he preached.... 256

PROP. 40.—The hearers of John believed that he preached to them the Kingdom predicted by the prophets, and in the sense held by themselves..... 260

PROP. 41.—The Kingdom was not established under John's ministry..... 262

PROP. 42.—Jesus Christ in His early ministry preached that the Kingdom was "nigh at hand"..... 266

PROP. 43.—The disciples sent forth by Jesus to preach this Kingdom were not ignorant of the meaning to be attached to the Kingdom..... 274

PROP. 44.—The preaching of the Kingdom, being in accordance with that of the predicted Kingdom, raised no controversy between the Jews and Jesus, or between the Jews and His disciples and apostles..... 280

PROP. 45.—The phrases "Kingdom of Heaven," "Kingdom of God," "Kingdom of Christ," etc., denote the same Kingdom..... 283

PROP. 46.—The Kingdom anticipated by the Jews at the First Advent is based on the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants..... 285

PROP. 47.—The Jews had the strongest possible assurances given to them that the Kingdom based on these covenants would be realized..... 287

PROP. 48.—The Kingdom being based on the covenants, the covenants must be carefully examined, and (Prop. 4) the literal language of the same must be maintained..... 290

PROP. 49.—The covenants being, in Revelation, the foundation of the Kingdom, must first be received and appreciated..... 293

PROP. 50.—This Kingdom will be the outgrowth of the renewed Abrahamic covenant, under which renewal we live..... 320

PROP. 51.—The relation that the Kingdom sustains to "the covenants of promise" enables us to appreciate the prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom..... 337

PROP. 52.—The promises pertaining to the Kingdom, as given in the covenants, will be strictly fulfilled..... 342

PROP. 53.—The genealogies of our Lord form an important link in the comprehension of the Kingdom..... 352

PROP. 54.—The preaching of the Kingdom by John, Jesus, and the disciples, was confined to the Jewish nation..... 356

PROP. 55.—It was necessary that Jesus and His disciples should, at first, preach the Kingdom as nigh to the Jewish nation..... 362

PROP. 56.—The Kingdom was not established during the ministry of "the Christ".. 366

PROP. 57.—This Kingdom was offered to the Jewish nation, but the nation rejected it..... 375

PROP. 58.—Jesus, toward the close of His ministry, preached that the Kingdom was not nigh..... 379

PROP. 59.—This Kingdom of God offered to the Jewish elect nation, lest the purpose of God fail, is to be given to others who are adopted..... 386

PROP. 60.—This Kingdom of God is given, not to nations, but to one nation..... 392

PROP. 61.—The Kingdom which by promise exclusively belonged to the Jewish nation, the rightful seed of Abraham, was now to be given to an engrafted people. 396

PROP. 62.—This people, to whom the Kingdom is to be given, gathered out of the nations, becomes the elect nation..... 401

PROP. 63.—The present elect, to whom the Kingdom will be given, is the continuation of the previous election chiefly in another engrafted people..... 404

PROP. 64.—The Kingdom being given to the elect only, any adoption into that elect portion must be revealed by express Divine Revelation..... 408

PROP. 65.—Before this Kingdom can be given to this elect people, they must first be gathered out..... 412

PROP. 66.—The Kingdom that was nigh at one time (viz., at the First Advent) to the Jewish nation is now removed to the close of its tribulation, and of the times of the Gentiles..... 419

PROP. 67.—The Kingdom could not, therefore, have been set up at that time, viz., at the First Advent..... 421

PROP. 68.—This Kingdom is then essentially a Jewish Kingdom..... 424

PROP. 69.—The death of Jesus did not remove the notion entertained by the disciples and apostles concerning the Kingdom..... 429

PROP. 70.—The apostles, after Christ's ascension, did not preach, either to Jews or Gentiles, that the Kingdom was established..... 433

PROP. 71.—The language of the apostles confirmed the Jews in their Messianic hopes of the Kingdom..... 445

PROP. 72.—The doctrine of the Kingdom, as preached by the apostles, was received by the early Church..... 449

PROP. 73.—The doctrine of the Kingdom preached by the apostles and elders raised up no controversy with the Jews..... 467

PROP. 74.—The belief in the speedy Advent of Christ, entertained both by the apostles and the churches under them, indicates what Kingdom was believed in and taught by the first Christians..... 470

PROP. 75.—The doctrine of the Kingdom, as held by the churches established by the apostles, was perpetuated..... 480

PROP. 76.—The doctrine of the Kingdom was changed under the Gnostic and Alexandrian influence..... 499

PROP. 77.—The doctrine of the Kingdom, as held by the early Church, was finally almost exterminated under the teaching and power of the Papacy..... 513

PROP. 78.—The early Church doctrine was revived after the Reformation..... 524

PROP. 79.—The Kingdom of God, promised by covenant and prophets, is to be distinguished from the general and universal sovereignty of God..... 556

PROP. 80.—This Kingdom of covenant, promise, and prediction is to be distinguished from the sovereignty which Jesus exercises in virtue of His Divine nature..... 559

PROP. 81.—This Kingdom, as covenanted, belongs to Jesus, as "the Son of Man".. 565

PROP. 82.—This Kingdom is a complete restoration, in the person of the Second Adam or Man, of the dominion lost by the First Adam or Man..... 572

PROP. 83.—This Kingdom is given to "the Son of Man" by God, the Father..... 577

PROP. 84.—As this Kingdom is specially given to "the Son of Man" as the result of His obedience, sufferings, and death, it must be something different from His Divine nature, or from "piety," "religion," "God's reign in the heart," etc... 582

PROP. 85.—Neither Abraham nor his engrafted seed have as yet inherited the Kingdom; hence the Kingdom must be something different from "piety," "religion," "God's reign in the heart," etc..... 585

PROP. 86.—The object or design of this dispensation is to gather out these elect to whom, as heirs with Abraham and his seed Christ, this Kingdom is to be given.. 586

PROP. 87.—The postponement of the Kingdom is the key to the understanding of the meaning of this dispensation..... 590

PROP. 88.—The Church is then a preparatory stage for this Kingdom..... 592

PROP. 89.—Christ, in view of this future Kingdom, sustains a peculiar relationship to the Church..... 596

PROP. 90.—Members of the Church who are faithful are promised this Kingdom.... 600

PROP. 91.—The Kingdom of God is not the Jewish Church..... 604

PROP. 92.—This Kingdom is not what some call, "the Gospel Kingdom"..... 607

PROP. 93.—The covenanted Kingdom is not the Christian Church..... 609

PROP. 94.—The overlooking of the postponement of this Kingdom is a fundamental mistake and fruitful source of error in many systems of Theology..... 621

PROP. 95.—If the Church is the Kingdom, then the terms "Church" and "Kingdom" should be synonymous..... 632

PROP. 96.—The differences visible in the Church are evidences that it is not the predicted Kingdom of the Messiah..... 634

PROP. 97.—The various forms of Church government indicate that the Church is not the promised Kingdom..... 638

PROP. 98.—That the Church was not the Kingdom promised to David's Son was the belief of the early Church..... 641

PROP. 99.—The opinion that the Church is the predicted Kingdom of the Christ was of later origin than the first or second century..... 644

PROP. 100.—The visible Church is not the predicted Kingdom of Jesus Christ..... 647

PROP. 101.—The invisible Church is not the covenanted Kingdom of Christ..... 655

PROP. 102.—Neither the visible nor invisible Church is the covenanted Kingdom... 662

PROP. 103.—This Kingdom is not a Kingdom in "the third heaven"..... 668

PROP. 104.—The Christian Church is not denoted by the predicted Kingdom of the prophets..... 671

PROP. 105.—The Lord's Prayer, as given to the disciples, and understood by them, amply sustains our position..... 689

PROP. 106.—Our doctrine of the Kingdom sustained by the temptation of Christ. .. 698

INTRODUCTION.

In this work it is proposed to show what the Covenants demand, and what relationship the second coming, kingdom, and glory of "The Christ" sustains to the same, in order that perfected Redemption may be realized. This, logically, introduces a large amount of converging testimony.

The history of the human race is, as able theologians have remarked, the history of God's dealings with man. It is a fulfilling of revelation; yea, more: it is an unfolding of the ways of God, a comprehensive confirmation of, and an appointed aid, in interpreting the plan of redemption. Hence God himself appeals to it, not merely as the evidence of the truth declared, but as the mode by which we alone can obtain a full and complete view of the Divine purpose relating to salvation. To do this we must, however, regard *past, present, and future* history. The latter must be received as predicted, for we may rest assured, from the past and present fulfilment of the word of God, thus changed into historical reality, that the predictions and promises relating to the future will also in their turn become veritable history. It is *this faith*, which grasps the future as already present, that can form a decided and unmistakable unity.

This is becoming more profoundly felt and expressed, and is forcibly portrayed in some recent publications (*e.g.*, Dorner's *His. Prot. Theol.*, Auberlen's *Div. Rev.*, etc.). Seeing that all things are tending toward the kingdom to be hereafter established by Christ, that the dispensations from Adam to the present are only preparatory stages for its coming manifestation, surely it is the highest wisdom to direct special and careful attention *to the kingdom itself.* If it is the end which serves to explain the means employed; if it is the object for which ages have passed by and are ever to revolve; if the coming of Jesus, which is to inaugurate it, is emphatically called "the blessed hope;" if it embraces the culmination of the world's history in ample deliverance and desired restitution; *then* it is utterly impossible for us to determine the true significance, the Divine course, and the development of the plan of salvation without a deep insight into that of the kingdom itself. Prophets, apostles, and Jesus himself, especially in his last testimony, continually point the eye of faith and the heart of hope to this kingdom as the bright light which can clearly illumine the past and present, and even dispel the darkness of the future. Scripture and theology, the latter in its very early and later development, teach us, if we will but receive it, that we cannot properly comprehend the Divine economy in its relation to man and the world, unless we reverently consider the manifestation of its

ultimate result as exhibited in this kingdom. It follows, therefore, that a work of this kind, intended to give an understanding of a subject so vital, however defective in part, requires *no apology* to the reflecting mind. Every effort in this direction, if it evinces appreciation of truth and reverence for the word, will be received with pleasure by the true Biblical student.[1]

In the reaction against Rationalism, Spiritualism, Naturalism, etc., special attention has been paid to the kingdom of God and the relation that it sustains to history. The attack and defense revealed both how important the subject, and how sadly it had been neglected. It has been admitted by recent writers of ability (*e.g.*, Dr. Auberlen, *Div. Rev.*, p. 387), that much is *yet to be learned* in reference to it; that only *a beginning* has been made in investigating the subject; that a correct solution of the difficulties surrounding it in order to give a satisfactory reply to objections *is still a work of the future.* Some (as *e.g.*, Rothe), when looking over the great array of Biblical authors, still find in their labors a something lacking, which when carefully analyzed resolves itself in a lack of Divine unity in reference to the kingdom of God, evincing itself in a mystical, if not arbitrary, definition of it, in various forms, to suit a present exigency, or harmonize a supposed difficulty. This feeling is strengthened by the continued assaults of unbelievers, which have been for some time made against the early history of Christianity. Numerous works have appeared, and with the boldest criticism have pointed out discrepancies existing between the ancient faith and that entertained by the large body of the Church at the present day; and from such differences of belief have inferred that the early faith was sadly defective, and that its promulgators are therefore unworthy of our confidence. We are told that the apostles, apostolic fathers, and the first Christians generally were well-meaning and even noble men, but "ignorant, enthusiastic, and fanatical" in their opinions. Rejoinders, on the other hand, have appeared, which, professing to defend the apostles, and fathers, are yet forced, *most unwillingly*, to admit the leading charge preferred by their opponents. Thus, *e.g.*, the German Rationalists point to the preaching of John the Baptist, the disciples, and the first believers, and show *conclusively* that they preached a kingdom which accorded with the Jewish forms—viz., a kingdom here on earth under the personal reign of the Messiah, the Davidic throne and kingdom being restored. They press this matter with an exultant feeling, realizing that the great proportion of the Church being opposed to such a belief materially aids them in condemning *the first preaching* of the gospel of

---

[1] When regarding the large number of able treatises on various parts of the subject here discussed, the author felt somewhat like Montesquieu, who, in his preface to "The Spirit of Laws," wrote: "When I saw what so many great men in France, in England, and in Germany had written before me, I was buried in admiration; but I did not lose courage. I said with Correggio, 'I also am a painter.'" My painting consists in bringing together upon a large canvas the ideas of many painters; or, without figure, to place in a strict logical, consecutive order the truths pertaining to the kingdom, truths too often presented in an isolated, disconnected manner, and thus destroying their force. As to the ability to perform such a labor of love, the text above contains a sufficient excuse. For God, passing by the refined and the learned, first showed forth His wisdom and power in Galileans (Acts 2 : 7); He chooses "the foolish things of the world to confound the wise" (1 Cor. 1 : 27); He places His "treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us" (2 Cor. 4 : 7), in order to evince the often-repeated fact that even humble talents and attainments may be highly useful in upholding the truth.

the kingdom, and thus making *the founders* of the Church unworthy of credence. The Church itself, by its published faith respecting the kingdom, forges the weapons that are employed against it. Every work on the other side in defense of the founders of the Christian Church, unable to set aside the abundant and overwhelming evidence adduced, *frankly admits* that the first preaching was in a Jewish form ; that the faith of the early Church is not now the faith of the Church (saving that of a few individuals) ; and endeavors to solve the difficulty (as, *e.g.*, Neander, and others) by declaring, that the early period was a transition state, a preparatory stage, an adaptation to meet the necessities of that age ; that hence the truth in the matter of the kingdom was enveloped in a "*husk*," and was to be gradually evolved in "the consciousness of the Church" by its growth. Aside from thus virtually making Church authority superior to Scripture (for according to this theory we know far more doctrinal truth than the apostles), we earnestly *protest* against such a defense, which leaves the apostles chargeable with error (embracing the husk instead of the kernel), invalidates their testimony, and makes them unreliable guides. Under several of the propositions this feature will be duly examined ; for the present we have only to say : the reason for such a lack of unity, of vital connection, of satisfactory apologetics, arises simply from ignoring a fact brought out vividly by Barnabas in his Epistle—viz., that the Abrahamic Covenant contained *the formative principles, the nucleus* of the Plan of Redemption ; and that all future revelations is an unveiling, a developing, a preparation for the ultimate fulfilment of that covenant, and of the kingdom incorporated in the predictions and promises relating to that covenant. The legitimate outgrowth is alone to be received as the promised kingdom, without human addition in the way of defining and explaining. In this way only can we preserve the simplicity and harmony of Scripture, find ourselves in unison with the early preaching of this kingdom, and consistently, without detracting from the apostles and their immediate followers, defend the Divine record against the shafts of unbelievers.

The multiplicity and utter inconsistency of prevailing interpretations of the kingdom ; the complete failure to reconcile such meanings with the preaching of the apostles ; the unfortunate concessions made by able theologians to the Strauss and Bauer school on the subject of the kingdom ; the impossibility of preserving the authority and unity of the apostolic teaching from the modern standpoint of the kingdom ; the honest desire to obtain, if possible, the truth—these and other considerations led the writer to repeatedly consider, for many years, the Divine Revelation (in connection with the history of man) with special reference to this subject, until he was forced, by the vast array of authority and the satisfactory unity of teaching and of purpose which it presented, not only to discard the modern definitions as untrustworthy, but to accept of the old view of the kingdom as the one clearly taught by the prophets, Jesus, the disciples, the apostles, the apostolic fathers, and their immediate successors. In a course of reading and study it has been constantly kept in view, and the results, after a laborious comparison of Scripture, are now laid before the reader. This work is far from being exhaustive. Here are only presented the outlines of that which some other mind may mould into a more attractive and comprehensive form. Owing to providences which prevented the writer from actively prosecuting the ministry, he was directed to a course of study

which influenced him years ago to draw up a draft of the present work. The need of such an one was then impressed, and this impression has been deepened by a varied and close observation. Yet, feeling the necessity of caution, it was held in abeyance to allow renewed reflection and investigation, until finally a sense of duty has impelled him to publish it as now given. If it possesses no other merit than that of presenting in a compact and logical form the Millenarian views of the ancient and modern believers, and in paving the way for *a more strict and consistent* interpretation of the kingdom, *this itself* would already be sufficient justification for its publication. The work, aside from its main leading idea, contains a mass of information on a variety of subjects and texts which may prove interesting, if not valuable, in suggestions to others. The author is not desirous to play the Diogenes, evincing, under the garb of humility and pretended low opinion of self, the utmost vainglory; or to enact the Alexander, showing, through an ardent desire for praise, a strong ambition for honors. A due medium, involving self-respect and a sincere desire to secure the approval of good men, is the most desirable, and also the most consistent with modesty. He therefore concluded, that no one could justly suspect his honesty of purpose, integrity, and desire to promote the truth, if he would publish his thoughts in the form herein given, even if he went to the length—impelled by what he regarded as truth—of giving the decided opinion, with reasons attached, that the views so universally promulgated respecting the kingdom of God are radically wrong, derogatory to the Plan of Redemption, opposed to the honor of the Messiah, and a remnant, remarkably preserved, of Alexandrian, monkish, and popish interpretation. Not that the writer claims entire freedom from error himself. Imperfection and a liability to err are, more or less, the condition of all human writings, even of the most well intended. Therefore, while, in illustrating or defending my own views, the opinions of others may be brought into review, it is far from me to assert that in some things, either through inadvertency, or ignorance, or prejudice, the author may not be ultimately found to be in error. Seeing that this is our own common lot, it would be unwise to approach each other's works with any other than candid eyes and charitable hearts; so that, while we may feel to regret what appears to us a mistake, we may at the same time duly acknowledge the truth which is given. It may be proper to add in this connection, lest the spirit and motive be misinterpreted, that in the course of the work the names of authors are necessarily presented whose views are antagonistic to those here advocated. As it would have required considerable space to insert in each instance the respect and high regard the author has for them, although they thus differ from him, he may be allowed, once for all, to say that, while compelled to dissent from them, he nevertheless *esteems them none the less* as believers in Christ. Honestly impelled to differences, and, in justice to our subject, to criticise the views of eminent men, we still gratefully acknowledge ourselves largely indebted to many of them for valuable information, instruction, and suggestions. We have no desire to reproach them, or, in imitation of some of them in reference to ourselves, to call their integrity, or piety, or orthodoxy into question. We may even indulge the hope that this work may elicit renewed reflection, study, and discussion, leading to the removal of the evident weakness and contradictory statements of the prevailing Church view. Its publication may, we trust, be provocative of good, sustaining as it does the humble

position of a forerunner of the truth, or the relationship of being merely suggestive, and thus opening the way for a more severe and critical examination of a doctrine which has been *too much taken for granted.* Defective as our works are in some respects, yet gifted minds have asserted, with charity and truth, that no mental toil, no laborious research, no earnestness of effort to interpret the Scriptures, however deficient in part or whole, should be undervalued, or scouted, or denounced, because all such may either present some truth which may serve to elucidate others, or produce thoughts that may be suggestive to others in introducing true knowledge. We too often overlook even our indebtedness to opposers of our opinions and belief. What Julius Müller says should influence us not only to attempt to labor ourselves, but to tolerate the efforts of others: "Our attempts to exhibit the truth in its entirety and connection are only like the prattle of children, compared with that clear knowledge which awaits us; but woe would it be to us if, because we cannot have the perfect, we should cease to apply to the imperfect, in all truthfulness and honor, our strength and toil" (quoted by Auberlen, *Div. Rev.*, p. 415). This work is written under the impression, deepened by the testimony of able scholars, that *the love of truth* is one of the fundamental principles given to us by Christianity, and revived by the spirit of Protestantism and Science. Ignorance, fanaticism, party prejudice, etc. may indeed at times have obscured it, but intelligent piety has constantly restored it. Under its influence every inquiry after the truth, if conducted with reverence to the Word, without animosity, and in meekness, even if unsuccessful in its full attainment, is regarded by the truly learned and wise with charity, without an impugning of motives, or questioning of the religious standpoint of the searcher. This leads of course, to the position, that the credit we desire to be awarded to ourselves for presenting what we conceive to be truth, should be likewise extended to others. And if others claim, that they are not to decline the responsibility of holding forth the whole truth from our apprehension of consequences; that they are not to disguise or withdraw it through fear of giving offense, of losing reputation and support—we justly claim the same privilege. More than this: we can say with a distinguished theologian, who, contrasting the labors of more recent theologians with those of the older, and pointing out how the Old Testament is beginning to be appreciated in its relations to the New Testament, and the future—how the historical and doctrinal features of the primitive Church are more distinctly developed, how the place of the Church in its relation to the kingdom of God is more fully recognized—adds, that these are only "the beginnings of a work in which it is a pleasure and joy to have any share." [1]

This pleasure, however, is materially affected by one feature, the natural result of human infirmity. Uprightness demands that we follow the truth wherever it may lead, regardless of results, keeping in mind the remark of Canstein (Lange, *Com.*, vol. 1, p. 516), "Straightforwardness is best. When we seek to make the truth bend, it usually breaks." The doctrine discussed in the following pages being within the field of controversy, and the subject of varied interpretation, it will become in its turn, owing to its antagonism to the prevailing theology, the legitimate subject of criticism. Of this we do not complain, but rather

[1] Auberlen, *Div. Rev.*, p. 264.

commend the fact. "History repeats itself," and in such a repetition we do not flatter ourselves to escape the usual fate of our predecessors in authorship. Indeed, we already have had sad foretastes of the same, confirming the teaching of Scripture, and corroborating the experience of good men, that no exercise of wisdom, caution, and prudence will be able wholly to avert the evil tongues and pens of others. Some men seem to be constitutionally constituted to be "heresy-hunters," and imbibe largely the spirit of Osiander of Tübingen, who (Dorner's *Hist. Prot. Theol.*, p. 185, note) discovered in Arndt's writings Popery, Monkery, Enthusiasm, Pelagianism, Calvinism, Schwenckfeldianism, Flacianism, and Wegelianism. Arndt survived the attack and still gloriously lives in the esteem of true Christian freedom, while his opponent is almost forgotten. This random illustration[1] is taken from a vast multitude familiar to every scholar, and serves to indicate a weakness naturally inherent in some men, and who, perhaps, are scarcely answerable for its unfortunate display. Truth itself, however, requires no such picking of flaws, no harshness of language, no personality of attack, no bigoted and selfish support. She loves to hide herself in meekness, humility, and love, while the graces of the spirit surround and accompany her. The rude grasp, the rough touch even, is sure to mar the neat foldings and to spoil the downy softness and shining lustre of her garments. That this work will bring upon the author bitter and unrelenting abuse is almost inevitable, presenting as it does unpalatable truths to a proud humanity. How can this be otherwise, when even the institution of the Lord's Supper, intended as a bond of union and love, has been made the subject of uncharitable discord, violent abuse, and miserable hatred between professed believers. While we trust that the spirit which actuated many of the eucharistic controversies may never again arise, we are only too sensible, from treatment already experienced, that human nature remains the same. If the amiable Melanchthon did not escape, but most earnestly wished to be delivered from the *rabies theologorum*, how can others be safe? Even the Master himself *was and is* attacked, and the disciple is not above his Master. The virulence occasionally received from some quarters reminds one of the utterances of older controversialists, such as Henry VIII.'s work, Luther's reply, and More's rejoinder. Perhaps, like St. Austin and others, they regard such a manifestation of spirit as perfectly legitimate, desirable, and honorable. We do not quarrel with those who have inherited a taste for "bitter herbs." Expressing ourselves candidly and fairly toward our opponents, we dare not return the epithets so liberally bestowed upon us. Two reasons prevent us: the first is, that dealing as we do "with the testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy," entering the sacred province of Scripture with the words of God constantly flowing from our pen, portraying the holy utterances of the Most High, it ill becomes us, when thus writing of the precious things pertaining to redemption, the kingdom of the Great King, and the ultimate glory of God, to mingle with it the painful evidences of human passion. The second is, dealing with a subject which, in the writer's opinion, has been misapprehended by talented men, it is amply sufficient, for the elucidation and confirmation of the truth, to point out defects and exhibit statements in opposition with-

[1] The Faculty of Wittenberg with John Deutschman (Kurtz's *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 2, p. 241) charged the amiable Spener with 264 errors, so lynx-eyed are some critics.

out defaming the character or standing of any one. The latter procedure is worthy alone of a grovelling jesuitical casuistry. Our names (Millenarian) have been linked with Cerinthus, heresy, etc., which is only imitating the amiable example of the Jesuit Theophilus Raynaud, who was noted for coupling his adversaries with some odious name to render them, if possible, contemptible by the comparison. It is the same trick resorted to by some Jews to wound Christ, and can only have weight with the unreflecting.[1] To hold up the faults of opinion in others, for the sake of contrasting, explaining, and enforcing the truth, is allowable to all; especially when they are published, and thus become a sort of common property, or at least challenge the notice of others; but to hold up a man's faults simply to make him odious is a despicable business. As Fuller (*Eccl. Hist.*, Book X., p. 27) has wisely said: "What a monster might be made out of the best beauties in the world, if a limner should leave what is lovely and only collect into one picture what he findeth amiss in them! I know that there be white teeth in the blackest blackamoor, and a black bill in the whitest swan. Worst men have something to be commended; best men, something in them to be condemned. Only to insist on men's faults, to render them odious, is no ingenious (*sic*) employment," etc. We doubt not the ultimate fulfilment of Isa. 66 : 5 in the case of many who have been thus defamed: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at His word; your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but He shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." This passage suggests that *a mistaken zeal* for God's glory may often be the leading motive of controversial bitterness—that our "brethren" may, through such overzeal, be its willing instruments. This, alas, embitters authorship on controverted questions. The opposition and obloquy consequent to and connected with such a discussion as follows while duly anticipated,[2] as a heritage of the studious sons of the Church (the more marked their labors, the greater the abuse), would be less painful if it came only from infidels or the enemies of the truth, but much of it comes through those from whom, in view of a common faith and hope, we expect different treatment—at least forbearance if not charity. Acknowledging the

---

[1] Simple candor requires us to say, that some of our opponents write against us in a style that forcibly reminds us of the Popish bulls against heretics, or the supercilious language addressed by sundry ecclesiastical and civil judges, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, against the Puritans—a style constantly reiterated in history and produced by the spirit, "I am holier than thou," connected with a feeling of personal importance akin to that of the petty constable who felt that anything in opposition to himself was in opposition to the commonwealth itself. Yet philosophy may suggest, that reproach, however bestowed, often answers, like the dark background or shading of a portrait, to bring out more vividly the individuality—a principle that Renan recognizes in Christ; the reproaches of others bringing out, by way of contrast, more prominently and distinctively the traits and characteristics of Jesus. Would any lover of the Christ wish this part of the record blotted out? If not, why object to it when related to ourselves, especially when contrasted with Matt. 5 : 10-12, etc.

[2] When Spalatin, the chaplain of Frederick the Wise, desired to translate a work that would give general satisfaction and at the same time be useful, he requested Luther to recommend to him such an one. Luther, in his reply, declared that it was impossible to find such a book, saying, that if he wished to make people "hear the voice of Jesus Christ, you will be useful and agreeable, depend upon it, to a very small number only." Luther's view, alas, is painfully corroborated by the disputes over "the testimony of Jesus," and the recompense meted out to those calling specific attention to it.

respectful and Christian manner in which we are spoken of by a number of our opponents, yet the simple fact is, that if any one dares to arise and call into question the correctness of popular views and propose another, one too in strict accordance with the early teaching of the Church, his motives are assailed, his piety is doubted, his character is privately and publicly traduced, his learning and ability are lowered, his position is accorded a scornful and degrading pity, by persons who deem themselves set up for the defense of the truth. This plainness of speech the reader will pardon when he is assured that the writer, for the sake of the opinions set forth in this work, has suffered all this from the hands of "brethren," who, by such efforts, reproaches, innuendoes, etc., have sought to lessen his influence and retard his preferment. Precisely as the learned Mede and hundreds of others have experienced.[1] We here enter our protest, that truth is never benefited by such conduct, and that Christianity in its most rudimentary form forbids such treatment. But in justice to the really intelligent class of our opponents, we must say that such dealings toward us do not come from the truly learned opposer—for among such the writer has the pleasure of numbering valued friends. One feature of this work will bring upon us the censure of some—viz., the candid concessions made to unbelievers who attack the Scriptures, and the acceptance of the principle of interpretation (*i.e.*, the grammatical sense), the views entertained respecting the kingdom by John the Baptist, disciples, and early church, etc., to which the writer is forced by justice, love for the truth, and the decided, overwhelming proof presented in behalf of the same. It must be acknowledged that many facts pertaining to the kingdom, as covenanted, predicted, and preached, are either entirely ignored or most imperfectly (inconsistently) explained by Christian Apologists. But these very concessions form for us a means of logical strength, of consonant unity, of accordance with Scripture and history, that, meeting unbelief *fairly* and *honestly* upon its own ground, furnish us with the proper weapons for defending the integrity of the Word and the reputation of the first preachers of "the gospel of the kingdom," bringing a continued verification of the Divine utterance, that "a man's foes shall be they of his

[1] Compare the case of Edward Irving (*Life of*, by Mrs. Oliphant, pp. 337-339), who offered to win the degree of Doctor of Divinity by submitting to an academical examination, etc. Some of our opponents have received the title for writing books against us. Those subject to such treatment can, however, console themselves with such passages as 1 Cor. 3 : 18, when, as Barnes tells us (*Com. loci.*, Remark 17), that the Christian "must be willing to be esteemed a fool; to be despised; to have his name cast out as evil; and to be regarded as even under delusion and deception. Whatever may be his rank or his reputation for wisdom and talent and learning, he must be willing to be regarded as a fool by his former associates," etc. Alas! this was foreseen, and hence the encouragement given by Jesus, Matt. 5 : 11, etc. Bishop Newton remarks (*Proph. Diss.*, Vol. 2, p. 164), that we have but little encouragement from the Church in studies of this kind, and instances the neglect bestowed upon two, "the most learned men of their times," viz., Mede and Daubuz. The experience of many corroborates this statement. The writer has now in his mind several men of eminent ability, who are suffering from the covert and open attacks of "brethren," and are in danger of losing positions of usefulness and trust. But we console ourselves with Rothe's declaration ("Stille Stunde"): "He whose thoughts rise a little above the trivial must not be surprised if he is thoroughly misunderstood by most men." One of the severest trials—incident to our infirmity—to a sensitive heart, is the loss of personal friends, highly esteemed, through adhesion to what is honestly regarded as the truth, but which such may suppose to be error.

own household." Of course, we expect no special favor from gross Infidels, Spiritualists, Mystics, Free Religionists, and a variety of others, whose basis necessarily leads to opposition and whose unbelief is frankly criticised. Yet even such have dealt far more justly toward us, owing to our honest conceptions of historical facts, than members who were united with us in the same church. We may suitably close this section by again referring to that noble characteristic of candor which should, above all, mark our criticism of doctrine. We select as an apt illustration of our meaning the honorable example of Professor Bush. Although in his writings an opposer of Millenarianism, he endeavors to conceal no facts, however adverse to himself, but freely gives them, being too much of a scholar to be unacquainted with them, and too much of a gentleman and Christian either to ignore, or to despise, or to deny them. Thus, *e.g.*, he fully admits the universality of our doctrine in the first three centuries and eloquently says: "We are well aware of the imposing array of venerable names by which it (Chiliasm) is surrounded, as if it were the bed of Solomon guarded by threescore valiant men of Israel, all holding swords, and expert in war." Unable to receive our doctrine, he still does justice to that noble list of martyrs, confessors, writers, theologians, missionaries, and others, who have held it, and finds in them the redeeming qualities of Christian integrity, faith, love, and holiness.

It is a fact, lamented by some of our ablest divines, that there must be something radically wrong in our prevailing interpretation of the Bible, which allows such a diversity of antagonistic exegesis and doctrine, and by which the truth is weakened and humbled, so that Revelation itself, by its means, becomes the object of Rationalistic and Infidel ridicule and attack, and is even sorely wounded in the house of its friends by its stumbling, conceding, but well-meaning apologetic defenders. To indicate this feeling, which prevails to a considerable extent, Dr. Auberlen (*Div. Rev.*, p. 387) quotes Rothe as saying respecting the defects of exegesis: "Our key does not open—*the right key is lost;* and till we are put in possession of it again, our exposition will never succeed. The system of biblical ideas is *not* that of our schools; and so long as we attempt exegesis without it, the Bible will remain *a half-closed book.* We must enter upon it with *other conceptions* than those which we have been accustomed to think *the only possible ones;* and whatever these may be, this one thing at least is certain, from the whole tenor of the melody of Scripture in its natural fulness, that they must be *more realistic and massive.*" This is a sad confession after the voluminous labors of centuries, and yet *true* as it is *sorrowful.* We may be allowed to suggest, that the only way in which this key can be obtained is to return to the principles of interpretation adopted and prevailing in the very early history of the Christian Church, by which, if consistently carried out, the kingdom of God in its "realistic and massive" form appears as *the reliable interpreter of the Word.* In other words, we have no suitable key to unlock Revelation if we do not seize *that provided for us* in the revealed Will of God respecting *the ultimate end* that He has in view in the plan of redemption and the history of the world. A way is only known when the beginning and terminus are considered; a human plan can only be properly appreciated when the results of it are fully weighed: so with God's way and God's plan, it can *only* be fully known when *the end intended* is duly regarded. How to do this will be contained in some of

the following propositions. That it will be accomplished we doubt not, and we are encouraged to labor on when such men as Dr. Dorner (p. 4, Introd., vol. 2, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.*), expressing the sentiments of many others, says: "There can be no doubt that Holy Scripture contains a rich abundance of truths and views, which have *yet to be expounded and made the common possession* of the Church," and adds, that this will be done as the necessity of the Church requires.[1] This, however, cannot be accomplished without long and *laborious study* of the Scriptures, diligent *comparison* of them, and inflexible abiding *within* the limits of their plain, grammatical teaching. We have no sympathy with that flippant, unargumentative, high-sounding, but unscriptural mode of presenting theological questions, so prevalent at the present day, by which the merest *tyro* of a student endeavors to elevate himself, as a teacher, above men who have been trained by grave and extended reflection, and which manifests itself by despising the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers and of the noble men of the Church, and enforces its views by an applauding of modern views and modern theories as evidences of progression in truth. The dignity of religion, the steadfastness of faith, and the reliability of the discovery of truth, must suffer by such a style, which lacks the strength imparted by a scriptural basis—a "*thus saith the Lord*"—being built upon the deductions of reason, with, perhaps, here and there a scripture passage thrown in by way of ornament.[2] Give us men, who, instead of following their own fancies, or binding their faith to human utterances, availing themselves of preceding knowledge, patiently, thoughtfully, and reverently go to the very roots of questions, and in things revealed by God determinately reject everything inconsistent with such a revelation. We know that such a course demands courage

---

[1] See the duty of contribution in this direction insisted upon, and so eloquently expressed by Van Oosterzee in his address, "The Gospel History and Modern Criticism," before the Evangelical Alliance of 1873, and his insistence upon all in the church in a broad catholic spirit participating, happily quoting Dr. Nevin: "The sectarian spirit is always fanatical, or affects strength and has none." Oosterzee in his *Ch. Dog.* (vol. 1, p. 69), speaking of an advancing and clearer apprehension of the truth, anticipates, such "*e.g.* on the subject of the eschatology of the nineteenth century."

[2] We are reminded of Henry More's sarcastic remark of smatterers in theology, who are "parrot-like prattlers, boasting their wonderful insight to holy truth, when as they have indeed scarce licked the outside of the glasse wherein it lies." Human nature always produces a class who think that what they do not know is not worth knowing, or who suppose that, from the knowledge professed, they are eminently qualified to judge of those things never examined or studied. The latter are illustrated by the professor of Church history (mentioned, *Blackwood's Magazine*, June 1873, in article on Dr. Arnold), who, when questioned as to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and the Apologists of the second century, replied, that he knew nothing of these writings, but "what with the Bible on the one hand, and the human consciousness on the other, he knew very well what must have happened in that century." Bishop Berkeley's saying is still true: "In the present age thinking is more talked of but less practised than in ancient times." In ancient times the thinkers were the instructors; nowadays nearly every one sets himself up for a teacher. The tendency now is to despise laborious research and to substitute tinsel; scholarship must give place to beautiful writing; depth must be sacrificed for a vast range of graceful figures of speech. The Bishop of Exeter (*The Intellectual Life*, p. 46) has well said, confirmed as it is by experience, "of all work that produces results, nine tenths must be drudgery"—"there is nothing which so truly repays itself as this very perseverance against weariness." The discriminating, the scholarly, the wise, will, over against the large majority, give due credit to evidenced study and labor, even if unable to accept of all its results.

and study, but in every instance when exhibited by published labors, it will command, if not the entire assent, *the respect* of the truly learned; for the latter, from experience, *can appreciate*, at least, the toil in producing such a work. Give us such men, and then we can hope to make advancement in Christian knowledge, in harmonizing the difficulties besetting theology, and in widening the domain of thought, faith, and hope. What we want is *solidity*, and that, in theology, is alone attainable by having underneath as a foundation to build on *the pure declarations of God.* What God says *is* true, what man says *may* be true; and the truthfulness of the latter can be ascertained, its certainty demonstrated, by comparing it with that which God has declared. If the comparison is favorable, let us accept of it; if unfavorable, then let us have the Christian manhood to reject it, no matter under whose name, patronage, or auspices it is given. Rendering the regard due to the writings of others, it does not follow that we must elevate them to the position of competitors of, or peers with, the Divine utterances. Such a test the author solicits from the reader, bringing to the consideration of the subject an impartial judgment, and weighing its value and authority in the scripture balance and not in human scales. Every sincere lover of the truth, even should his labor be rejected in part or whole, must *feel honored* by the institution of such a comparison.

It has, however, been the fate of some authors to be so far in advance of their contemporaries that, appreciated only by the few discerning or candid, it has required time, or the necessity of the Church, or the endorsements of a line of students to give importance and weight to their statements. While the deepest thinkers freely admit that *new and valuable* contributions to theology are reasonably to be anticipated, that such are absolutely required at the present juncture, and that such can only be found in the rich resources of the Word, yet it is remarkable that a contribution thus given will, especially in the hands of those whose minds are controlled by human traditions and by an exalting of Church authority above that of the Scriptures, be rejected and anathematized on the ground of its being in opposition to their preconceived and favorite formula of doctrine.[1] Others, through indifference or an indisposition to examination, will pass it by with, probably, a momentary interest. Others again, the few tried friends of intellectual and theological effort, will give it a fair, frank, and sincere reception, and form a candid estimate of its value based exclusively upon its correspondence with the Holy Scriptures. The latter occupy *the real student position*—one that Dorner has aptly characterized as of "individual freedom, that indispensable medium for all genuine appropriation of evangelical truth"—a freedom

[1] Truth has ever met with bitter opposition, and the cessation of this condition would nullify the example and exhortations of the Master, and materially lessen the prospect of future reward and glory. Emerson, in referring to a scholar's duty to afford at least "hospitality to every new thought of his time," adds: "The highest compliment man ever receives from heaven, is the sending to him its disguised and discredited angels." Advised by some friends, who take no interest in "the blessed hope," to destroy my work (and if such advice had been followed in the case of others, exceedingly valuable works, the most highly esteemed, would never have seen the light and secured the admiration of multitudes—Comp. *Library Notes*, p. 145, etc.,) because the only books read were those of well-known and noted men, the writer felt impelled to perseverance for the reasons assigned in the preface.

only limited by Revelation. Without intending an imitation of such great writers as Bacon and others, who declared that they wrote for "posterity," and that it would require time to "ripen" their views so as to cause their due appreciation, yet such is the subject-matter of this work, so beset and resisted by the torrent of opposing doctrine, so circumscribed by the intrenched prevailing dogmas, so unpalatable to the licentiousness of the increasing free-thinking, so unwelcomed to a proud and self-satisfied reason, that we are justly apprehensive of an overwhelming opposition to the following propositions. In this belief we are fortified by the predictions of the Word, which unmistakably teach that they will find but little acceptance with the world, and even with the Church at large, and that they will only be pondered and received by the thoughtful *few*. In this period of prosperity, of sanguine hope of continued and ever-increasing peace and happiness, the minds and hearts of the multitude will be closed against all appeal, all instruction. It is only when the dreadful storm of persecution and death, alluded to in several propositions, shall, when excited and marshalled by the elements and forces now at work, burst with fearful violence upon the Church, and beat with pitiless vehemence upon the heads of true, unflinching believers in Christ, that *this work* will find *a cordial response, a hearty welcome* in the breasts of the faithful. Time with its startling and terrible events will *justify* this publication. When the dreams of fallible man, now so universally held as the prophetic announcements of God, are swept away by stern reality; when, instead of the fondly anticipated blessedness and glory to be brought about by existing agencies, the blood of man shall again stain and steep the soil of earth with its precious crimson, *then* will the doctrine of the kingdom, as here taught, be regarded worthy of the highest consideration, and *then* will it also become *a solace, hope, and joy* under tribulation. But to remove the suspicion of arrogance or pride in making so strong an assertion, we may be allowed to say, that such a future estimation is not based on literary or theological merits or attainments, but solely upon a strict adhesion to and firm belief in *the infallible Word of God* as herein delineated under the guidance of a legitimate rule of interpretation, by which the Divine purposes relating to the Church and world are plainly and distinctly taught. The possessions of God, even the most costly, are often given to mere children, and denied to the wise and noble. The Magi, although babes in knowledge compared with the Pharisees, came nearer to the truth than those who supposed themselves to be specially set up for its advocates. Numerous examples attest the same and reveal the feature, that just in proportion as a man, learned or unlearned, receives and endorses the declarations of God, *to the same extent* will his writings have *an abiding value*. Especially is this true concerning the things pertaining to the future—that region, those ages known only to the Eternal, and utterly imponetrable to mere mortal vision. Hence, the writer consistently claims that his labors will not be *in vain;* that they will at least some day be esteemed *in the degree* that they sustain to the Bible. We firmly hold to the opinion, confirmed by the providences of God, that the necessity has arisen for a renewal of the early Church doctrine respecting the kingdom. If the millennial age, as conceded by a host of antagonistic writers, is near at hand, and if the kingdom in that age is such as herein portrayed, *then* is the kingdom itself not very distant, and *then too* ought we reasonably to expect—in view of its peculiar nature,

prominence, aims, etc., especially of its immediate tremendous and frightful antecedent preparations, and of its becoming a net and snare for the unbelieving and wicked—that before its appearance God will raise up *instruments*—even if weak Jonahs—who will so distinctly announce the order of events, so vividly represent the nature of the kingdom, point out its manner of manifestation, give a precise understanding of the Church's actual relationship to the world and this kingdom, that the Church will *be prepared* to endure the awful scenes awaiting her, and that the saints, called to suffer the loss of life, may, in the thus revealed will of God, find *encouragement and comfort* instead of disappointment and despair. With the hope of being *thus honored* with others[1] as an instrument *in upholding the faith* of God's dear children in the darkest period of the Church's history, one will *sadly but cheerfully* endure the censures of mistaken zeal and bigotry, and give his days and years of wearisome labor as an inspiring sacrifice of love.[2]

The doctrine herein advocated, because of its being so directly opposed to the current theology, and perhaps new in form to some readers, must not be regarded in the light of a novelty.[3] It is, as we shall show, far older than the Christian Church, and was ably advocated by the founders and immediate supporters of that Church. It is admitted by all scholars, that the Apostolic Fathers and many of their successors endorsed it, and that since their time eminent and pious men have taught it, and that to-day it is embraced in the faith of some in the various denominations of the Church. We therefore are not open to the charge of introducing a "modern novelty." Again: men of pretensions, without perceiving the logical result of its once being universally held by the early Church, may deride this early view of the kingdom and stigmatize it as a return to "Jewish forms." But persons of reflection, seeing how largely it is interwoven with the very life, prosperity, and perpetuity of the Church in its earliest period, and perceiving how deeply we are indebted to "Jewish forms," even if unable to accept of its teachings, regard its faith with respect. Indeed, it is difficult to apprehend how any one can scorn that which inspired a hope that supported and strengthened the ancient steadfast witnesses for the truth, the very pillars of the Church in their sufferings, the dying martyrs at the stake, on the cross, or in the circus. Cut off the believers of this very kingdom as they existed and testified in the first, second, and third centuries, and *where would be the Church?* The really intelligent comprehend this, feel its force, realize their indebtedness to such believers for the perpetuation of gospel truth, and hence from such

---

[1] See Props. on His. Mill. doctrine for others thus honored.

[2] The author of *The Kingdom of Grace* in his preface coolly charges the Millenarian view with being a "novelty." (Comp. Props. 76–79.) Over against such unscholarly affirmations, it is sufficient to present the acknowledgment of Dorner (*Hist. Prot. Theol.*, vol. 2, p. 462–3), that Millenarian doctrines have been successfully introduced into the province of theology, and that, as in the early ages of the church and in the days of Spener, etc., they are of importance to a correct understanding of the kingdom of God.

[3] It is saddening to have religious ideas—sanctified by the dearest associations of life; hallowed by connection with suffering, trial, and bereavement; endeared by study, meditation, and prayer; fortified by strength—imparting power in times of deepest gloom—ruthlessly trampled upon, or branded by cruel terms; but if productive of comfort, hope, and strength to ourselves and others, such trials are alleviated by a preponderating gladness of heart.

we anticipate *no censure*, couched in derision, in advocating what was once almost, if not entirely, universal in the Church. They are ready to acknowledge how, instead of its being a novelty and being held by weak and unreliable men, it interpenetrated the most significant and remarkable era, and how widely it was inculcated by the very teachers to whom the Church owes, under God, its growth and extension.

Some, probably, may object to the quotations as excessive or pedantic, but the reader will allow me thus to express my gratitude to and respect for others; thus to avoid the charges of misquoting or misstating writers (from which he has unjustly suffered); hence the author, book, and page are adduced to facilitate reference and indicate an intended fairness in argument, thus to aid those who are disposed to examine the affirmations in the following propositions; to show how many great and earnest thinkers have given this subject, or parts of it, their earnest attention; to evince my indebtedness to others, and avoid the appearance of so many writers of the present day, who, while under great obligations to others for valuable material, give no sign of a just recognition; to imitate the conduct of those who go forth to meet the storms of the sea, taking in a quantity of ballast to keep the bark steady among the currents and winds; to emulate the practice of writers of conceded merit, impressed by the fact tersely stated by D'Israeli (*Curios. of Lit.*, vol. 2, p. 416), that "those who never quote, in return are seldom quoted;" to present a sense of delicacy by avoiding "the odium of singularity of opinion," adding weight and authority to what otherwise might be regarded as doubtful; and, lastly, to avoid even by implication the application of the simile of Swift in "The Battle of the Books"—viz., of being like the spider weaving his flimsy nets out of his own bowels, instead of being like the bee passing over the field of nature and gathering its sweets from every flower to enrich its hive. We may be allowed to add: like the bee, however, we may justly claim, if nothing more, the industry and skill requisite in the gathering of the wax, the honey, and the building of the cells.[1] Indeed, such is our infirmity, that we all are more or less influenced by the authority of names, and in the reading of a work chiefly composed of controverted questions given in an argumentative form, we reasonably expect an array of advocates on both sides, which imparts confidence that the author has bestowed some attention to the subject, and makes his labor, in consequence, the more valuable as an expression of opinion or a book of reference. At the same time, important as it is to the student to know and trace opinions, we are not influenced, either by their commonplaceness,

[1] Burton (*Anat. of Melancholy*, p. 37) quaintly remarks: "As a good housewife out of divers fleeces weaves one piece of cloth, a bee gathers wax and honey out of many flowers." In reference to the difficulties of authors, the originality manifested, the crediting of thoughts and ideas to others which have become assimilated with our own, etc., the reader may consult Mathews' *The Great Conversers*, D'Israeli's *Calamities of Authors*, *Curiosities of Literature*, Saunders's *Salad for the Solitary*, etc. This, however, does not prevent a student who *diligently* compares scripture with scripture to bring forth—so rich is the precious mine—things "new as well as old" (Matt. 13 : 52). That explorations thus conducted will not be fruitless may be found not only in exegetical remarks scattered through the work, but under special propositions, as those, *e.g.*, on the disciples preaching, the preaching of Jesus, the election, the postponement of the kingdom, the covenants, the genealogies, the temptation, the Divine sovereignty, the Son of Man, the kingdom, the Church, the parables, the inheritance, the resurrection, the barren woman, Pre-Mill. Advent, signs, Divinity of Jesus, etc.

axiomatic nature, or remoteness in time, to assert, as Glanvil (Lecky, *Hist. of Rat.*, vol. 1, p. 132, note) sarcastically charged the scholars of his day, on the authority of Beza, that women have no beards, and on that of Augustine, that peace is a blessing, or to believe that common pebbles must be rare because they come from the Indies.

Finally, the form of propositions adopted avoids repetition and insures easy reference. It also gives distinctness to the numerous subjects so intimately connected with the kingdom, and it enabled the writer to abridge what otherwise would have required considerable enlargement. The design kept in view has been to give the greatest amount of information within the smallest space, resisting the temptation, often presented, of extending some salient point. The propositions, separately treated, are to be examined and criticised in the light which each one sustains in its connection with the whole. It is but a low polemical trick to detach one from the rest without indicating its relationship to others, and upon such a detachment frame a charge of error. It does not require much cunning or skill to wrest the words of any author from their connection, to misrepresent their meaning, and to hold them up to undeserved reproach. Willing to have any fault or error pointed out, it must, to give it adequate force, be done not only with a consideration of the manner and relation in which it is set forth, but also of the scriptural arguments, if any, which profess to sustain it. Otherwise, we take refuge in what Zeisius (Lange, *Com.*, vol. 1, p. 496) says: "If the words of Christ, who was eternal Wisdom and Truth, were *perverted*, why should we wonder that His servants and children *suffer* from similar misrepresentations."[1]

GEORGE N. H. PETERS.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, 1883.

---

[1] May the author add: after many years of labor—as the following pages indicate—and the cold fraternization of "brethren" who had no sympathy for Chiliastic study, it would be a personal gratification to the writer to learn from students who have investigated the subjects presented in this work, that the perusal of this book has given them pleasure and strengthened them in "the blessed hope."

THE

THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

OF OUR

LORD JESUS, THE CHRIST.

PROPOSITION 1. *The kingdom of God is a subject of vital importance.*

The Scriptures cannot be rightly comprehended without a due knowledge of this kingdom. It is a fact, attested by a multitude of works, and constantly presented in all phases of Biblical literature, that the doctrine respecting the kingdom has materially affected the judgments of men concerning the canonical authority, the credibility, inspiration, and the meaning of the writings contained in the Bible. If in error here, it will *inevitably* manifest itself, *e.g.*, in exegesis and criticism. This feature has been noticed by various writers, and, however explained, the views entertained on this subject are admitted to greatly modify the reception, the interpretation, and the doctrinal teaching of the Word.

To illustrate: Olshausen, Pref. to *Com.*, attributes Luther's remarks and hesitancy concerning the Apocalypse to a preconceived opinion of the kingdom, and to his not "thoroughly apprehending the doctrine of God's kingdom upon earth." Numerous examples will be given as we proceed. It is gratifying that recent writers begin to appreciate the leading doctrine of the kingdom. While some are wrong in not more accurately distinguishing between the Divine Sovereignty (Props. 80 and 81) and the covenanted kingdom (Prop. 49, etc.), yet, as the Bible, they correctly make the kingdom of God *the central* topic around which all other doctrines logically arrange themselves. Correctly apprehending the kingdom of God as the guiding idea, Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. i. p. 65) justly observes: "The dogmatic theology which understands its vocation will be neither more nor less than a theology of the kingdom in all the force of the word." He aptly remarks (p. 168): "The idea of the kingdom of God is the golden thread which runs through all; and of this kingdom the Bible is the document;" and quotes Nitzsch: "The Word of God is the testimony of His kingdom, in the form of a history and doctrine explained and continued by personal organs." Many others, however they may treat it, designate it as Augustine (*The City of God*), a fundamental thought or idea.

Obs. 1. Its importance may be estimated by considering the following particulars: 1. The kingdom is the object designed by the oath-bound

covenant (Prop. 49). 2. It is the great theme, the burden of prophecy (Props. 33–35, etc). 3. It is a subject which embraces a larger proportion of Revelation than all other subjects combined; thus indicating the estimation in which it is held by God. Dr. Pye Smith, Bickersteth, and others have well observed and commented on this peculiarity—viz., that inspired writers say more respecting the kingdom of Christ than they do concerning all other things treated or discussed in the Word. 4. It was the leading subject of the preaching of John the Baptist, Christ, the disciples and apostles (Props. 38–74). 5. It was a cherished subject of preaching in the primitive Church (Props. 75–77). 6. It is the foundation of a correct scriptural preaching, for the Gospel itself is "the gospel of the kingdom." 7. To promote its establishment Jesus appears, suffers, and dies (Props. 50, 181), and to manifest it He will come again (Props. 66, 68, 130, etc.). 8. Jesus Christ Himself, must be deeply interested in it, since it is a distinguishing blessing and honor given to Him by the Father (Prop. 84), and belongs to Him as His inheritance (Props. 82, 116, etc.). 9. We are invited, as the most precious of privileges, to inherit this kingdom (Prop. 96). 10. It is the constantly presented object of faith and hope, which should influence us to prayer, duty, and watchfulness. 11. It is the result of the preparatory dispensations, enabling us to appreciate the means employed to attain this end. 12. It embraces within itself perfect completed redemption; for in it all the promises of God will be verified and realized. 13. It exhibits in an outward form the pleasure of the Divine will in the salvation of the race and the deliverance of creation (Props. 149, 145, etc.). 14. It brings the Divine utterances into unity of design (Props. 174, 175), exhibits manifested unity (Prop. 173), and vindicates the inspiration of Holy Writ (Prop. 182), including the Apocalypse (Prop. 176). 15. It enforces not only the humanity (Props. 82, 89) of Christ, but also His Divinity (Props. 85 and 183), with the strongest reasoning. 16. It exhibits to us the majesty and glory of Jesus, "The Christ," as Theocratic King (Props. 88, 89, 132, 184, etc.), and the pre-eminent position of "the first-born" who are co-heirs with Him (Props. 118, 119, 127, etc.). All these, as well as other related points, will be fully discussed in the following pages. A sufficiency is briefly stated, that the reader may not fail to see *how significant* must be a proper comprehension of this subject.

We are prepared, from such considerations, to appreciate the remark attributed by Lange (*Com.*, vol. 1, p. 254) to Starke: "The kingdom of heaven must form *the central point* of all theological learning." Van Oosterzee (*Theol. of the N. T.*, p. 69) calls it *the foundation thought*, and, after giving the doctrine of the kingdom its proper position in the teaching of Jesus (saying, "that the idea of the kingdom of God is *fundamental* in the theology of Christ,") remarks: "Already Hess has furnished a treatise on the doctrine of the kingdom of God, in which he shows how prominent a place this idea occupies in Holy Scripture, especially in the teaching of the Lord. It is surprising therefore that Schmid, in the work cited, assigns to it the third place in his treatment of the doctrine of Jesus. Much better Neander, who, in his life of Jesus, derives a 'whole system of truths' from the parables of the kingdom of God." Let us add, however, that even Schmid does ample justice in acknowledging its importance, when (*e.g.*, *Bib. Theol. N. T.*, p. 243) he calls it, *the groundwork* of His (Christ's) teaching."

Such testimony could be multiplied. It is gratifying to find numerous recent writers of eminence (as *e.g.* Delitzsch, Auberlen, Kurtz, Bonar, etc.) who emphatically declare that the most important subject for careful consideration, and the one, too, that will most serve to explain the plan of salvation, is that contained so prominently in the preaching of Christ, viz., that of the kingdom. We conclude in the words of one of the most recent, Thompson (*Theol. of Christ*, p. 19): "The whole circle of doctrines taught by Christ revolves about *this central point, that he represented to men the kingdom of God*;" or to recall Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. I, p. 169): "The *central thought* is contained in the idea of the kingdom of God." Dr. Kling (Herzog's *Ency.*, Art. "Kingdom of God") pertinently says: "The idea of the kingdom of God is the *central idea* of the entire economy of revelation; the kingdom of God is the purpose of all heavenly revelation and preparations, and therefore *the moving principle* of Divine works, guidance, and institutions of the Old and New Testament, the law and the gospel, and even of creation and promise from the beginning on."

Obs. 2. It is significant to the thoughtful student—a fulfilment of prophecy—that the idea of a distinctive Divine kingdom related to Christ and this earth, a kingdom which decidedly holds the foremost place in the teaching of Jesus, should be made, both (with few exceptions) in theology and the confessions of the Church, to come down from its first position in the Bible and occupy, when alluded to, *a very subordinate one.* In hundreds of books, where it reasonably ought to be conspicuous, a few references of a somewhat mystical and unsatisfactory nature, or a brief endorsement of the old monkish view. that it applies to the Church, dismisses the entire subject; while inferior subjects have long chapters and even volumes in their interest. There is, to the reflecting mind, something *radically wrong* in such a change of position, and the wider the departure from the scriptural basis the more defective does it become. Any effort, as here made, to restore the doctrine of the kingdom to its true and paramount Biblical station should at least solicit attention.

Obs. 3. The kingdom deserves the first place in Biblical and the first rank in Systematic theology. The reasons for this, as already intimated, are abundant. This has been too much overlooked, and the kingdom has been placed in a subordinate position, until for some years past a reaction —induced by unbelieving attacks—has taken place, and the kingdom (however explained) is brought out again most prominently, especially by Lange (see Pref. to *Com.*), Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dogmatics*), Thompson (*Theol. of Christ*), Auberlen (*Div. Rev.*), and others. While thus advocating its claims to doctrinal position, we do not, as sometimes unjustly charged, depreciate the importance, the value, and the exceeding preciousness of the person and death of Jesus. The latter is doctrinally the outgrowth from the former, and as provisionary (for without the latter the kingdom, as covenanted and promised, could not possibly be obtained), for the kingdom, is of incalculable consequence.

If it be said that "the Christ" is of greater importance than the kingdom, this is fully admitted, inasmuch as the theocratic king who establishes the kingdom is greater than the kingdom itself. Indeed, as the student will observe, our line of reasoning proceeds to exalt the kingdom because of the vital union existing between the king and kingdom—the latter being the inheritance of the former. On the other hand, we glorify "the Christ" by showing the result and grandeur of *His work* as exhibited in this theocratic ordering. In the kingdom, Jesus Himself is evermore the central figure, and He can never be regarded in a higher, holier, clearer light than that reflected upon Him by His theocratic relationship. This will hereafter be brought forth in detail.

Obs. 4. In proportion as investigation advances in this direction may we expect valuable acquisitions. Reuss (*Hist. of Ch. Theol. of Ap. Age*, p. 137), although mistaken in his interpretation of the kingdom, truthfully says: "There can be no doubt, then, that this full and suggestive idea of the kingdom of God must be in some way the *mine to be explored* by us, in order to bring to light *the treasures* which Christian science have to mould and fashion, to meet the necessities of every successive sphere, and the measure and capacities of every mind."

Obs. 5. That the subject of the kingdom is one widely acknowledged as leading can even be seen in the most extreme views, as *e.g.* Swedenborgianism, Mormonism, Shakerism, etc. We need only refer to the simple fact that writers of pantheistic and mystical tendencies have taken the phrase "kingdom of heaven" to be the real starting-point of Christianity, which they designate "The New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven;" and from which they argue that all men should morally labor for the infinite, making every effort, whether in religion, science, poetry, art, etc., to be hailed as a subjective submission to, or acknowledgment of, this kingdom. Taking the spiritualized notion entertained by many in the Church, they enlarge it by giving to it a pantheistical dress or mystical adornment, to suit their ideas of evolution, law, unity, philosophy, human nature, spiritualism, etc. Attention now is only called to the circumstance, that in systems and theories of religion the most unscriptural, still a great degree of prominency is given to the idea of the kingdom.

Even Bauer says: "The essence of Christianity is the doctrine of the kingdom of God, and the conditions requisite for a participation in this, so as to place man in a genuine moral relation to God." Christlieb (*Modern Doubt*, p. 38) approvingly quotes Bauer, but is inclined to make the essence to be Christ, bringing men back in and through Christ. Both are correct: viewing Christ as the means of salvation, etc., He is the foundation of the Christian system; but regarding the Bible in its doctrinal aspect or even the end designed by Christianity and its relationship to the past and the future, then the kingdom of God forms the fundamental idea, and "the Christ" is the chosen instrumentality by which it is to be realized. As our work is devoted to the doctrinal aspect, we would say that the essence of Christianity, linked with the past dispensations and the future one, is the kingdom of God, more specifically shown to be obtained through Jesus Christ—*now* the heirship by repentance and faith in Him, *then* by actual inheriting at His coming.

Obs. 6. This subject is attractive to the reverent believer not merely because of its being the absorbing theme of Old Testament prophecy and New Testament prediction, but owing to *the personal relationship* that he sustains, as an heir, to it. It is fitting to recognize, comprehend, and appreciate our inheritance. But even the literary aspect, the intellectual excellence of it, invites earnest investigation. Aside from its being a predominating idea of a book, which has had such a moulding influence in all the departments of life, it is the topic which, above all others, calls forth the most eloquent and sublime of all the descriptions and promises of the Bible, culminating in the last heart-stirring words of Jesus intrusted to John.

This excellence is illustrated, *e.g.*, by the last chapter of Habakkuk, which Dr. Franklin admired as exceeding all human descriptions, and which, it is said, he caused a number of infidels at Paris, reading it to them without informing them that it was in the

Bible, to eulogize as something descriptively grand. The reader, too, may recall the poet Burns, so sensitive to beauty, that it is said of him that he could not read Isa. 25 : 8, Rev. 21 : 4, and kindred passages without being affected to tears. Who can estimate the emotions, the delight excited by this subject, as presented by inspired men, in the hearts of believers in the past and present.

Obs. 7. When surveying the vast array of facts and events, some the greatest that the world has ever witnessed, all pointing to this kingdom as a contemplated end ; when looking at the same as they occur and exist to-day, preparatory to the kingdom; and when contemplating the host of remarkable, astounding events predicted to come to pass in connection with the kingdom still future, surely this forms a subject worthy, beyond all others, of the earnest, devout and patient study of every student of the world's eventful and, without this key, perplexing history. The kingdom embraces so much, both in preparation and in actual realization, that, in view of its extent, the doctrine exceeds all others in magnitude, enfolding in itself nearly all doctrine.

To this we may add the pregnant idea (Lange's *Com. Luke*, p. 326, Doc. 1) : "It lies in the nature of the case that Christian eschatology, the more the course of time advances, must become less and less an unimportant appendix, and more and more a *locus primarius* of Christian doctrine."

Obs. 8. A deeper investigation of this doctrine and a correspondent return to the old faith, held by men who, by position and association (as *e.g.* Apostolical Church), were pre-eminently qualified to comprehend it, will remove those painful concessions now made to unbelief, which stigmatizes the apostles and early Church as still under the influence of "erroneous Jewish forms." Such a study and return, will relieve theologians from being driven to the humiliating expedient of virtually acknowledging that the apostles were mistaken in their notions respecting the kingdom ; that they embraced "the Jewish husk," which, however, contained the germ of truth (which they, situated as they were, could not properly appreciate) that "the conciousness of the Church" in its development (so Neander, etc.) was to strip of its surroundings and fructify into full grown truth. It is alone in the direction indicated by us, that we can hope—defending as it does every utterance and doctrinal position of the first preachers of the kingdom—for a consistent pleading, justification, and protection against the Strauss and Bauer school (and others), which has driven noted theologians—led by a preconceived doctrine of the kingdom—to place "the consciousness of the Church" (that finally obtained the truth which had escaped the grasp of the apostles), as exhibited in Church authority or theology, or the productions of fallible men, above that of the Scriptures containing "the Jewish husk." The importance of our doctrine is evinced, in that it reverses all this, *exalting and vindicating* both the Scriptures and the correct knowledge of its inspired writers.

This doctrine, rightly apprehended, is not only important to elevate apologetics, to meet the objections of unbelief, to honor the authoritative doctrinal utterances of the Scriptures, but is admirably adapted to refute numerous errors, out of which religious systems are originated, and through which they are maintained. The following propositions will introduce many of these, and practically show how they are met and defeated by this doctrine alone.

PROPOSITION 2. *The establishment of this kingdom was determined before, and designed and prepared from, the foundation of the world.*

These two phrases are given in Matt. 25 : 34, Jno. 17 : 24, Eph. 1 : 4, Heb. 4 : 3, 1 Pet. 1 : 20, Rev. 13 : 8, in comparison with other passages. The one may indicate that the Divine purpose relating to the kingdom existed in the mind of the Eternal before the creation of the world; and the other, that the creation itself both evinced His intention to carry out His design (*i.e.*, was preparatory), and that it was in fact, as it existed before the fall and ensuing curse, the prepared sphere of its manifestation.

Comp. Matt. 13 : 35, Luke 11 : 50, Rev. 17 : 8. Whatever application these passages may have to the future kingdom, we cannot rid ourselves of the plainly implied meaning that, in the mind of the Divine Architect and Purposer, the contemplated final use of this world was allied with its origin. Shallow, unbelieving criticism makes itself merry at the idea of "the foundations of the earth," and present it as a proof that the Bible teaches an untrue form, and hence exhibits ignorance. The forcible figure of speech and the intent are entirely overlooked, for the sake of making an uncritical attack. As to the form, the Bible gave it (Job 26 : 7) long before science taught it; as to "the foundations," the general analogy of the Scriptures teach that these are in the creative power, wisdom, love—the attributes—of the Creator "in whom we live, move, and have our being."

Obs. 1. Hence, we properly infer *the dignity* of this subject, comprehended in the eternal counsels and evolved from the ever-existing "purpose of Him, which worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."

King Edward VI.'s Catechism (Bickersteth's *Promised Glory*, p. 2), however it may explain it, correctly affirms: "Before the Lord God made heaven and earth, He determined to have for Himself a most beautiful kingdom and holy commonwealth." Moll (Lange's *Com. Heb.*, Doc. p. 211) says: "At the very creation of the world God looked forward to and made arrangements for the eternally abiding and unchangeable kingdom of glory; and to the introduction of that kingdom tend all the revelations, arrangements, and providences of God in the history of the world."

Obs. 2. We also justly infer, that God's will thus expressed respecting the kingdom indicates *a Divine plan*, which, in view of His attributes, necessarily embraces *unity of design*. Therefore, when the kingdom is once defined by the Spirit, no change or modification can possibly be allowed without the most express declarations from God announcing it.

Obs. 3. The idea of the kingdom being thus identified in its connection with eternal purpose and with creation, God will *undoubtedly accomplish* His revealed will concerning it, confirmed as it is even by oath. God Himself *stands pledged* to the ultimate realization of this idea.

Obs. 4. The exercise of creative power, and its continued exhibition in behalf of man and the world, clearly shows *the Divine determination* to establish this kingdom, notwithstanding the antagonistic elements introduced by the fall. All things exist, because God has a determined end in view, which end is embraced in this kingdom.

Obs. 5. This kingdom is one pertaining to the earth. Before the creation of the world, it only existed in the determination or purpose of God, but at creation the very foundation of the world was laid in preparation for it. We know that the expression "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," is interpreted by many simply to mean, prepared for you from the beginning or from eternity, and refers only to purpose. But taking into consideration the paradisaical condition of the earth at creation and the fact (Props. 140–148) of its future restoration to the same when the kingdom is to be established, we believe that the phrase embraces a far deeper significance, viz., its relationship to the earth. "From the foundation of the world" is indicative that God purposed this very earth, when founded, for this kingdom.

Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 312) says: "Because destined for Christ and his elect people in the mind of God," to which we add, destined to become the theatre of a theocratic kingdom. It may be suggested: As will be shown hereafter, this kingdom embraces completed redemption, and this alone indicates the truthfulness of our proposition, because redemption (which the kingdom perfects) was in purpose co-existent with that of creation (Eph. 1 : 4, 1 Pet. 1 : 20). This enables us to consider the unbelieving objection that God made creation so imperfect that it required constant interference or "tinkering," seeing that all things have been previously foreseen and provided for in order—against all adverse influences arising from free will, passion, prejudice, etc. to carry out a predetermined result to its intelligently expressed consummation. On the other hand, it answers the extravagant eulogies heaped by unbelief (in opposition to revelation) upon nature, its perfection, sublimity, etc., in showing that the Creator Himself, far from deeming nature able to save man, to render him happy, to deliver him from evil, declares it placed, with all its faded nobility, with all its tarnished greatness and riches, under a curse, and proposes in the doctrine of the kingdom a renewal, a deliverance, a restitution, which shall free nature, exalt man, and glorify the Maker.

Obs. 6. Such phraseology involves, of necessity, owing to the fall and entailed curse, a glorious restitution for which provision is to be made. We are pointed to that original perfection of creation which the Almighty pronounced good, but this being marred (as the Bible teaches) by sin and resultant evil, it is requisite, before God's purpose is fully carried out, to restore that forfeited perfection. How this is done will be explained at length hereafter.

Obs. 7. This phraseology respecting the kingdom includes, in view of expressed predetermination, the appointment or preordination of the king (1 Pet. 1 : 20). It also comprehends the number of the rulers, elect, heirs or inheritors of the kingdom (Eph. 1 : 4, etc.), as well as every particular, provisionary and realized, pertaining to it. God does not undertake the accomplishment of a set purpose without His perfect knowledge embracing all things relating to it. For "known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world" (Acts, 15 : 18, Isa. 46 : 9, 10, etc.)

Obs. 8. The idea of the kingdom being the beginning (*i.e.*, leading to creation, etc.) and the ending (*i.e.*, embracing the final result) of the

dispensations or ages, we may well believe what the Scriptures state concerning it, viz., that this idea is carried on to a practical accomplishment in order that the supremacy and authority of God may be universally acknowledged, and that the manifold wisdom and love of the Lord may be displayed and experienced in the eternal ages. It also reaffirms that for this object and end all things are sustained and allowed, to work out, under Divine Providence, their destiny in respect to this kingdom.

Obs. 9. This language, so expressive of the comprehensiveness and fundamental nature of the kingdom idea, suggests to us that the dispensations or ages themselves (the Adamic, Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Christian) are ordered in their succession as part of the Divine purpose in relation to this kingdom. If we are to take the rendering given by Locke, Chandler, Clarke, Whitby, etc., to Eph. 3 : 11, such a special ordering is announced. Instead of our version, "according to the eternal purpose," etc., they read : "according to the disposition or arrangement of the ages which He made for (or, in or through) Christ Jesus our Lord." Whatever translation we may prefer, one thing is certainly taught in the passage, viz., that in the "eternal purpose," or "the purpose of the ages," etc., is included the notion that time itself is embraced in God's plan with special reference to Jesus Christ as the King of the kingdom, for whom the plan is carried into execution and by whom it will be perfected.

Favoring the rendering "the arrangement of the ages" as most in accord with analogy (teaching that times themselves are controlled, etc., by God), yet we object not to receive Bloomfield's "disposition of the ages" or Barnes' "purpose of the ages," etc., because under all of them is still included the provisionary measures instituted in time, following each other in succession, for and by Christ. The idea of a Divine plan, ever-abiding and sure, is necessarily connected with the passage, which, as Holy Writ teaches, includes the doctrine that all things are ordered for and have their foundation in Christ, because He is the Christ, the theocratic king. The plan of salvation contemplates a restoration effected through Christ and witnessed in this kingdom, and, therefore, it embraces all arrangements, even those of time. This is corroborated by other passages. Thus *e.g.*, 1 Cor. 2 : 7 reads : "the mystery which He ordained before the worlds" (*πρό τον αἰῶνῶν*, before the ages), *i.e.*, the ages relating to the world (Comp. Prof. Lewis's ch. on Time-worlds in *Six Days of Creation*).

Obs. 10. The kingdom being comprehended in the eternal counsels of God and in the design of creation, and being allied with various orderings extending over the past history of the world and with others still future, we ought reasonably to anticipate it to be a deeply involved, widely comprising subject, having a variety of aspects (as *e.g.*, in relation to the Father, Son, elect, etc.), and an encircling of other subjects (as *e.g.*, election, resurrection, judgment, etc.), as well as a profundity of scope (as *e.g.*, in relation to time, the person of the king, glorification, etc.), which demand *most careful* study, reflection, and comparison to understand.

Obs. 11. The proposition indicates a fundamental position that the student of the kingdom must occupy. It implies that as the kingdom is God's purpose, all knowledge of the kingdom must be derived from Him. It is God's idea, contemplated and realized, that we are endeavoring to apprehend, and all reliable information must come from Him. Hence, compare Prop. 9.

Obs. 12. In Prov. 8:31, wisdom is represented as "rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth," and as delighting in or presenting "my delights" to "the sons of men." When the Divine purpose, as embraced in this kingdom, in reference to the earth and man, is completely manifested, then the reason of this will also fully appear. Wisdom will be justified both in preparing this earth for its display and in exhibiting itself in the riches bestowed upon her adherents in the theocratic relationship. If it is wisdom to receive any truth of God, much more is it wise to lay hold of the great leading truths, that we may finally obtain the blessings that true wisdom imparts.

Obs. 13. The proposition, from a purely Biblical standpoint, shows that we cannot entertain the view that unbelief urges against the Bible, viz., that Oriental religions antedate the Bible by many centuries. The respective proofs of priority are found in the respective religious works in the shape of assertion, and the truthfulness of one or the other must be determined by its contact with the facts of history. Now history, as far as known outside of the religious books, does not countenance Oriental exaggerations of age; on the other hand, history corroborates the Bible statement, which, owing to a plan systematically developed and with which is connected a vast array of facts, is fully sustained both as to alleged age and contents. (Compare Props. 179 and 182.) The proof of a continuous plan, evidenced in the history of the past and present, and in the immense superiority of subject matter, adaptation to man, etc., will follow in various propositions.

Obs. 14. Lastly, this proposition is based on the scripturally derived statement, that a Divine Creating Mind and a Ruling Will orders and rules over all, so that notwithstanding apparent difficulties and unexplained problems, that Mind and Will shall be ultimately triumphantly vindicated in an open, revealed manner, indicating, what piety already realizes as an earnest in preparatory work, their close and intimate relationship with man and earth. This absolute Mind and Will, affirming that it consciously and personally works to introduce a predetermined kingdom, is, of course, the original fountain-head from whence all proceeds. To the believer in the Word, it is unnecessary, because our views are based on Scripture, to add anything; but to the unbeliever we may remark: that in defense of such a position it is not required to represent the absurdities, the contradictions of reason, etc., into which those fall who deny this existing Mind and Will (other writers have ably done this), but rather to follow out in all its connections the leading doctrine of the kingdom, and from the evidences of marked design and unity manifested in its history, bring forth a proof in behalf of a personal existing God, ordering and overruling all things, that will commend itself to the intelligent reader *more than any other* that we could possibly propose. The greater the work contemplated—and there is none greater than this kingdom—the more clearly ought we to see the intelligence of the Mind that originates it, and the power of the Will that performs it. If that Mind and Will has proposed, in Revelation to man, a certain, determinate plan of operation by which the kingdom shall, after a while, be openly revealed; if the design and mode of procedure and result commends itself to faith and reason as adapted and desirable; if history and experience plainly sustains the developments of

such a plan through the ages, *then* we may rest assured that in harmony with such a purposed plan, with its corroborating history and adjustment to the necessities of man and creation, there must be, as the Bible wisely and scientifically affirms, a guiding mind and controlling will. It would be premature to press this argument; let us then first present an array of incontrovertible facts, and from these facts, as a conclusion (*e.g.*, Prop. 182, etc.), deduce the statement made, that the kingdom itself is dependent upon the pleasure and work of the Father both in its inception and provision, in its prediction and realization. (Comp. *e.g.* Prop. 84.)

This proposition logically follows from the idea of intelligent design. The Bible appeals to the evident manifestation of design in the mind of the Creator as exhibited in the ordering of the universe. Natural theology lays special stress on the evidences of a previous forethought and knowledge of adaptedness. The Scriptures likewise refer us to the abundant testimony of design in the mind of the Almighty Ruler as declared in the ordering and provisionary ruling of the world. The moral, religious, and civil training of mankind, the fundamental laws of society, etc., are appealed to in proof. Numerous passages like Ps. 94 : 9, 10, Isa. 40 : 14, Acts 15 : 18, Isa. 46 : 9, 10, Rom. 11 : 33, Eph. 1 : 8, 9, etc., indicate not merely God's knowledge and wisdom, but the manifestation of such in a predetermined purpose. Systematic theology directs particular attention to the evidences of a previously settled purpose. Our subject largely develops this fact, and insists upon the truth and force of Eph. 3 : 10, 11 and kindred passages.

PROPOSITION 3. *The meanings usually given to this kingdom indicate that the most vague, indefinite notions exist concerning it.*

Theologians, eminent for their piety and position in the Church, are now entertaining crude ideas and contradictory conceptions of the kingdom. For many centuries, under the interpretation given by men who have, probably unconsciously, largely imbibed the spirit of the Alexandrian school, the kingdom has been made to mean a variety of things at the option of the writer. Modern authors, with but few exceptions, instead of discarding this looseness, seem to revel in it, making the kingdom to denote almost everything that fancy connects with religion, or the Church, or even with humanity. We select, out of numerous examples, several to illustrate *the prevalent* mode of expounding it, and *the latitude* of opinion expressed concerning it.

Obs. 1. Albert Barnes, who, possessing many admirable traits, is regarded as a popular commentator, gives the following definitions of the kingdom in his Commentary. The kingdom is, Matt. 3 : 2, "His (Messiah's) spiritual reign begun in the Church on earth and completed in heaven;" Matt. 6 : 10, the "reign," God's reign, or the Gospel of Christ advanced; Matt, 13 : 24, "the gospel," or "the effect of the gospel;" Matt. 13 : 31, "piety in a renewed heart, or the Church;" Matt. 13 : 44, "the gospel, the new dispensation, the offer of eternal life;" Matt. 13 : 45, "religion," or "the gospel;" Matt. 13 : 52, "the gospel," or "the truth;" Matt. 25 : 34. "salvation," "eternal life," or "heaven;" Matt. 26 : 29, "heaven;" Matt. 19 : 24, "way of salvation;" Matt. 21 : 31, to "become Christians," or to "follow the Saviour;" Matt. 5 : 19, "the Church;" Matt. 5 : 20, "the Church," or "the world to come;" Matt. 11 : 11, "preaching the kingdom of God, or the gospel;" Matt. 16 : 19, "the Church on earth;" etc. With minor changes (as *e.g.* Jno. 3 : 5, "the true Church," 1 Cor. 15 : 24, "dominion in general"), and a hesitancy in precisely determining what it means (as *e.g.* Mark 10 :15. "the gospel, the new dispensation by the Messiah, or the reign of God through a mediator," etc.), we find these often repeated. Surely the kingdom cannot possibly mean all these things, seeing that such explanations are *both arbitrary and contradictory.* The gospel of, or concerning, the kingdom is one fact, the kingdom itself is quite another; the dispensation in which the kingdom is to be manifested is certainly different from the kingdom which it embraces; the heirs of the kingdom are certainly not the inheritance. These and other plain scriptural statements are *entirely overlooked* in such definitions. The evident antagonism of such popular explanations are amply sufficient to their refutation. The reply to all such definitions will follow, as *e.g.* Props. 90–115.

Dr. Lawrence in the *Independent*, October 23d, 1870, makes "the kingdom of heaven" to mean: 1. "The universe of matter and mind;" 2. "That part of the revolted human race which has been brought into subjection to Christ;" 3. "A kingdom of grace, because it is by God's love in Christ that they—believers—are brought into it;" 4. "A kingdom of glory in heaven;" and 5. "It is His reign over His loyal subjects." Our Church literature is permeated with similar definitions. M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Kingdom of Heaven," defines it, first, "the Divine spiritual kingdom, the glorious reign of the Messiah;" then afterward it is "the Christian dispensation or the community of those who receive Jesus as the Messiah;" this again is divided into "an internal and external form"— internal "in the hearts of all Christians," and externally it is "embodied in the visible Church;" and then finally in its future relation, "it denotes the bliss of heaven, eternal life." Compare Dr. Craven's remarks, in an excursus, Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 94, on Robinson's definition (*Greek Dic.*) of the kingdom, who makes it a dispensation, also a principle, and likewise a people actuated by that principle. Dr. Craven justly objects to such "a looseness in the use of language."

Obs. 2. Dr. Barrow, *On the Creed*, explains "the kingdom of heaven" as "capable especially of two acceptations." Without discarding other views, he lays down this proposition: "It first commonly signifies the state or constitution of religion under the gospel, in opposition to, or contradistinction to, the state of things under the ancient law." To prove this, he shows that "in the time of the law, God's kingdom was in a manner earthly," and proceeds to point out its earthly characteristics; but that now under the gospel "God's kingdom is more capacious, unlimited," and, in brief, more spiritual. From this he deduces that it may denote: 1. The state of relation; 2. The society of men put into such a state; and then also adds: 3. It is "taken for the perfection or utmost improvement of this state."

Aside from the indefiniteness of such a definition, indicating the difficulty of forming a consistent whole (for the relation in which men are placed is superseded by the men themselves, and then again by the perfection of the state realized), we only now notice some self-contradictions which it contains: 1. If the phrase "kingdom of heaven" is used "in opposition or contradistinction to" former dispensations (the ancient Theocracy), then it follows, which he himself will not allow, that no true kingdom of God existed previously to the Christian Church. 2. If the kingdom only denotes the state or constitution of religion, does it embrace or reject that which preceded the Christian era? If it embraces it, then, after all the kingdom is a continuation of the former; if it rejects, then it does not allow that religion existed previously in "a state or constitution." 3. If the mere "capaciousness," etc. causes such a change in phraseology, that the expression "kingdom of heaven" is applicable to the Church now and not to the Church previously existing, how comes it, notwithstanding its supposed earthly nature (as opposed to the present state), that the ancient saints are accounted equally worthy with Christian believers to enter in and inherit the kingdom? The whole theory, in its invidious comparisons, is derogatory of God's previous appointments, and degrades the position occupied by the ancient believers. Other objections, still more serious, will be brought forth under appropriate heads: these however, briefly suggested, are sufficient for the student to note the defectiveness of interpretation.

Obs. 3. Neander's elaborated theory of the kingdom is pervaded by the same indistinctness and contradiction. Thus *e.g.*, in one place (*Life of Christ*, sec. 213) the kingdom is something not visible, not outward; in other places (*Hist. Ch. Church*, vol. 2, p. 176) "the Church comprised the whole visible form of the kingdom of God," and (p. 177) "hitherto, therefore, there could be no visible appearance of the kingdom of God beyond the pale of the Church." His view only makes these "apparent" contradictions; for he has a number of kingdoms to suit the varied demands of his development speculations. He gives us: 1. An

invisible kingdom connected with the Church ; 2. An invisible kingdom established in the heart ; 3. A visible kingdom in the Church ; 4. A future consummation or completion by the direct intervention of Jesus Christ ; 5. The present as one with the future, *i.e.* viewed connectedly ; 6. A kingdom in the person of Christ ; 7. The higher spiritual world or heavenly community co-existing with the invisible Church.

In defining, a singular variety is introduced, and as we shall have occasion to quote largely from him under the propositions relating to the Church, one illustration (*Hist. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 499) will suffice : " The idea of the Church is subordinate to that of the kingdom of God, because by the latter is denoted either the whole of a series of historical developments or a great assemblage of co-existent spiritual creations." Here is certainly a latitude opened great enough to introduce the various changes that strict adherence to the development theory required. Following propositions will show how unscriptural such interpretations are, when compared with the simplicity and unity of the Word. They engraft upon Holy Writ the deductions of Hegelian philosophy, and thus, through the great ability and learning cojoined, mislead the unwary reader.

Obs. 4. Dr. Lange (*Bremen Lectures*, 1871, Lec. 8) says : " The kingdom of God itself, the older theologians divided, not without grounds, into the kingdom of power, the kingdom of grace, the kingdom of glory. Still it must be remarked that each of these kingdoms properly separates into two kingdoms ; the kingdom of power into God's rule over entire nature, and His rule over the whole rebellion of such intelligences as, in the misuse of freedom, have gone astray ; the kingdom of grace, into the typical prefiguration of the real kingdom of heaven, or the Old Testament theocracy, and into the real, *i.e.* spiritually potent, New Testament kingdom itself ; the kingdom of glory, into the realm of the triumphant Church in the other world, and the union of that world and this in the final consummation." Lange thus forms six kingdoms or divisions of the kingdom, which was rendered necessary by the partial rejection of the early Church doctrine. These are purely theological deductions, having *no foundation* whatever in Scripture, as will appear when we come to the preaching of the apostles, the doctrine of the Church, etc. As we are only now concerned in giving a few specimens of entertained opinions, it is premature to present our reply. Like preceding definitions, it lowers the theocracy by denying to it the reality of being in all respects the kingdom of God. This alone should cause us to receive it with grave doubts.

It is difficult at times to understand those complex and contradictory meanings. Thus *e.g.*, Lange in his Commentary gives a variety, some of which are not in accord with those just mentioned. In the general introduction he says : " As mankind was originally destined to form the kingdom of God, and for that purpose was arranged into one family, the kingdom of God may also be viewed as the restoration of mankind to one body under the One and Eternal Head (Acts 3 : 21, Eph. 1 : 22) in whom it was elected from all eternity, and called, for the harmonious manifestation of the glory of God, Eph. 1 : 4, 5." (This we can cordially adopt with the provision that this is done in the covenanted way proposed). But then he adds : " The kingdom of God is that new creation in which God reveals Himself in His character as Redeemer." " It consists in the restoration of the dominion of the Spirit of God over the hearts of men," etc. Hence it existed from the beginning of time, for he says, p. 3, " the real kingdom of God was founded when redemption was introduced," etc. On p. 24 he has it founded in the Apostolic Church and manifested in " ecclesiastical and Christian life." On p. 25 he has " the kingdom of heaven in the person of Christ," and afterward " the person of Christ in the kingdom of heaven." On p. 25 he has " His kingdom founded upon earth by the planting of His Church through the power of the Holy Ghost," etc. Thus there is a shifting from one position to another, a substitution of the means by which to obtain

the kingdom for the kingdom itself, etc., that evidences a weakness incompatible with a leading doctrine of the Bible. For indefiniteness, see Com. on Matt. 16 : 13, 20, p. 298, where it is, and then it is not, the kingdom of heaven. Comp. p. 299, s. 5 and 6, etc.

Obs. 5. Olshausen (*Com.* on Matt. 3 : 1) defines the kingdom of heaven to be both "external and internal;" externally in the Church, and ultimately in its consummation; internally in believers, and in the ideal future world. Hence a believer is already in the kingdom, or carries it with him, and "yet even for him it is still to come," *i.e.*, a higher manifestation or realization of it. This is also "applied to different relations" both of time, place, etc. How unsatisfactory this is in the light of covenant and promise, will be shown under the Church (Props. 94–115), where the incongruity of persons being in the kingdom while still heirs, the lack of resemblance between the covenanted kingdom and the Church (visible and invisible) are fully noticed. Much that Olshausen has written is valuable and suggestive (take *e.g.* the caution, ch. 10, p. 116, Introduction), but his exegesis of Matt. 3 : 2 is most certainly defective. For any theory which can make "is at hand" to be actually present, thus arbitrarily changing the tenses used; which virtually makes the kingdom of God "always existing," thus not discriminating between things that materially differ; which makes the theocracy under Moses and David a mere type, thus overlooking its reality as a kingdom; which applies Luke 17 : 21 to a kingdom in the heart, divides and subdivides the kingdom after the fashion of those already referred to, and tells us, without proof annexed, that "the Saviour put forward its ideal character," must be received with great caution.

The reader will notice that we also introduce those who are Millenarian, or have a strong bias for our doctrine (as Olshausen, Lange, etc.), and yet largely adopt the mystical notion of the kingdom. While such have the kingdom pre-eminently, and in its fulness, in the millennium, they also (not accurately distinguishing the kingdom, *as covenanted*, from the Church, not observing the postponement of the kingdom, not discerning the difference between the Divine Sovereignty and the Theocracy, etc.) have a kingdom now existing in the Church and individual believer, preparatory to and merging into the other or proper one. A large number of eminent men take this position, as *e.g.* Oosterzee, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Bonar, etc. A careful consideration of Scripture compels us to differ from brethren highly esteemed; the reasons will follow in their order.

Obs. 6. In Dr. Hodge's recent work on "Systematic Divinity," we find (p. 596, vol. 2) a section entitled, "the Church, God's kingdom." To prove this caption, he informs us that God determined to deliver man from his apostasy, and hence inaugurated a kingdom antagonistic to that of darkness. This kingdom thus introduced had no "visible organization apart from the families, the people of God." It was afterward through the descendants of the patriarchs formed into a "visible kingdom," which has existed down to the present day. But when we ask, if it has always thus existed, why *e.g.* do the prophets speak of it as non-existing, as still future, as something to be anticipated, as set up by the Messiah at His coming, such questions, and similar ones, that readily suggest themselves to the scholar, remain unanswered. Indeed, as he goes on defining, he forgets his previous declaration; for when speaking of the nature of Christ's kingdom he tells us, that "as the Messiah was to come to make all things new" (which he thus strangely locates with the first Advent instead of the second, as the Scriptures do), we have also "the establish-

ment of a new kingdom." How can it be new, if it has always existed? Then he has Christ's dominion over the universe, calling it "the kingdom of power;" Christ's "spiritual kingdom," which is twofold, viz., an invisible kingdom consisting only of the regenerated, and a visible kingdom manifested in the organized, external society of believers. Finally, he gives us "the kingdom of glory" to be revealed when Christ comes again. Thus he presents us, 1. An invisible kingdom down to the patriarchs; 2. A visible kingdom down to Christ; 3. An invisible one down to the first Advent; 4. Christ's kingdom of power; 5. Christ's invisible kingdom since his Advent; 6. Christ's visible kingdom extending from the same period; 7. And the kingdom of glory. Surely the very enumeration of such a list, when compared with the simplicity and uniform phraseology of the Bible, forces upon our minds the suspicion that there must be a serious defect in a system which requires such an array of kingdoms; which ignores the distinctive marks of the covenanted kingdom; which does not distinguish between the universal Divine sovereignty and the kingdom as predicted; and which presents us a series of definitions utterly unknown to those who were *specially* set apart to preach the gospel of the kingdom.

Such interpretations, with slight changes, could be multiplied. The New Testament, with notes published by the American Tract Society on Matt. 3 : 2, makes the kingdom "the sway of Christ's Gospel and dispensation over the hearts, lives, and destinies of men, both in this world and the next," and this (mistaking the means for the end) is equivalent to "the Messiah's reign as predicted by the prophets." But to make this out, recourse is had to various "stages" in the "heart of the individual believer, in the churches, in influencing society, in the millennium, in the judgment-day, and in the heavenly world." Storr, in *Diss. on the Kingdom of Heaven*, compresses the matter so that it shall "embrace the whole time of the Messiah." He forgets that this is not the time of the Messiah (*e.g.* Luke 17 : 22), but the times of the Gentiles (Luke 21 : 24), and that the predicted time of the Messiah is still future, (Comp. *e.g.* Props. 136 and 137). Schmid (*Bib. Theol. N. T.*, p. 244) tells us that "the kingdom of God is understood to be both present and future; the dominion of the exalted Christ, which consists partly in the influence over the minds of men exercised by the Word, partly in the guidance of the external destinies of the Church, partly in the rewards and punishments at the last judgment. In it, too, is perhaps recognized the kingdom of grace, the temporal institutions of religion, the kingdom of glory, and the future acts of judgment; adding, too, the idea that Jesus was only in error in fixing too close a proximity for this judgment." Schmid afterward defines the kingdom to be "in its nature, on the one hand, something simply existing and eternal, and, on the other, something temporal, developing itself through various conditions;" being also "a Divine order of things," "a communion of spirits founded by Christ," "a fellowship of men," etc.

Obs. 7. The definitions given to the kingdom by Infidels, Rationalists, Free Religionists, etc., are varied. While some reject the idea entirely as a mere phantom or "Jewish conception," others incorporate it and make it mean, "God manifested in and through nature," or "God in humanity," or "God in progressive development," or "the truth," or "the supremacy of reason," or "the supremacy of the natural dignity and nature of man," etc. Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 240) makes it, "the reign of the poor and disinherited," "the literal accomplishment of the Apocalyptic visions of Daniel and Enoch," "the kingdom of souls" (p. 249), "the good," "the reign of justice," "the liberty of the soul," etc. In this direction there is no end to the notions respecting it, generally drifting, however, toward the idea of a humanity redeemed by an enthroned reason

(of which Jesus is an example of high genius), or of a God permeating nature and man.

Indeed, no doctrine of the Bible has fared so badly through mere fancy, imagination, enthusiasm, and fanaticism as that of the kingdom. In behalf of a theory or system it has been perverted, distorted, and abused until many persons, looking only at the abuses and antagonism (forgetting that all truth is subject to the same), discard the whole matter. When the Papacy, Shakers, Mormons, etc. define it in a way to embrace their particular organizations; when Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, etc. interpret it so as to include their ambitious projects; when almost every denomination, sect, etc. explain it so as to make themselves the recipients of the kingdom; when it has been prostituted to the basest of purposes, and it is presented in a hundred different aspects and claims—all this only shows how important these parties consider the incorporation and possession in some form, of the doctrine. It is amazing to a person who steadily for years notices the definitions of others, how latitudinarian they have become in these modern days. Recently a tract written and published by Speer informs us that the Church was "taken into the Roman kingdom of God"—*i.e.*, into the Roman Empire, thus designating that "the kingdom of God" which the Scriptures (Dan. 2 and 7) call a "Beast." We are told by Rev. Fowle (*Contemp. Review*, May, 1872, art. "Christ. and Immortality"), that "by the kingdom of heaven Christ meant almost, if not quite exclusively, the establishment of God's rule and order upon earth;" and to make this denote the Church is, in his opinion, "a substituting a secondary and comparatively unimportant interpretation for the primary and true one." This, then, opens the way for mystical incorporations, for it supplies "the missing link needed to bind together the morality of Paganism and Christianity," and brings us to this result: "the kingdom of heaven is civilization viewed religiously, owning God as its Creator and Judge, and looking for still nobler developments in other spheres."

Obs. 8. Those who give us such definitions, antagonistic to the primitive Church view, exhibit also the greatest diversity among themselves respecting *the commencement* of this kingdom in its supposed present form. They are as little agreed concerning its beginning as in its meaning. Some commence it in paradise; others, after the fall when redemption was proposed; some with the patriarchs or with the theocratic ordering at Sinai; others, at the preaching of John the Baptist; some, with the birth of Christ; others, at Christ's baptism; some, at the preaching of Jesus and disciples; others, at the confession of Peter; some, at the death of Christ, or at his resurrection and ascension; others, on the day of Pentecost; and others, at the destruction of Jerusalem. Some again have several commencements or different stages; others have only one, regarding all previous as merely typical and unreal. Quotations illustrative of this antagonism will be given in following propositions. Let us only now suggest to the reader: is it not remarkable that a kingdom of God, so distinctively covenanted and predicted, should be so indefinite in its commencement that eminent and pious men are unable to point out its beginning with any degree of absolute certainty? That we even find many who, in their perplexity, have several beginnings, such as "typical," "initial," etc.? That they are undecided from what period in Christ's life to date it? Surely, is it not wise to consider that such a diversity, unknown to Scripture, and based solely on assertion, may arise from some mistake, a fatal flaw in its meaning? Having a kingdom to find and at present existing (over against the plainest statements of Scripture to the contrary), it is easy to see *how* such a confusion and variety arises.

Obs. 9. Attention is called to the fact, that the most serious contradictions greatly weaken the force of these definitions. Thus *e.g.* eminent

men inform us that there has been a continuous kingdom, without intermission, from the earliest period down to the present. Now others, as *e.g.* Van Oosterzee (*Theol. of N. Test.*) positively makes the kingdom of heaven or of Christ something "new;" not a mere continuation, for "since it had first come nigh in the fulness of time, *it did not before exist* on earth;" and then asserts that it is a mistake to make the Church the kingdom. He reduces the force of the latter by admitting that, although it is spiritual, yet the Church is also the external form in which it appears. With some truth, we have here an admixture of error and weakness, that neutralizes the whole. In the following pages, it will be shown, step by step, that the kingdom of God did previously exist on earth, that it does not apply to the existing Church, and that the kingdom of Jesus Christ, when established, is *not new* but *a renewal* with precious, astounding additions. Meyer (*Com.* on Matt. 3 : 2), seeing how fanciful, arbitrary, and contradictory are the interpretations usually given, cautiously remarks: "These expressions 'kingdom of heaven,' etc., never signify else than the Messianic kingdom, even in those passages which seem to denote the Church, the Christian religion, etc."

Obs. 10. Able authors admit that Christianity has met with, and undergone, changes since its introduction. Buckle (*Hist. Civ.*) informs us that this has been affected by foreign events contrary to the original scheme. This has been pressed by Bauer, Renan, etc. All confess to some variations from the original; one class contending that they are for the better—another, for the worse. However this may be, it must be acknowledged, that when comparing the early Church doctrine of the kingdom with the meanings now so extensively given and adopted, *a wide departure* from the original and primitive meaning is fully evidenced. It is a substitution, too, so opposite and diverse, that it assumes the attitude of hostility to the first one adopted by the Church, casting, at the same time, as many shadows as Simon Magus is reported to have done when walking the streets. The design of this work is to restore and defend the original meaning, by showing its scriptural basis and historical connection.

It has been truthfully said by Jer. Taylor (*Works*, vol. 5, p. 348) that "men will call all opinions by the name of religion; and superstructures by the name of fundamental articles; and fancies by the glorious appellation of faith." This, alas, is constantly repeated, so that the student needs constant watchfulness. Nothing is exempt from diversity, so that, as illustrative, Vares long ago assured us that he reckoned the old philosophers had about eight hundred opinions concerning the "summum bonum."

Obs. 11. Considering the various conflicting interpretations entertained by learned men respecting the kingdom, we realize what Glanvil (*The Vanity of Dogmatizing*) developed from hints given by Bacon, viz., the fallibility of the most powerful mind even under the most favorable circumstances, and in its moments of highest confidence. After making due allowance for the leadings of education, the tenacity of prejudice, the proneness to error, the inherent weakness of intellect, we have still *a sufficiency* to guide us. God foresaw this diversity, and hence accommodated Himself to our weakness in *the plain, grammatical language and sense* in which He expresses Himself. But unfortunately we are prone, in our

superior wisdom, to overlook this fact, and arrogate to ourselves the higher power *of adding* to the grammatical meaning *our own constructions* of what the sense ought to be, and thus plunge ourselves into hopeless embarrassments.

Obs. 12. The only way to rid ourselves of these ill-defined and antagonistic explanations, is to adopt *legitimate principles of interpretation*, and then carefully, in detail, examine the original covenants and promises upon which the kingdom is based; and if we have obtained a definition *strictly in accordance* with these, *never* to depart from the same, without the most express—not inferential—proof in hand that a change is denoted.

Obs. 13. It is a lamentable fact, that few theologians are to be found who are willing to give *a rigid* scriptural examination to this subject. Preachers, who profess themselves called to proclaim "*the gospel of the kingdom*," totally waive such a study. A few isolated passages, either torn from their connection, or misapprehended in their relationship to other Scripture, form the basis of a vast inferential structure. Instead of making Holy Writ the standard of interpretation, multitudes, while *in theory* recognizing the Bible as the sole measure of faith, yet *in practice* will take the explanations and Scriptural references given by favorite authors as their reliable guides, without the least attempt to verify, by a personal application to Scripture, their correctness. Undoubtedly we are greatly indebted to writers for definitions, interpretations, suggestions, etc., yet, after all, those who are called on to instruct others should satisfy themselves by *a personal* study of Revelation that their belief and opinions are scripturally founded. Error, too, is often plausible and friendly; truth sometimes comes in the garb of an adversary.

Obs. 14. Many shrink from investigation when they find that things which they fondly believed, incorporated in their prayers and hopes, and portrayed with eloquence, are subject to the suspicion of being built upon a sandy foundation. It is a trite saying that "truth never dies," however great the opposition; and we may rest assured that any opinion that we may individually entertain, can never alter or seriously affect the truth of God. It is folly to shelter ourselves behind the fear that, peradventure, inquiry and scrutiny may lead to a revolution of our views. This may indeed be an amiable weakness, but it is one as fatal to the student as Delilah's hands were to Samson. If in earnest search after the truth, such a result, should it occur under clear apprehension and decided conviction of Scriptural authority, must be accepted *as alone honorable*. It is to the credit of some of the greatest writers (especially the German who so frankly express it), that opinions once strongly advocated were subsequently discarded under the persuasion that truth, honesty, and integrity required the change.

PROPOSITION 4. *The literal, grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures must (connected with the figurative, tropical, or rhetorical) be observed in order to obtain a correct understanding of this kingdom.*

On a proposition which has brought forth many volumes in its discussion, we desire simply to announce our position, and assign a few reasons in its behalf. Its import is of such weight; the consequences of its adoption are of such moment; the tendency it possesses of leading to the truth and of vindicating Scripture is of such value, that we cannot pass it by without some explanations and reflections.

Obs. 1. We unhesitatingly plant ourselves upon the famous maxim (*Eccl. Polity*, B. 2.) of the able Hooker: "I hold for a most infallible rule in expositions of the Sacred Scriptures, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changes the meaning of words, as alchymy doth, or would do, the substance of metals, making of anything what it pleases, and bringing in the end all truth to nothing." The primitive Church occupied this position, and Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* 2, C. 27) gives us the general sentiment when (in the language of Neander, *Hist. Dogmas*, p. 77) "he says of the Holy Scriptures: that what the understanding can daily make use of, what it can easily know, is that which lies before our eyes, unambiguously, literally, and clearly in Holy Writ."[1] However much this principle of interpretation was subverted, as history attests, by succeeding centuries (not without protests), yet at the Reformation it was again revived. Thus Luther (*Table Talk*, "On God's Word," 11) remarks: "I have grounded my preaching upon the literal word; he that pleases may follow me, he that will not may stay."[2] In confirmation of such a course, it may be said: if God has really intended to make known His will to man, it follows that to secure knowledge on our part, He must convey His truth to us *in accordance* with the well-known rules of language. He must *adapt Himself to our mode* of communicating thought and ideas. If His words were given to be understood, it follows that He must have employed language to convey the sense intended, agreeably to the laws grammatically expressed, controlling all language; and that, instead of seeking a sense which the words in themselves do not contain, we are primarily to obtain the sense that the words obviously embrace, making due allowance for the existence of figures of speech when indicated by the context, scope, or construction of the passage. By "literal," we mean the grammatical interpretation of Scripture. Some writers, to avoid lengthy or circumlocutory phraseology, have employed the phrase "literal interpretation," by which they denote,

not that every word or sentence is to be taken in its rigid literalism, but that the language of the Bible is to be interpreted by the customary rules of grammar and rhetoric, which are used in determining the sense of the "Iliad," "Paradise Lost," and works of human composition. We are to accept of a strictly literal rendering, unless we have the distinctive marks of figures of speech, when the tropical sense is also received, without *afterward, in addition,* engrafting upon it another and separate sense which is not allowed by the rules of grammar, but which (*i.e.*, last added sense) is applied by many to the Bible, as if the language of that book was not fairly circumscribed by, but formed an exception to, *the universal laws* of language. This is our position endorsed by the exhortation given to all to search the Scriptures (Acts 17 : 11, Jno. 5 : 39), by the frequent appeals made to the fulfilment of prophecy on a literal basis, by the obligations to know God's Word founded on the ability (Matt. 24 : 15) to comprehend it, etc. When employing the word "literal," we are to be comprehended as also fully acknowledging the figurative sense, the beautiful ornaments of language ; we cordially accept all that is *natural* to language itself, its naked strength and its charming adornments, but object to *additionally* forcing on it a *foreign* element, and enclosing it in a garb that hides its just proportions. When, too, it is said that the Bible is thus to be interpreted like any other book, governed by the laws which alone can protect us against a wrong imposition of meaning, reference is solely made to its grammatical construction, and not, as Liberals and others employ this idea in behalf of unbelief, that it is merely a human production. With the human element there is also a Divine ; grammatically, to accord with our infirmity, it is constructed like any other book, but under, in and through this are truths far beyond human conception and production.[2]

[1] Neander (*Ch. Hist.* vol. 1, p. 388) says that Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, etc., in opposing Gnosticism, directed attention to "a sober, grammatical method of interpretation, and leading them to establish the first hermeneutical canons," etc. The student will observe that, while advocating the early reception of the grammatical interpretation, yet even, as Mosheim, Neander, and others have noticed, then some of its advocates as well as others more or less imbibed the Rabbinical Jewish custom of obscuring the plain language of Scripture by forced allegories and a recondite sense. The Jews, as is well known, while to a large degree holding to a literal interpretation (as *e.g.* in reference to a literal coming and kingdom of the Messiah, etc.), at the time of the First Advent had fallen more and more into a figurative and allegorizing interpretation, which culminated in the speculative Cabala. Milman (*Hist. Jews*, vol. 3, p. 443) remarks of the Cabala : "Not only was the Bible one vast allegory, in which the literal sense was scornfully cast aside, and a wild and arbitrary one attached to every history and every doctrine, but at the same time there was a superstitious reverence for the letter ; the numbers of the letters, 10, 7, 12, 32, every single letter, the collocation of every letter, the transposition, the substitution, had a special, even a supernatural power." Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 326) refers to Eisenmenger (Entwectes Judenthum), and remarks that "some Rabbinical authorities contend for forty-nine, and others for as many as seventy meanings to each verse."

[2] Bloomfield (Pref. p. 15, *Gr. Test.*) quotes Luther, Melanchthon, Scaliger, and Bishop Middleton as favoring the grammatical and literal sense. Luther (On Deut., quoted Seiss's *Last Times*, p. 253) pointedly says : "I here once more repeat, what I have so often insisted on, that the Christian should direct his efforts toward understanding the so-called *literal sense of Scripture, which alone is the substance* of faith and of Christian theology, which alone will sustain him in the hour of trouble and temptation, and which will triumph over sin, death, and the gates of hell, to the praise and glory of God. The allegorical sense is usually uncertain, and by no means safe to build our faith upon ; for it depends for the most part on human opinion only, on which if a man lean he will find it no better than the Egyptian reed. Therefore Origen, Jerome, and similar

of the Fathers *are to be avoided, with the whole of that Alexandrian school which abounds in* this species of interpretation." The *Encyclop. Relig. Knowl.*, Art. "Sense of Scripture," affirms that the Reformers, over against the Romish fourfold sense, adopted the grammatical, and that Luther declared it to be "the only sense that it will do to die by." Mosheim (*Eccl. Hist.*, vol. 3, p. 137), over against "the uncertain and fallacious method of the ancients, who neglected the literal sense, and labored to extort from the holy oracles by the aid of the fancy a kind of recondite meaning, or in other words to divert them without reason, to foreign applications," eulogizes "that golden rule of all sound interpretation which Luther first introduced, namely, that all the sacred books contain but one single meaning," and commends Melanchthon because "rarely departing from the literal meaning." All the Reformers, without exception, expressed similar views; and however much they may have, on the one hand, injured the principle by a too rigid literalism in some instances, or, on the other, by a violation of it, yet every one holds it up as a principle to be followed as a guide. Every student of the Reformation must have noticed that one of the objections urged against the Reformers was their too strict adherence to the letter, as *e.g.* Carlstadt's issuing violent tracts against Luther's "stupid and shallow literal theology." Ellicott (*Aids to Faith*, Essay 9, Scrip. and Inter.), after tracing the interpretation of the Church, says: "there has been from the very earliest times, not only in theory but in practice, a plain, literal, and historical mode of interpreting Scripture," and this he finds exemplified even in many who often, for the sake of the preciousness of the literal, overlooked their theory of differing senses.

[3] The extreme of Parker (*Dis. of Religion*, p. 242) is one-sided—viz., "the conclusion is forced upon us that the Bible is a human work, as much as the Principia of Newton or Descartes." Unbelievers and semi-believers generally advocate that the construction of the Bible is like that of other books, but refuse (Bauer, etc.) to credit the fact that it is diverse from all other books in the authority and truths that it contains. Our entire argument following shows that we hold it to be above and beyond all other books in the unity of supernatural and Divine things embraced. Briefly: when the dyer and weaver color and weave the woollen fabric of artistic design, we do not discard the wool, or dye, or machinery—common to the production of all woollen fabrics—which have aided in producing it, when we also regard the design, the figures and their connection, and admire the taste and skill of the designer. Thus applied to the Word, admitting the instrumentalities employed—even the most humble—it would be folly to confine ourselves to these, and not contemplate the unity of design, etc. evidenced. Again, the very fact that the Bible is received as a revelation, has influenced many, who are largely addicted to spiritualizing, to tell us, as *e.g.* Professor Bush (Pref. to *Mill.*): "it cannot be doubted that the sacred volume was given to man in order to be understood." If so, how is it possible to discard the grammatical interpretation for another depending solely upon man's inferences or fancies? Again, this position does not conflict with a twofold fulfilment of prophecy, if some choose to adopt it in several cases (Comp. Brooke's *El. of Proph. Interp.*, p. 86, etc.), seeing that both fulfilments are based on the same literal sense. Again, the grammatical interpretation combined with the historical does not forbid, owing to the variety of subjects, the greatness of them, the deep meanings often presented, the connection that one portion has to another, the difference of style, the signification of words, etc., a diversity of opinion on various passages.

Obs. 2. The only true standard of interpretation is the grammatical (aided by the historical), and this opposes: 1. That spiritual or mystical one which looks for an internal revelation either in or under the letter; 2. The rationalistic notion that such an interpretation must be attached to the letter as will best accommodate itself to reason; 3. The Romish idea that such an interpretation of the letter can only be accepted as is in unison with the authoritative utterance of the Church; 4. And the High Church notion, that only such a meaning as is consistent with symbolical representations can be received. The adoption of any one of these four opinions immediately causes a *prejudicing* of the Word, and thus *unqualifies* the person from becoming an unbiased interpreter. Let the reader consider that the grammatical interpretation was for ages *the only one* used; and can a reason be given why it should suddenly be abandoned for another? Much of Scripture was presented long before Christ, and the portion thus

written was literally comprehended by the Jews, not only without rebuke from, but with the decided approbation of, the Almighty. God appeals to the literalness of His Word, as affording proof that each part shall find in due time its mate. His veracity and power are staked on a literal fulfilment. Now if the Word was not thus to be understood; if a hidden and recondite sense lay beneath it waiting for Origen, Swedenborg, etc., to reveal it, how could the Jews be censured for misapprehending the Scriptures; how could they derive comfort and edification from them; and how could they possibly have entertained an enlightened faith and hope? To suppose this is equivalent to saying, that for many centuries the Jews held to an erroneous sense[1]—to the "husk," as Neander and others phrase it—and that they were guided into, and confirmed in, such a belief by *the express words* of God Himself. If we reject the literal and substitute another mode of interpretation, there is no deliverance from this dilemma, however much men may attempt to gloss it over by "progression," "development," etc. Admitting that revelation was gradual, that truth and additional light were introduced by degrees, all this has nothing whatever to do with *the mode* of interpretation, seeing, as we shall abundantly show hereafter, that a consistent unity can only be preserved by *a continuous* application of the same method of interpretation to the respective additions given. It is the most reasonable to anticipate, that a principle of interpretation once universally held and for ages applied, would not undergo a reversal without a plain direction from God authorizing it to be made.[2]

[1] We do not overlook (Obs. 1, note 1) that before the Advent of Jesus the Jews had already, to some extent, departed from this literal interpretation, having adopted an allegorical, mystical system, which was in favor with the Rabbinical portion. This, however, does not vitiate our argument, which urges the period preceding this introduction, and accepts of the fact that, *e.g.*, in reference to the doctrine of the kingdom, there was no departure from the literal interpretation even among the Rabbinical party. The mystical departure, too, was confined to but a few, comparatively, of the learned, and had but little influence upon the body of the nation. This is seen, 1. By the united expectation of a literal kingdom, as admitted by all writers; 2. By the preaching of John the Baptist, the disciples, and Jesus; 3. By the rejection of Jesus on the ground that a literal kingdom was not established, etc. Even Shedd (*Hist. Ch. Doc.*) acknowledges that "one of the principal grounds of their (Jews) rejection of Christ was the fact that He represented the Messiah's rule as a spiritual one in the hearts of men, and gave no countenance *to their literal* and materializing interpretation of the Messianic prophecies." (Shedd's misapprehension of Christ's teaching will be noticed hereafter, but he is correct in his statement that the Jews understood the Messianic prophecies in their grammatical sense.) Dr. Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 326) affirms: "The allegorical interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures cannot be historically proved to have prevailed among the Jews from the time of the exile, or to have been common with the Jews of Palestine at the time of Christ and His apostles. Although the Sanhedrim and the hearers of Jesus often appealed to the Old Testament, according to the testimony of the New Testament writers, they give no indication of the allegorical interpretation. Even Josephus has nothing of it. The Platonic Jews of Egypt began, in the first century, in imitation of the heathen Greeks, to interpret the Old Testament allegorically. Philo was distinguished among those in that place who practised this method and he defends it as something new and before unheard of, and for that reason opposed by the other Jews; De Confus. Lingu. page 347 *seq.* Jesus was not, therefore, in a situation where he was compelled to comply with *a prevailing custom* of allegorical interpretation; for this method did not prevail at that time among the Jews, certainly not in Palestine, where Jesus taught." (He declares: "The writers of the New Testament themselves make a clear distinction between the allegorical and literal interpretation of the Old Testament. When they use the allegorical method, they either say expressly, *here is allegory*, Gal. 4 : 24, or they show it by the context, or by prefixing some particle of comparison, *e.g.*, ὅσπερ καθώς, Heb. 7,

John 3 : 14, Matt. 12 : 40." He concludes, therefore, that we must receive literal predictions, promises, etc., unless otherwise indicated, which rule he repeatedly violates in his own work.) Dr. Knapp's position is abundantly confirmed by Neander, Mosheim, Kurtz, and other historians, by articles in Cyclopædias on Philo, interpretation, etc. Pressense (*The Early Years of Christianity*, p. 99) says : "While an ingenious and learned school formed at Alexandria had contrived by a system of allegorical interpretation to infuse Platonism into the Old Testament, the school at Jerusalem had been growing increasingly rigid, and interdicted any such daring exegesis. It clung with fanatic attachment to the letter of the Scriptures, but, failing to comprehend the spirit, it sunk into all the puerilities of a narrow literalism. Its interpretations lacked both breadth and depth ; it surrendered itself to the subtilities of purely verbal dialectics." So also Pressense (p. 325) remarks of the heresies of the first century : "These heretics then followed the example of Simon Magus, in turning the Scriptures to their own purposes, and wresting them into the confirmation of their peculiar tenets. They gave an allegorical interpretation to the historical portion of the Old Testament, and thus cast a sacred veil over their monstrous errors." Heresy is no friend to the plain grammatical sense of the Word. The history of interpretation is briefly told. The first, and Jewish, method was to abide by the grammatical sense (still retained to some extent by the Orthodox—over against the Reformed or Rationalist—Jews, and especially by "the Karaites" or "Scripturists"), but as the Jews came in contact with Greek and Oriental philosophy (in Egypt, Greece, etc.), the effort to conciliate the Hebrew Scriptures with such a philosophy led to a second mode by which the obvious sense is made figurative in order to convey another sense—the latter being regarded as the higher. This brought forth three distinctive types of interpretation : the grammatical, the ideal, and these two, more or less, combined. The Jewish method—evidenced by its exclusiveness and Messianic hopes—was adopted by the primitive Church, as witnessed *e.g.* by its application of prophecy, its Pre-millenarian views, etc. The ideal, presented in the system of Philo, was inaugurated into the Christian Church by the Alexandrian fathers, and speedily gained a wide-spread reputation, being followed by numerous writers. A combination of the grammatical and ideal found a host of followers down to the Reformation. Tradition, metaphysical speculations, some favorite form of philosophy, were incorporated. At the Reformation there was a return to the Jewish method, and while the ideal and mystical has been largely adopted, yet the extremes—excepting in a few cases—once so prevailing are now avoided. As to Philo's system, afterward adopted by Christian fathers (Origen, etc.), we only quote, as illustrative, from an Article entitled "Alexandrian Christianity" (*The North Brit. Review*, August, 1855) : "According to him (Philo), nearly the whole of Scripture, not only its parables, its symbolical ceremonies, its obscure prophecies, but even the simplest language in which it relates the most ordinary transaction, every name and every number that it contains, possesses not only a plain but also a hidden meaning, the former of which is to the latter as the body to the soul." After stating that Aristobulus and other Jews, Oriental and Alexandrian, and even Greeks (in application to their poets) had employed this method, the writer adds : "We should say that the adoption of this principle of interpretation by Philo and his Christian disciples was the greatest obstacle to their discovering the true meaning of the Bible, and is the cause of their being almost useless as expositors. They themselves compared the literal interpretation to the flowers and fruits that grow upon the surface of the ground, and the allegorical one to a jewel hid beneath the soil ; and we may well say that, while boring and groping after this jewel supposed to be concealed, turning every stone and sifting every grain of sand, they often missed or destroyed the wholesome fruit and beautiful flower that grew before their eyes and beneath their feet." So that Ueberweg (*Hist. Philosophy*, vol. 1, p. 229) remarks : "Philo criticises the attitude of those who merely hold fast to the literal sense of Scripture as low, unworthy, and superstitious."

[1] It is a sad fact that multitudes declare the plain grammatical sense in numerous passages, if received, to be a corruption of the truth. God is thus virtually charged not merely with surrounding "the kernel" (truth) with "a husk "(error), but (to carry out the figure) with *a poisonous* one! But even men who constantly violate the grammatical sense by the engrafting of a higher and spiritual sense, at times confess the superiority of the former. Thus, to illustrate (quoted in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Interp.") : "Jerome (*Com.* in Mal. 1 : 16), about A. D. 400, could say, 'The rule of Scripture is, where there is a manifest prediction of future events, not to enfeeble that which is written by the uncertainty of allegory.'" "Even Hilary in his book 'De Trinitate,' 1, properly asserts, 'He is the best reader who rather expects to obtain sense from the words than imposes it upon them, and who carries more away

than he has brought, nor forces that upon the words which he had resolved to understand before he began to read.'" The student will not fail to observe that Protestant Confessions of Faith insist upon this grammatical sense when *e.g.* speaking (Art. XX. Anglican Church) of "God's Word written," or (Art. 18, Scotch Conf.) of "the plain text of Scripture." Indeed, all confessions are based upon it, and assume the sense accepted as the one commending itself to all by the common rules of language. Many, like Porphyry (in his third Book; see Art. on, McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*), object to the allegorical and mystical interpretation introduced into the Church by the Alexandrian fathers, as *e.g.* illustrated in "The Apology," (vol. 1, p. 11 of *The Literalist*), and in Luther's principle of interpretation (vol. 3, p. 127). Some Millenarian writers (as Dr. Craven in Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 98) prefer "normal" to the word "literal," as more expressive of our views of interpretation, not discarding the figurative.

Obs. 3. Such a reversal or change is, unfortunately, inferred from several passages of Scripture, and professing to be controlled in this matter by the Word, it becomes requisite to examine the legitimacy of the inference. 1 Cor. 2 : 14 is advanced as in conflict with our proposition and as fully endorsing its opposite, viz: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he *know* them, because they are *spiritually discerned.*" This passage pushed to an extreme, forms the key-note of the mystical, spiritualizing, Origenistic system of interpretation; the foundation of countless vagaries. Let us test it, *e.g.*, by the facts connected with the incarnation and death of Jesus; these were revealed by the Spirit and realized in such a manner that they are to be understood literally (as commands, duties, etc.), but to one class they are foolishness, and they do not *know* them, in the sense of appreciating their value, or importance, or relation to God and man (for *knowing* is used, as any concordance will show, as an equivalent for appreciation, experience, etc.); while to another class they are known by "spiritual discernment." What does this latter expression denote? That we are to attach to the incarnation and death a *spiritual* meaning and *discard the literal?* No! "spiritually discerned" is discerning "*the things of the Spirit,*" *i.e.*, things given by the Spirit; noting how the Spirit reveals and records them in the Scriptures, submitting ourselves to the guidance and enlightening influence of the Spirit *through* the written Word, until by His teaching and Divine aid we learn *to appreciate and to appropriate* the truths revealed to ourselves; and not to reject a literal rendering, and fasten, under the assumption of special superadded enlightenment, another sense upon the Scriptures. "The things of the Spirit" *are a matter of record,* and not left to the fancies or heated imaginations of every man who professes to be remarkably guided and influenced by the Spirit. Therefore, to properly discern what are the teachings of the Spirit, the record itself must be received in the sense prescribed by the usage of language. Even if the passage be regarded as teaching that the soul, mind, or Spirit discerns the truth, this does not invalidate the literalness of the recorded things of the Spirit, as already evidenced by the example presented. For in the context it is distinctly stated that God reveals His truth through the Spirit, and that such a revelation is contained "not *in the words* which man's wisdom teacheth, but" (in the words) "which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things" (*i.e.* the things taught by the Spirit) "with spiritual things" (*i.e.* with other things also received from the Spirit). This brings us back to the question already answered, How are *the words* themselves to be apprehended—as teaching what they grammatically contain, or as including some other meaning?

Another passage often paraded as against us is found in 2 Cor. 3 : 6: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; *not of the letter, but of the Spirit: for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.*" While it is impossible to preserve the force and true apprehension of this Scripture without understanding what is meant by the New Testament or covenant (which will be examined Prop. 50, in connection with the Abrahamic covenant), yet, aside from this, sufficient reason can be advanced to rebut its reference to a literal, or any other system of interpretation. Asking what is meant by "the Spirit," the answer comes in the very same chapter "*Now the Lord is that Spirit*" (v. 17, comp. Barnes' admissions, etc.), and (in v. 18, according to Barnes, Beza, Wolf, Locke, Rosenmüller, Doddridge, etc., the Greek is) "*from the Lord the Spirit.*" If Christ be the Spirit here denoted, how can it refer to interpretation? Or, if the testimony of the apostle, that by the Spirit Christ is meant, is set aside, we ask then, How comes it, according to the statement of Neander and a host of writers, that the apostles could not rid themselves of the "materialistic husk" of a literal interpretation of the Word? If the "literal" application "killeth" as some[1] declare, how does it come then that God gives His word *in such a form?* Is it *reasonable or credible* that He, who is justly lauded for benevolence, mercy, and grace, would give truth surrounded by a deadly covering—truth too indispensable to secure the happiness and peace of man? Is it not the rule of the Divine procedure (uttered by Jesus, Matt. 7 : 8, 9, 10, etc.) that even man will not give to an asking son a stone for bread or a serpent for a fish, much less God? Such are a few of the questions that immediately suggest themselves, when making the passage advocate a proceeding that would be inconsistent in man. The simple, unpretending meaning of the verse is this: that the Word of God in its letter (*i.e.* in its plain, unambiguous written form) cannot give life; that possessing the letter *alone* would inevitably lead to death, for having *only* the letter the covenant promises could *not* be realized, but that having *the Spirit, even Christ,* the assurance is given that the letter itself—death without Christ or the Spirit—or the promises of God contained in the letter, shall be duly verified and accomplished. Two passages throw light on this verse; the one where even the letter of the Gospel, the preaching of the apostles, may prove to be a "savor of death unto death" (2 Cor. 2 : 16) without Christ; and the other (John 6 : 63), when Jesus, to indicate the future resurrection and possession of eternal life, says: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth" (comp. 2 Cor. 4 : 14; John 5 : 21; Rom. 8: 11; Gal. 4 : 17; Phil. 3 : 21), keeping in view that this quickening is applied to Christ in 1 Pet., 3 : 18, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." Hence the literal aspect of the truth is far from being condemned or set aside; if so, it would sweep away *the most precious promises* that the Bible contains. It is then to be received, but in connection with it, *that also* which alone gives it efficacy and power in this world, and in that which is to come.[2] The idea, therefore, of the apostle is, that without the related work and power of Jesus, as the Christ, and His Spirit exerted in our behalf, the mere reception of the truth in its material form will, instead of delivering from, only conduct to death. There is nothing in the scope of the passage to indicate any such reference as many attach to it, so condemnatory to the Bible and the practice of the apostles.[3]

[1] Cornelius Agrippa (*On the Vanitie of Sciences*, ch. 97) speaks of the Scholastics and their performances, and adds (what is applicable to-day): "against which if any will resist with the authoritee of the holy Scriptures, fourthwith he shall saie: *the letter killeth*, it is deadly, it is unprofitable; but they saye that we ought to search out that which lieth hidden in the letter afterwarde they having recourse to interpreting, to expoundinge, to glossinge, and to sillogisinge, do rather give it some other sense, than the proper meaninge of the letter; if thou instantly require an answere and be earnest upon them, they will give evil language and call thee Asse, as one which understandeth not that which is hidden in the letter, but as a serpente feedest on the earthe alone," etc. A recent illustration of a ruinous interpretation of this passage in 2 Cor. 3 : 6 may be in place. The eloquent H. W. Beecher preached from this text, as reported *e.g. N. Y. Sun*, May 19th, 1873, and the sermon exhibits the painful conclusion that in his efforts to glorify "the Spirit" he utterly degrades "the letter." Misapprehending the meaning of his text, he presses it in his service to undervalue—as infidels do—the written record; comparing the latter in its imperfections to the dead bark, moss, worms, and insects scraped (by assailants, unbelievers) from the trees of an orchard, adding: "and the more they raked the better he would like it," etc. The tendency of such declarations are dangerous and most derogatory to the Word. Then, again, it is amazing to witness the self-contradiction of writers. Take *e.g.* Calvin (who in many places favors a literal interpretation *Inst.* ch. 10 B. 2, S. 8,) speaking of the letter, says: "The Old Testament is literal, because it was promulgated *without the efficacy of the Spirit*," etc., and yet in the same section he admits that under this "literal" dispensation men were converted, that the work of the Spirit was experienced, that men were moved and spake by Him! He endeavors to palliate his expression by adding that this "*is used by way of comparison*." But this does not remove the difficulty, and it does not inform us how the Old Testament, *once* literal, *now* becomes "spiritual." And when Calvin was attacked (D'Aubigné's *Reformation*, vol. 3, p. 81) by Quinten "the spiritual," the latter sought refuge in the following: "We are not subject to the letter which killeth, but to the Spirit which giveth life. . . . The Bible contains allegories, myths which the Holy Spirit explains to us." Calvin replied: "You make your Scriptures a nose of wax, and play with it, as if it were a ball."

[2] The critical reader will observe that our argument has only reference to the doctrinal interpretation, and not to the practical influence that doctrine or truth should have on the life. There may be a clear apprehension of doctrine, and yet it may (as, alas, multitude of instances testify) be inconducive to piety, etc., but this practical neglect does not affect the interpretation. Spener (Hagenbach, *Hist. Doc.*, vol. 2, p. 246) took the right position when opposing the mere reception of the letter without an additional self-appropriation of the truth expressed in it. And in opposing the Quakers he justly observes, on the other side: "Our feelings are not the norm of truth, but Divine truth is the norm of our feelings. *This rule of truth exists in the Divine Word apart from ourselves.*"

[3] The misinterpretation of this and the previous passage has opened a wide door to innumerable vagaries and assumptions of higher spiritual excellence. Thus, to illustrate: it led Schwenkfeld (Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 2, p. 155), to call Luther's insisting upon the unconditional authority of the Word of God "a bondage to the letter," and caused him to exalt a professed "inner word of the Spirit above the written Word of the Scriptures." The names of Antoinette Bourignan, Seb. Frank, Thamer, Servetus, Labadie, "The Angelic Brethren," Jumpers or Barkers, Shakers, Duchoborzins (a Russian sect, see Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 2, p. 239), Zoharites, Muggletonians, Petro-Joannites, and others, are suggestive of the same. This theory of interpretation run to excess may be found in Woolston's book (London, 1722), "A Free Gift to the Clergy," in which "the hireling priests of what denomination soever" "are all ministers of the letter." The titles of various works are amply sufficient, such as *e.g.* How's "Sufficiency of the Spirit's Teaching without Human Learning; or a Treatise Tending to Prove Human Learning to be no Help to the Spiritual Understanding of the Word of God;" or the "Allegorical Explanations of both Testaments;" or the "Mystical Ark," etc. So Hutchinson based his system on a fanciful etymology of Hebrew words, from which spiritual significations were drawn, so that history was turned into prophecy, and the plain grammatical sense was set aside. Such extravagances still exist, and a thousand illustrations might be drawn from recent writers, reviving in a measure the idea advocated even by Lardner, Stevenson, Pearce, Sherlock, etc. (who follow Woolston's and Thomas' views) that the Gospel history itself is to be understood in a mystical or parabolic sense. Mysticism, more or less developed, is found in many authors of the present day, although they refuse the ex-

treme of the "Abecedarians," who (Appletons' *Cyclop.*) "held that without the aid of study the Holy Spirit would convey directly to the understanding a knowledge of the Scriptures, and that, therefore, it was better not to know how to read." It is also a sad commentary on human weakness that tracts and books, containing doctrinal statements, interpretations of prophecy, etc., claim that their interpretations were given by special Divine inspiration or enlightenment through the Spirit. Without questioning the sincerity of these persons (for men are easily led to such a belief, if they assume themselves to be the special favorites of the Spirit in the reception of gifts), it is sufficient to say that every such a plea vitiates the value of their teaching, and imposes alone upon the weak, ignorant, or unreflecting, who are unable to test their utterances by the general analogy of the Word. Luther, on John 14 : 25–28, gives an infallible rule for trying the professed (by men) utterances of the Holy Spirit, thus : "If one come, therefore, and present anything to me as taught or revealed by the Holy Spirit, I keep to the Word and hold this doctrine up to it, as to the true touchstone. If now I see that it agrees with that which Christ says, I receive it as right and good. But if it be a departure from it, or would produce something different from it, then I say, Thou art not the Holy Ghost, but the detestable devil. For the true Spirit comes in no other name than in the name of Christ, and teaches nothing other than what the Lord Christ has said." A writer in the *North Brit. Review* (May 1849) objects to Morell ("Philosophy of Religion"), not allowing the letter of the Scriptures its true position and weight as the testimony of God, but makes the only ground of certitude to exist in the subjective mind of the inquirer—in intuitional consciousness. The fact is that, to induce the highest certitude, we must receive the authoritative letter as containing the truth, give it its logical force (through reason), and allow its intuitive influence (through a responding moral nature), dependant upon the Spirit that gave the truth, and upon our adaptability for its reception. God's Word is true, whether men receive or reject it.

Obs. 4. Briefly, then, we are forced by a regard for consistency to endorse the proposition for the following reasons: 1. God communicates with us through language, and He follows, in order that we may understand, the usages of language. 2. The literal interpretation was the ancient mode employed down to the time of Christ. 3. It was the early Christian Church method, and continued thus until subverted by the Alexandrian and monkish one. (Comp. *e.g.* in reference to interpretation of Scriptures relating to kingdom, Props. 70–78). 4. It is the one to which God alone appeals in behalf of the veracity, etc., of His word. 5. It is the only one that can give us the certainty that it is not the work of man. 6. The fundamental truths of Christianity, the covenants, the person, incarnation, life, and death of Jesus, the promises, the fulfilment of prophecy, etc., are based upon it. 7. It is the one that maintains its reasonableness and accordance with the laws of language, and can thus be tested and proven. 8. It presents a simplicity which binds together the Old and New Testaments in unity of language and of design that no other system bestows. 9. It brings forth most prominently the analogy of Scripture and of faith. 10. It not only preserves the promises of God intact, but fully shows how and when they are fulfilled. 11. It conduces to bring out most distinctively a perfect Redeemer and a completed redemption. 12. It prevents a host of contradictory meanings applied to the kingdom, clearly tracing and presenting it as the covenants and promises demand. 13. It effectually closes the door to a flood of wild and antagonistic interpretations fastened on the Word under the claim of superior spiritual enlightenment, discernment, and sanctity. 14. It aids us fairly to meet, without lowering and degrading the Word by abject concessions and the accommodation theory, the assaults of unbelievers. The bearing of all this will be evidenced as we pass over the leading doctrine of the Bible ; and the result of our labors, the fruit of adherence to grammatical interpretation, will indicate the solidity of the ground occupied.

Dr. Sprecher in his *Groundwork of Theol.*, p. 1, ch. 5, on "The Right of Private Judgment and the Sufficiency, Intelligibility, and Efficacy of the Sacred Scriptures," fully and ably sustains our position. After insisting upon the intelligibility of the Scriptures, because "a revelation unintelligible is no revelation at all," etc., he (p. 109) remarks: "As the revelation is made in oral communications and in written words, in articulate speech and intelligible language—language intelligible to its first hearers and readers—it follows that the words in this revelation must have been used according to the rules of language then prevalent, the *usus loquendi* of that day, according to the meaning or sense of the words to those to whom the language was vernacular. Otherwise the communication could not have been understood by them. It is evident, therefore, that the Bible must be explained in the same way, and interpreted by the same rules which apply to any other books written in the same language. This was the view of Luther, and he called it the *sensum literalem*." Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 38) justly observes, in behalf of the grammatical sense, that if the Word is at the mercy of the interpreter, then the Bible "is no longer a revelation, but a concealment of God's will." Professor Riddle (*Hints on Bible Interpretation*) forcibly observes that "the right of private interpretation" "assumes that the Bible is a human (in its language) book; that however its human authors were inspired, they wrote or spoke so as to be understood, using words, whether literally or figuratively, in the sense in which general usage employs them. For if this principle of interpretation were not correct, there could be no duty of private interpretation." "Indeed, any other position makes the Bible a dishonest book." Chillingworth (*Works*, vol. 1, p. 231) affirms our view, because God designed His Word not simply "for the learned, but for all men," which design is only met by the grammatical sense.

Obs. 5. Our position is endorsed, at least in theory if not always in practice, by the ablest writers. Our introductions and aids to the study of the Bible (as *e.g. Horne's*, vol. 1, p. 322, etc. Comp. Alford's *How to Study New Test.*, Dunn's *Study of the Bible;* Smith's *Dic. of the Bible;* Herzog's *Encyc.*, *The Bible and its Study*, etc.), regard it as fundamental to a correct understanding of the Word. Theologians and authors in every statement of doctrine or argument, lay stress on it as the strongest possible proof to be adduced in favor of what the Scriptures actually do teach. This, *e.g.* is evidenced on almost every page of such works as Kitto's *Cyclopedia*, Fairbairn's *Bib. Dictionary*, Kurtz's *Sac. History*, etc., and in all our leading commentaries, in Sys. Divinity, etc. Indeed, the plain grammatico-rhetorical sense is to multitudes the end of controversy. The reformers, as stated (comp. Mosheim's *Ch. Hist.*, Cent. 16, S. 3; Eichhorn's *Gech. der Cultur*, p. 1, and 175; Hallam's *Introd. Lit. of Europe*, vol. 2, p. 287 etc.) confined themselves, more or less, to the literal interpretation. Even some eminent Roman Catholic divines (comp. Calmet's *Dic.*) have admitted the literal sense, as *e.g.* John Charlier De Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, of whom Neander (*Hist. Dogmas*, vol. 2, p. 607) says: "Gerson first of all asserted as a fundamental maxim that the literal sense of the Bible was the only true one; that all things necessary to salvation were plainly contained in the Bible, and that no true doctrine could be at variance with the Bible." He, however, neutralized this by also declaring that this literal sense must be explained by the interpretation of the Church, given to it through General Councils. The most pompous array of testimonials might be presented in favor of the interpretation advocated by us—even from men who are largely addicted to spiritualizing—but the illustrations appended will suffice. It is self-evident that, in the perusal of the writings of others, we feel, explain it as we may, that in the interpretation of Scripture they are correct and truthful in proportion as the literal sense or the natural figurative one sustains them. Barnes (*Com.* Gal. 4 : 24) expresses our view: "the great truth has gone

forth, never more to be recalled, that the Bible is to be interpreted on the same principle as all other books; that its language is to be investigated by the same laws as language in all other books; and that no more liberty is to be taken in allegorizing the Scriptures than may be taken with Herodotus or Livy."

Rev. Dr. Sprecher, my honored instructor in theology, in a letter addressed to me dated January 16th, 1856, after referring to his extensive reading on the subject and the reflection of years, says: "Their (*i.e.*, Millenarians) principles of interpretation are correct," however he may differ on some details of exegesis. Rev. Robert Hall, in his *Review of Gregory's Letters*, utters the following: "Let the fair grammatical import of Scripture language be investigated; and whatever propositions are, by an easy and natural interpretation, deducible from thence, let them be received as the dictates of infinite wisdom, whatever aspect they bear, or whatever difficulties they present. Repugnant to reason they never can be, because they spring from the author of it; but superior to reason, whose limits they will infinitely surpass, we must expect to find them, since they are a communication of such matters of fact respecting the spiritual and eternal world as need not to have been communicated, if the knowledge of them could have been acquired from any other quarter." Ernesti only expresses the views of many when he tells us: "Theologians are right when they affirm the literal sense to be the only true one." In the *Inst. Interp. of the New Testament*, he lays it down as a fundamental law of exegesis that the interpretation of Scripture is to be conducted by the same rules applicable to the interpretation of a classical or profane author. (This has not been wholly eliminated in Professor Stuart's translation). The only caution requisite is, that no exegesis is to be considered isolated from other Scripture, but must be regarded in its connection with the general analogy, spirit, or design of the writers. The painful fact is, that, however correct in principle, Ernesti, Michælis, and others too much overlooked the internal and Divine unity exhibited by a grammatico-historical interpretation—*i.e.* its union and correspondence with a continuous Divine plan. They failed to combine what even exegesis presented. Every reader of course knows that without the literal interpretation, works on the fulfilment of prophecy cannot be effective as seen in writings of Sherlock, Newton, Kett, Faber, Keith, Hurd, etc. Greswell (*Parables*, vol. 3, p. 173) denounces the dangerous practice of making varied senses, as "substituting an indefinite and capricious standard of interpretation," and then forcibly adds: "If there is any one principle of interpretation which from the nature of the case is not liable to vary; which is founded in the reason of things, and cannot accommodate itself to the peculiar tastes or prejudices of individuals, in the use and admission of which persons of every persuasion might be capable of concurring, and which would lead all, if they applied it rightly, to similar conclusions; which is consequently the least likely to fail of the desired effect, and therefore we may presume was of all others intended to be our guide and director in arriving at the knowledge both of what we are required to believe, and of what we are bound to practice; it appears to me to be this, that we take the words of Scripture as we find them; that we endeavor to ascertain their true, grammatical sense, whether in the Old or the New Testament, in the first instance, and then receive the truths which are thereby conveyed, whether articles of faith or rules of practice, according to the plain and simple and obvious meaning of the language itself." Graff, in his *Lay Sermons*, No. 1, observes that "the language is human," and adds: "It is this human phase of the Scriptures which brings them within our reach, even as it is the human nature of the Divine Person, of whom they treat, that renders Him capable of being our Saviour, Representative, and Friend. As in the perusal of other books, so in reading the Bible, there is no better general rule than that *the obvious meaning* is the true." A sensible art. on *Biblical Interpretation* may be found in the North Brit. Review, Aug., 1858. We only add this: if the idea contained in the grammatical sense is not the one inspired, then the inspiration of the views presented is largely left to the option of the interpreter.

Obs. 6. This proposition is of the utmost importance, seeing that, as all frankly acknowledge, our doctrinal basis and subsequent superstructure depend upon its adoption. The early Christians in their simplicity and faith occupied our posture,[1] and therefore held a doctrine concerning the kingdom, which, by a change to another attitude, is now regarded by the

masses as erroneous. We are mainly indebted to Origen for this transformation, he giving the leverage through which it was accomplished. Luther and others may give their estimate of his performance.[3] It is sufficient to say that he laid down the principle "that the Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written," etc. (Porter's *Lec. Hom.*, p. 51). He advocates (*De. Princ.* B. 4 C. 1) the threefold interpretation; the obvious sense he likens to "the flesh; a higher sense is equivalent to "the soul," and a still higher is represented by "the Spirit;" "for as man consists of body, soul, and spirit, so in the same way does Scripture." How this system spread is briefly stated by Mosheim (*Eccl. Hist.*, Cen. 3, p. 2, S. 6): "A prodigious number of interpreters, both in this and succeeding ages, followed the method of Origen, though with some variations; nor could the few, who explained the sacred writings with judgment and a true spirit of criticism, oppose with any success the torrent of allegory that was overflowing the Church."[3] Augustine (*City of God*, B. 17, S. 3) gives a threefold meaning to the prophecies, one referring to the earthly, another to the heavenly Jerusalem, and a third to both of these. The moral sense advocated by Kant (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 323), which, setting aside the grammatical, imposes a moral meaning, whether the passage can naturally bear it or not, is an offshoot of such a system. So also the theory of accommodation to the opinions and prejudices of the Jews as advanced by Semler and developed by his followers (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 324), is the natural offspring of such bold handling of the Word. In addition: the extravagant claims of Swedenborg that he was set up as the true interpreter of the Word, is exclusively based on the notion that to him was, for the first time, given the secret key by the Creator himself, to unlock the Bible and portray its meaning; and this key, on examination, turns, only in a more scientific way, the old bolts in Origen's lock, now enlarged and reburnished. It resolves itself in as wide a removal as possible from the literal, and finds morality and religion in the plainest historical statements and facts; in short, wherever a mystical ingenuity could engraft them.[4] Without questioning the sincerity, intended honesty, and piety of such men, justice to ourselves, and a desire to vindicate the truth, demands an exposure of their inconsistency and dangerous tendency. Many, indeed, reject the vagaries of Origen, the absurdities of Augustine, the folly of Kant and Semler, the visions of Swedenborg, and would regard it as uncomplimentary to be classed as interpreters with one or the other of them, who, notwithstanding, are precisely in the same category. For with all these, they also forsake the literal sense, or, if the passage contains it, the figurative sense, and *add as the true sense another*, viz., a spiritual or mystical. It is singular, too, that many writers, unable to discriminate between figurative language and their own superadded spiritualizing, confound the two, although greatly differing, as one. Waldegrave, Fairbairn, and others employ the term "figurative" as if it were equivalent to spiritual, overlooking the fact that all figurative language falls under the grammatical construction of speech and is very different from *the additional* meaning fastened upon the obtained figurative sense. Let us again say: all parties admit—however some may afterward discard it—the literal sense; they all accept of the figurative meaning ascertained by the rules of grammar and rhetoric; these are freely admitted as contained in the words or sentences, and thus far all are agreed, but here the points of agreement cease, and

the paths become diverging. We are satisfied with the sense thus obtained, seeking no other foreign to all languages, and which no one dreams to apply to any book except to the Bible. They, on the other hand, are not contented with such a sense—frequently finding it contradictory to their preconceived theory—but gravely tell us that this grammatical sense is a purely *representative* sense of another and differing one, which last they fail, either through design or discrimination, to distinguish from the literal.[5] This peculiar mode of interpretation, traceable to the old Origenistic method, makes it easy to fasten almost any meaning to "the kingdom of heaven." To its looseness are we indebted for the varied interpretations concerning it.[6]

[1] Professor Shedd (*Hist. of Ch. Doc.*, B. 6, ch. 1) endeavors to make the impression that the later system of interpretation (*i.e.*, Alexandrian) was "the most authoritative one." Rev. Shimeall, in his *Reply*, conclusively shows that it only became such, over against the literal, by a wide and disastrous departure from the once prevailing interpretation. Ellicott (*Aids to Faith, Essay* 9, "Scripture and its Interpretation") correctly shows that the only really valuable and authoritative interpretation of the Church, including even the available portion of Origen's, etc., is that based on a grammatical and historical one. The reader will be gratified with his Essay.

[2] For Luther's view, see note to Obs. 1. Also Michelet's *Life of Luther*, p. 273 and Ap. p. 419. Comp. estimate of Mosheim, Neander, Milner, and Kurtz in Ch. Histories, Killen in *The Old Cath. Church*, Porter's *Homiletics*, etc., and it will be found that Pressense (*Early Years of Chris.*, vol. 2, p. 328) is correct when he says that Origen's mode of interpretation "reads a Bible of his own invention, a human book within the Book of God."

[3] Compare Hagenbach's *Hist. of Doc.*, sec. 162, vol. 1, Davison's *Sac. Herm.*, p. 163–192, etc., and it will be found that Origen's threefold sense and Augustine's three and fourfold sense gave place even to Angelom's sevenfold and eightfold sense, and ultimately to as many as could be derived. John Scotus Erigena taught an infinite sense, and Cocceius declared, "that the words of Scripture must everywhere be supposed to signify just as much as they may signify," *i.e.*, as much as fancy could torture out of them. Milner justly describes (*Eccl. Hist.*, vol. 1, p. 469) a long period thus: "A thick mist for ages pervaded the Christian world, supported and strengthened by his (Origen's) allegorical manner of interpretation. The learned alone were considered for ages implicitly to be followed; and the vulgar, when the literal was hissed off the stage, had nothing to do but to follow their authority wherever it led them." This "mist" is far from being dispelled, and the work performed under its cover is still largely retained.

[4] Swedenborg (*The Apoc. Revealed*, vol. 2, p. 959) advocates three senses, viz., "the celestial, the spiritual, and the natural;" the last being of little account. Under the pious garb of visions, etc., he conveniently gets rid of the grammatical sense, and, with it, of covenant and prediction according to their plain meaning. This Swedenborgian key reveals, *e.g.*, that (Div. Prov. No. 326) "cows" signify "good natural affections;" that (True Ch. Relig. Nos. 113, 277) a horse denotes "the understanding of the Word of God;" that (Arc. Cœles. No. 2089) Ishmael begetting twelve princes means "the primary precepts which are of charity;" that (Arc. Cœlest. No. 4790) Joseph sold to Potiphar signifies "the alienation of Divine truths by scientifics." A large number of such engrafted meanings are scattered all through his writings, and remind us strongly of Origen's flights in the same direction. Thus *e.g.* the latter makes the seven women taking hold of one man, mentioned by Isaiah, to denote the "seven operations of the Divine Spirit," viz., "the spirit of wisdom, of intelligence, of council, of virtue, of knowledge, of piety, and the fear of the Lord" (Porter's *Lec. Hom.*, p. 51). Multitudes followed and endorsed such interpretation. Gregory the Great in his exposition of Job fancies that "Job's friends denote the heretics, his seven sons the twelve apostles, his three daughters the laity adhering to the Trinity, his seven thousand sheep the same faithful people, and his three thousand humpbacked camels the depraved Gentiles." Eckhart (art., *Mystics of Fourteenth Century*, Littell's *Living Age*, vol. 123, p. 457) informs us that "the shell is to be broken, the husk to be torn off and flung away ere the spiritual kernel could be reached." How he reaches this "spiritual kernel" is illustrated in his sermon on the restoration to life of the widow's son, thus: he makes

"the city of Nain to be the soul of man, the disciples the rays of light entering into the soul, and the widow's son the human will," etc. Nicholas of Basle, with thousands of others, in a professed spirit of self-renunciation, but which really exalted self in that it possessed a private inspiration, sought out the hidden meaning of Scripture. Under the plea of supernatural illumination, ancients and moderns discard the authority of the letter—some are extremists, others more moderate.

[5] Thus *e.g.*, take the promises relating to the re-establishment of the throne and kingdom of David, and to the blessings to be enjoyed by the same Jewish nation which realized the fulfilled threatenings, and after the grammatical sense, both strictly literal and figurative, is obtained, then these are converted into something else. Thus David's throne is the Father's throne in heaven, the blessings specifically announced to the Jews are spiritualized as something now to be experienced and appropriated by the Gentiles, etc. Those who are desirous to see how far men can go in spiritualizing are referred to the writings of T. R. Gates and others. This additional sense, too, is often one of the most far-fetched inferential, reminding one of the Rabbinical principle, thus (Hopkins' *Puritans*, vol. 1, p. 533) illustrated: "Hunting on the Sabbath day is a sin," says the Jewish Talmud, and "therefore catching a flea on that day is sin, because it is a kind of hunting." This is no caricature; for recently in the *Christian Pulpit* appeared an article by an evidently sincere writer (whose name, out of respect, is repressed) on the "Parable of the Leaven," in which the author asserts that the first measure of meal was the Jews, the second measure George Washington and his compeers, and the third a chosen body now raised up in a certain sect of which the writer is a member! Alas for the Word, when thus mutilated. One of the latest exhibitions in this direction is found in Milton Woolley's *Science of the Bible*, which interprets all by supposed astronomical relations. Even plain history symbolizes natural phenomena, either terrestrial or celestial. We give a brief specimen of application: "Now when Moses was grown (*i.e.*, when Aquarius rises heliacally as before the sun), he spied an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew (*i. e.*, winter smiting summer), and he looked this way and that way, and perceiving himself unseen (*i.e.*, the sun's rays hid him), he slew the Egyptian (*i.e.*, winter was followed by summer). But when he went out the second day (*i.e.*, after he passed the summer solstice), he saw two Hebrews (*i.e.*, the two halves of summer) striving together," etc. Ridiculous as this may appear, it is not near as dangerous as many other interpretations already mentioned.

[6] The reader is reminded that recent writers, as Fairbairn, Brown, etc., make no effort to give us canons or rules which would guide us in engrafting a spiritual sense upon the grammatically figurative. The nearest approach is that given by Horne, (Introd. vol. 1, p. 382, on the "Spiritual Interpretation," sec. 1). This is unsatisfactory because it mixes type, symbol, figure, etc. In conversation with a talented professor of theology, allusion was made to Horne's rules for spiritual interpretation, and although favorable himself to spiritualizing, he promptly rejected them, and frankly admitted that determinate rules could not be recorded, claiming that there were some things beyond our power to fully recognize and control by rules. However true the latter may be as to some scientific or theological truth, it certainly cannot apply to interpretation.

Obs. 7. A departure from the literal sense has not only caused those immensely varied and antagonistic interpretations of the kingdom, but it has, in its self-defence, forced able and pious men to a confession which undermines and destroys the authority of the Bible. Strauss, Bauer, and others, charge the Bible, including the New Testament, with teaching in a direct, literal sense a visible, outward kingdom here on earth under the personal reign of Jesus; in brief, a kingdom in its *Jewish form*. This is frankly admitted by eminent theologians; indeed, there can be, as we shall hereafter show, no question about its being a fact. But how do they get rid of this objection as urged by Renan, Parker, and others? Easily enough, by turning on to it the light afforded by their additional sense. We have one of the most scholarly inform us. Thus *e.g.* Neander (*Life of Jesus*, p. 250, etc.) concedes that the true idea of the kingdom of God was contained in a "materialistic husk," which (the latter) he designates a "chimera, which was the rough rind of the sacred bulb;" and contends that this "husk" was in the second or third century removed, and then

"the real kingdom of God was made clear," and the believers in that "rough rind" by the change "became heretics." In other words, the literal sense once held is discarded and another sense, which is pronounced the true one, is given to the kingdom, and *a complete reversal* of opinion follows, so that in the estimation of many the former believers are no longer to be regarded as in sympathy and belief with the Church. We *earnestly protest* against such a procedure, which makes the apostles and early believers to put their faith in a "chimera," "a rough rind," "a materialistic husk;" which proclaims with the utmost self-complacency that "in the things of the Spirit," in doctrinal truths, we, or the Church, *are far in advance* of the apostles; which makes inspired men and preachers of the kingdom ignorant of the leading doctrine of the Bible, and one too that they were specially to proclaim. Let this husk be the grammatical sense—strictly literal and figurative—we are abundantly satisfied with its consolations, profundity, and sublimity. Its meat is wholesome and nourishing, imparting strength, and we need no other, although it is, with high-sounding words, pronounced to be the inner, sacred germ developed by "the consciousness of the Church," or by the growth induced by the Spirit. When we see that the reception of this inner germ produces direct antagonism to *one admitted* sense of the Word, hostility to the early faith of the Church, inability to fairly meet the objections of infidelity, a countless number of mystical additions leading to the most extravagant revelations, we respectfully, but firmly, decline the intoxicating potion. This "germ system" virtually makes the Bible "all things to all men," in a way that opens wide the door to the entrance of that mournful, endless procession of diverse, adverse, opposite, inimical opinions, doctrines, systems, etc., which appear in the history of hermeneutics, theology, and the Church. Should we not, to say the least, hesitate before we endorse a method which has been so widespread for evil, and which, with the best intention, sweeps a net with meshes so large that it cannot hold in confinement the fishes it encloses; which is a power so explosive and dangerous to manage that when handled its effects cannot be controlled? It leads even such men as Cocceius to exult in the prolific manner in which reason can become the measurer of Scripture, saying: "The Scripture is so rich that an able expositor will bring more than one sense out of it." What kind of riches these are, we need not now delineate.[1]

The most dangerous attacks of unbelief against the Bible are based on a purely grammatical interpretation of it. The result is, that the teaching of the Scriptures being diverse—as *e.g.* in reference to the kingdom—from the spiritual conceptions of the modern Church, both are rejected on the ground that they are unreliable, for the first given by professed inspired men is not entertained by the Church, and the second is solely the work of fallible successors. Now the vast mass of the Church, having left the apostolic interpretation and followed the Alexandrian, monkish, and popish interpretations, is utterly unable to resist those attacks without resorting to a double, concealed, inner, or spiritual meaning. Here is *the fatal lack of consistency;* for it is virtually admitting that the Word according to its letter cannot be defended, thus opening a wide gap for the enemies of the truth to enter, conceding that one admitted sense possesses a serious defect. Now, we propose in this work to take the principles of interpretation correctly adopted by unbelievers, admitted by many ortho-

dox to be sound and reliable, however they may violate them, and show, step by step, presenting Scripture proof as we advance, that they preserve the integrity of the Word, the inspired teaching of the apostles, and a marked unity of design in redemptive purposes. While there is a large class who make their attack against Christianity through the literal interpretation and reject it as untenable, there is another large one who profess to retain some regard for the Bible, and under this esteem manipulate the literal sense by engrafting upon it what they designate a higher and nobler sense. Rationalistic, Naturalistic, and Liberal books, full of Free Religionist ideas, develop this feature largely. Alas! this destructive work was taught them by the system of believers, and they plant themselves complacently upon the interpreting basis so kindly provided—all objections being swallowed up in the latitude given by a supposed freedom. Grammar, rhetoric, and history are violated for the sake of an idea, an "inner germ," and the most scholarly, learned men are pushing on, exultantly, the work.[2] Prudence dictates a return to the grammatical sense, which all admit, and a strict adherence to the same. Every one feels that just in proportion as an important doctrine or truth is founded upon such a sense, in that proportion is it credible. Even mystics, the greatest spiritualizers, seek to sustain their views by an appeal to such wherever available. The leading doctrine of the kingdom cannot prove an exception to a rule which commends itself to good judgment.

[1] History is full of them. Not merely Cocceius (Mosheim *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 3, p. 429), but a host of others arose in all centuries, who thus perverted the plainest passages, making even (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 384, note) the incest of Lot and his daughters a sign of salvation through Jesus Christ, and the phrase "Joshua the son of Nun" to be the equivalent of "Jesus the Son of Man," etc. These are extremes, which happily the good sense of many of our opponents reject with us, and they are only presented to show what fruits the system itself, in the hands of some, produces. Multitudes accuse us of folly (1 Cor. 3 : 18) in adhering to the grammatical construction, but they forget two things, 1. That if the grammatical word contains foolishness, *then* the Spirit is justly chargeable in its production; and 2. That no mistakes of rigid literalism, overlooking figures of speech contained (as alleged *e.g.* against the Audiani, the followers of Audæus), can be compared with the more serious and dangerous blunders of spiritual and mystical interpretation. One of the most sad mistakes, under the impression of "spiritual discernment," is found in the history of Irving's life (see p. 445, etc., and App. p. 567, 609, *Irving's Life* by Mrs. Oliphant). The student, undoubtedly, has noticed the multitude of interpretations which accommodate Scripture—in the manner of the clergyman who preached before the Pretender at Perth from Isa. 14 : 1, 2—to present existing circumstances and conditions, when the context, scope, etc., indicate no such reference. Professor Sherer, when he repudiates "the literal system" as "the theological baggage," and makes the Spirit apart from (not in and by) the Word the bestower of new revelations, new truths, new doctrines etc., is only reproducing an old departure from the Scripture teaching; and when Castellio, at Geneva, said, "The Spirit will eclipse the light of the Scripture as the sun eclipses the light of a candle," it is only the repetition of an oft-repeated fanatical prediction. It is the spirit of the Jesuit who made the Pope "the greater light," or of the London preacher who made Pharaoh to mean God the Father, Joseph the Son of God, and Potiphar's wife sinful nature (Ency. Bib. Knowl., art. "Spiritualize").

[2] The spiritualistic theory, now so prevalent and heartily endorsed in the Church, is bearing its deadly fruit in many a work published under infidel and semi-infidel auspices. Thus *e.g.* A. Coqueral, Jr. (Hurst's *Hist. Rational.*, p. 409) is the mouthpiece of a vast number when he declares that "authority does not rest in the letter, or in the leaves of Scripture. The Divine Spirit acts in the soul freely and independently of the letter. It is high time that we renounce the puerile, disrespectful, and contradictory worship of the letter. The letter killeth." It is not a sufficient reply to say that these men believe that every man possessing truth is equally inspired with the apostles, and

hence do not confine themselves to the spiritual sense of the Word, but embrace their own individual deductions. For this is precisely what multitudes, professing to be Christians and not ranked with infidels, are doing, viz., giving an additional sense to the Word under the claim that "the letter killeth," and that the Spirit is specially given to them, *thus manufacturing a Bible of their own* out of the Word consistent with their own conceptions of what truth demands. We can, alas, point to large organized bodies setting up antagonistic claims in this manner, while all denominations are, more or less, leavened by its spirit and practice. Admitting the principle to be a correct one, how can you meet in argument those who claim that they have the Spirit equally with yourself? You cannot appeal to the letter, for that "killeth;" you cannot appeal to the Spirit, for both profess to possess it. In fact, it leaves us no solid criterion by which to judge.

Obs. 8. While urging a literal interpretation, we are, as already intimated, equally opposed to that ultra-literalism which makes no allowance for the figures of speech incident to all language. Tropical usage is by no means an evidence of ambiguity or weakness; it is rather that of clearness and strength, for according to the decided testimony of rhetoricians, its design and province is (Blair's *Rhet.*, S. 14) to "illustrate a subject, or throw light upon it," or (Jamieson's *Rhet.*, p. 138) "to give us, frequently, a much clearer and more striking view," etc. Hence to reject them is to evince a childish play, such a puerile literalism as was exemplified in Origen's unfortunate emasculation (how much had this to do with the after-development of his threefold sense?), and even in the contest between the great reformers Luther and Zwingli on the words instituting the Supper. This disclaimer is the more necessary, since in numerous books, reviews, and newspapers, it is alleged that Millenarians confine themselves to the exclusive, rigid, literal sense, admitting no other, and denying that of figure. One writer even, Dr. Spring, made the utterly unwarranted assertion that we "affirm that the prophetic and apocalyptic writings which speak of the Millennium are free from figures, symbols, and are altogether literal."[1] The simple truth is, that not a single Millenarian author, from the days of the apostles down, holds to such an opinion; all of them, without exception, fully recognize symbols, types, and figures of speech, notice their peculiarities, and discriminate them from the strictly literal. It is *their plain, unanimous* statement that language must be interpreted by the laws which produce and regulate it: if symbolic, it is to be interpreted by the laws governing symbols; if typical, then by the laws underlying types; if figurative, then by the rules controlling figures; and if rigidly literal, then by the laws of unfigurative speech. Works specially directing attention to these rules are presented by Millenarian writers, as *e.g.* Brookes, Bickersteth, Lord, Winthrop, etc.[2]

[1] *The Literary and Theological Journal* of D. N. Lord, while published, did good service in correcting such unjust representations, both in showing their groundlessness and in advocating the direct converse. To this journal the reader is referred for numerous examples of misrepresentations (like Spring's, etc.), corrected, for illustrations of the manner in which passages are explained by us and our opponents, and for the opinions of Duffield, McNeile, and others on the subject. Bickersteth's *Guide*, Brooke's *Elements of Prophetic Interpretation*, *The Prophetic Times*, etc., may also be consulted with advantage.

[2] It is not necessary to reproduce the rules adopted by us, for these are found in our grammars and rhetorics, introductions to the Bible (as Horne's, etc.), and in the writings of the class mentioned. Let us add, that the grammatical interpretation of figure, symbol, type, is not the spiritual interpretation that we condemn; but *after* the lawful interpretation of such figure, etc., has been ascertained, to leave this and fasten another

upon it—this so-called spiritual sense we resist. While the literal may be unlawfully made figurative, and the figurative by violence be made literal—mistakes to which all are liable—a legitimate literal and figurative interpretation is not to be set aside for another and representative sense of something that the words *do not express*. It is amusing to notice writers who cannot distinguish between their special superadded spiritual sense and a figurative one; and who, blundering, call figure, symbol, and type spiritual language, or else overlook the fact that as figurative language falls in with the purely grammatical, they cannot justly charge us with error in making it such, when we hold to a literal fulfilment of the same *after* it has been interpreted by the rules of language. We hold that rigid literal language, symbol, type, and figure in their plain grammatical interpretation often teach us spiritual facts, etc., but this they do in the plain sense conveyed. Even allegory we receive where it is plainly contained in the language; and in reference to the expression of Paul (Gal. 4 : 24), this is no criterion to be followed by us, as is clearly stated by Albert Barnes (*Com.* loci.), to which the reader is referred, coming as it does from one who favored spiritualizing.

Obs. 9. To prove that our proposition is wrong in limiting the interpretation of the Bible by the laws of language, as universally held, it must be shown: 1. That the Bible in its usage of language is an exception to all other books. 2. That the subject-matter, superior to that contained in other books, is not conveyed to us through the common channel of language in the ordinary way. 3. That a sense beyond that given by the rules of language is a legitimate one, and either, in some manner, drawn from language itself or found incorporated or announced in the Word. 4. Some rules or directions for ascertaining and applying this additional sense, so that it may be easily recognized and not arbitrarily used. 5. Some decided—not inferential—examples of such a sense being determined and enforced by the Bible, in order to elevate it to a justly recognizable rank. In this way we may, perhaps, be enabled to appreciate that overwhelming stream of scholasticism, mysticism, and spiritualism pervading our theological literature. Men laughingly refer to those enormous summaries of Divinity concocted in past ages, with their violations of Scripture language, while they themselves, unconsciously, approvingly quote and endorse in their formative theology many of the erroneous interpretations of the Thomists, Scotists, Occamites, etc. Having a system of interpretation identical in many respects with the scholastics, etc., it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to rid themselves entirely of their interpretations.[1]

Another feature must also be discarded. It has become quite fashionable with recent writers, in their efforts to find arguments against us, to practically lower the prophetical portion of the Word by placing the non-prophetical of the New Testament in the scale as far superior to the former, etc. (so *e.g.* Waldegrave, comp. Lord's *Journal*, Ap. 1857). Now, whenever a system is forced, in self-defence, to thus discriminate between the Scriptures and portions of them, exalting one part above the other as more worthy of reception or credence, instead of receiving *the whole* as standing upon the same ground of being a revelation of God's will and purpose (comp. Prop. 16), it is evidence—decisive—of weakness and imperfection. A substantial method does not need such unstable propping. Notwithstanding its plausible and authoritative air, it becomes, by its disintegrating qualities, a dangerous instrumentality. It is the weapon so freely employed by German Rationalists and others to invalidate the credibility and authority of the prophetic writings, and to graft upon them any desired meaning. To make one portion of scripture to be the sole

and exclusive arbiter and interpreter of the Bible, is subversive of the light given in a general analogy and a continuous Divine plan. Such a course is like to that of a person who, in a large room containing a number of windows, contents himself with the light of one when all are available; and then, owing to the quantity of light received, distinguishing things imperfectly, still contends that such is their true and only appearance.[1]

[1] Hence Le Roy Pope (*Modern Fancies and Follies*, p. 337) takes the position, owing to the variety of interpretation, that the true meaning of the Bible cannot be obtained from the language of Scripture, asserting: "The only light which can afford us this indispensable aid, and bring the religious world, which has gone so far astray, back to true religion, is the light of nature." But he forgets; 1. That the variety of interpretation springs not so much from the grammatical sense as from the system of spiritualizing the language; 2. That no other book must call in "the light of nature" in order to have its true sense presented; 3. That the advocates of this "light of nature" also bring in an endless variety of interpretations; 4. And that he thus makes, allowing the claims of the Bible, the lesser to be the guide and instructor of the greater.

[2] Other points worthy of notice might be presented, but we briefly advert to another, very common, viz., boldly to assert a sweeping accusation without giving any reasons or facts to sustain it. Thus *e.g.* Fairbairn (a valuable writer) *On Prophecy*, Append. G, p. 497, approvingly quotes Hengstenberg, attempting to make the literal interpretation odious, saying, "that its strongest condemnation consists in its being the very method of interpretation which led to the crucifixion of Christ." If this is its "strongest condemnation," we are abundantly satisfied to retain it. Allusion is evidently had to Jesus being charged with His being a king, etc., but let the objector bear in mind that Jesus never denied the charge, but appropriated the fact as applicable. This will be developed under its appropriate head hereafter; now it may be said, the Jews rejected the literal fulfilment of prophecy in Christ's forerunner, in Christ's birth, life, miracles, entry into Jerusalem, crucifixion, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension. The apostles accuse them of such conduct, and hence their unbelief is represented as *the more inexcusable*. Their hatred toward and their crucifixion of Christ, according to the testimony, was based neither on the literal nor the spiritual interpretation of prophecy, but on their unbelief, hardness of heart, apprehension of the people leaving them for Christ, etc., thus leading to false and malicious charges. The best possible refutation of Fairbairn is given by himself, p. 223-226 of the same work, where the literal fulfilment of prophecy is lauded, and we are told that "it is necessary to compare together prophecy and history" to see the literal authentication.

Obs. 10. In our Introductions to the Bible it is a generally admitted principle that no important doctrine should be solely based on figurative language; that to give it certainty it ought to be founded on the literal meaning of the words. This is a necessity, notwithstanding the theorizing, so much impressed, that in every promulgation of doctrine, men will instinctively feel that if they can secure the literal sense in their favor, *the strongest possible proof* is thus obtained. Why reject this when we come to the doctrine of the kingdom? Surely, if there is a doctrine in the Bible that ought to be sustained by *the clearest evidence*, it is the leading one of the kingdom. This is abundantly provided, if we will only consider and receive it. Its simplicity should not deter us; this feature ought rather to recommend it to our special notice. More than this: if we reject it we will be held responsible for the same, just as Jesus held the Jews accountable for the literal understanding of the Scriptures. We certainly are not amenable to a still "higher sense" of interpretation, whose laws are not given; and certainly we are not to be condemned for rejecting that which is said by men to be concealed, hidden under the letter, and which it is impossible to perceive in the letter by the rules

regulating that letter. Thus *e.g.* out of the many meanings engrafted upon the kingdom by the adoption of a hidden germ, etc., which sense ought we then to adopt, and what assurance have we that it is, after all, the correct one? No! we are only answerable to God's demand, how we have treated *the very letter* committed to our trust, and this obligation presses alike upon the learned and unlearned. Our doctrine, firmly adhering to one system of interpretation, is found equally in both Old and New Testament. Our opponents tell us that the Jews understood the Old Testament too literally, and in place of their belief we are informed (*Essays and Reviews*, S. 7, p. 406), that it is necessary for the salvation of the world to introduce new truths into the Old Testament in place of the old. Others plead that the primitive Church comprehended the New Testament too literally (Neander, etc.), but that this was merely a transition stage before "the husk" was thrown off and the genuine truth revealed. Once for all let us say, that as reverent believers in the Word, it is impossible to credit such explanations, condemnatory of God's Word, justice, and love, and cruelly unjust to His ancient people, as if they were in faith a deceived people, and the deception grew out of God's mode of teaching. Never can we accept, however sincere its advocates, of such consequential, evil-tending teaching. We desire not to endorse a system which, in the hands of a God-fearing man, may result in comparative little injury, but which, in the grasp of infidelity, becomes a power, widely felt, in subverting all the distinctive orthodox doctrines, the most cherished hopes of the Church, and the true idea of the kingdom of God.

The literal interpretation is especially valuable in argument. It gives the only solid foundation for the expression of opinion; for a sense that language bears upon its very surface is undoubtedly the one intended by the author, and however unwilling persons are to admit it, yet they, notwithstanding, feel its force. Even mystics, etc., in explaining the added spiritual sense, wish us to receive their own explanations in this way. To resort to added senses, engenders doubt, or impresses the mind that something evasive exists. Coleridge (*Aids to Reflection*, p. 82) justly observes that, "in arguing with infidels, or the weak in faith, it is the part of religious prudence, no less than of religious morality, to avoid whatever looks like an evasion. To retain the literal sense, whenever the harmony of Scripture permits, and reason does not forbid, is ever *the honester* and, nine times in ten, *the more rational and pregnant* interpretation. The contrary plan is an easy and approved way of getting rid of a difficulty; but, nine times in ten, a bad way of solving it." Ellicott (*Aids to Faith*, Essay 9) well says: "The true and honest method of interpreting the Word of God—*the literal, historical, and grammatical*—has been recognized in every age, and the results are seen in the agreement of numberless passages of importance that may be found in expositors of all periods," and it is this agreement, thus cemented by a common bond, that adds force in argument.

Obs. 11. All believers ask for the aid of the Spirit in understanding the Scriptures, but this aid or enlightenment is not *outside* of the scriptural truth, but *of* it. Faith, in its influence upon the heart, qualifies the believer to appreciate the Word; for its truths can only be properly estimated by him who practically receives them and experiences their power in heart and life. The higher our experience of God's promises, the more we are enabled to understand Holy Writ containing them. The Author of the Scriptures is the Spirit: we honor Him by asking His assistance to comprehend them, and such honor and reliance is only properly exhibited by *a personal study* of them. Human helps are valuable, and the Spirit will certainly (as experience testifies) use them in impressing the truth, provided the chief reliance is placed on the Scriptures them-

selves as given by Him and the moral enlightenment resulting from their reception. This distinguishes a mere student from a believer, for a man may be learned and able, and yet utterly fail to receive the truth as intended (thus failing in his apprehension), while an unlearned believer, cordially accepting and appropriating personally the Scriptures, experiences their power in his own heart and life. ("If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God," John 7 : 17); but *both* combined, learning and religious experience, elevates the man to the highest plane.

Whatever principle of interpretation is adopted, without appropriating practical faith and the resultant fruits, we cannot get the understanding that God commends. Unless the Scriptures make us "wise to salvation" (2 Tim. 2 : 15), all our theoretical knowledge is vain (*e.g.* Matt. 7 : 21-23 ; 1 Cor. 13 : 1-3, etc.), and only increases our condemnation (*e.g.* John 3 : 18, 19, and 12 : 47, 48, etc.). The grand truths contained in the plain grammatical sense must—as God intended—lead to a heart-felt obedience, with a coexistent moral, religious, spiritual influence, and then its preciousness will be self-evident. It is certain that the Christian consciousness possesses the Witness of the Spirit, but this witness is not given *independently of* the truth, but always connected therewith, and hence is evidenced in the ordinary religious experience—not by a direct but indirect, not by an immediate but mediate testimony—by the work it performs, the fruits it bestows, the experience it gives, the controlling love that it imparts. Any other view opens—as history sadly shows—the door to fanaticism and ten thousand visionary interpretations. Let us remember, that the Witness of the Spirit, the Sealing of the Spirit, the Mind which was in Christ, are all the same (comp. President Edwards' *On the Affections*), and it materially aids us in estimating the effect that the Scriptures should have upon ourselves by the Spirit's help, and in ridding ourselves of that vast body of interpretation presented to us under the claim of a special, supernatural, inward teaching of the Spirit. An observance of the rules common to language, practical sense, a due regard to the analogy of Scripture and Faith, an observance of the historical application in reference to opinions and views held, an unprejudiced mind and a heart willing, irrespective of preconceived ideas, to bring forth the real meaning and intent of the writer—these, in connection with a personal experience of the truth, are requisites to constitute a good interpreter.

PROPOSITION 5. *The doctrine of the kingdom is based on the inspiration of the Word of God.*

The authenticity and credibility of the Scriptures has been ably defended in special treatises, so that, in order to define our position, it is only necessary to give a few observations on the connection that this kingdom sustains to inspiration. At the conclusion of this work, the subject will be resumed (*e.g.* Prop. 182), and, as a result, the credibility and inspiration of the Scriptures be evidenced by the continuous Divine purpose as shown in the kingdom.

Inspiration, while including, is not based on the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible, as Froude (*Short Studies*) has noticed; it is not established even fully by miracle and prophecy, although essential to the supernatural, for all religions claim these; but it is to be found (satisfactory to reason) in a revealed Divine purpose or plan, clearly announced, carried on for ages in the form and manner previously stated, the same being recognizable at any period in the existing history of the world, etc. Hence, *e.g.*, Froude makes little of Colenso's attack on the Pentateuch and of the replies to him, asserting that the genuineness and authenticity in ascription of human authorship has no relevancy to the deeper one of inspiration. He takes the position of a writer in the *Westminster Review* that any proof (as that derived from the discoveries of Rawlinson) of the truthfulness or knowledge of the Bible record, is no proof of Divine inspiration. It must be admitted that the orthodox party have sometimes too hastily concluded the inspiration of the Word from such isolated cases (seeing that a historical fact announced in the Bible may also be one in possession of fallible man); but, on the other hand, Froude and others forget that they themselves would employ historical inaccuracy as evidence against inspiration. The latter embraces the former. The truth is, that nothing will satisfy a class of critics; prove the genuineness and authenticity, and the reply is, that such may be the case, but it still is the sole work of man; prove the inspiration from doctrine, unity, design, etc., and the answer is, that the genuineness and authenticity is not yet proven, thus refusing, what they concede to be, the greater to include the lesser. Ebrard (*Gospel Hist.*, p. 600) aptly says: "We are far from denying that there are men to whom no one could demonstrate the genuineness of the New Testament writings. He who will not believe in *the Risen One* will seek with unwearied diligence for loopholes by which he may escape from the positive proofs of the genuineness of the Gospel writings and the truth of Gospel history. The Gospel still remains to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness; and conversion and regeneration still form the porch of the understanding, even to the literary understanding, of the Scriptures. The Gospel, as Lange has well said, is so inexorably a critic to everything that springs from the flesh, that the flesh is stimulated to bring its negative criticism to bear against the Gospel in return."

Obs. 1. All that we know of the covenanted kingdom was spoken by holy men of old as they were professedly moved by the Holy Spirit. The Bible, which contains the doctrine of the kingdom, asserts this as a fact. How is this fact to be fully recognized? When the man of science looks at the long-protracted labors of nature, how, in periods far distant, in countries far apart, in century after century, she has been uniform in her work, indicating continued unity of design and purpose amid the exist-

ing diversity, he reasonably concludes that the unseen but felt (in results) laws, by which she operates and controls all things, truly exist. The invisibility of them forms no objection to believing in them, because their effects are visible and commend themselves to him as satisfactory and conclusive evidence. The uniformity of their operation, especially, forces upon him the irresistible conviction of their reality. The Bible claims *the same* treatment. It is the product of what we call "inspiration;" and it asserts that the same invisible force or power that produced this "inspiration" is constantly exerted in its verification. Now, if we test this Biblical claim as we do the invisible laws of nature, it will also be found to possess a majestic reality. But how is this test to be applied? Surely not to the invisible law itself, for that cannot be handled, but to the effects that it produces, or to the results which it accomplishes. This can be done in two ways: either to have the effects or results personally appropriated, as in nature to see, touch, taste, and feel the same, and in religion to experience its force and power by reception of the truth; or else to imitate the man of science as above indicated. Taking the latter mode: as the scientist looks at nature, so let him survey the Word, and see how men, separated by ages, countries, languages, customs, habits, education, intelligence, position and rank, have continuously unfolded a redemptive plan; how they have stated and predicted the same things with a remarkable unity amid a diversity of style, language, etc.; how, when comparison is instituted, and the additions of one are attached to the other, a unity of Divine purpose is exhibited; how this unity was preserved in the events that occurred, in the religion that was established, in the Christianity that was founded, in the personal experience of believers, in the hostility of the enemies of the truth, in the progress of the Gospel, in the internal and external aspect of the Word itself: and *then* let him give *an adequate cause* for all these results. It has become prevalent in some quarters to leave the prophetical portion of the Word out of the question, on the ground that it would be difficult to show, either that the events were not antecedent to prediction, or that man had not shaped their course influenced by previous prophecy. Without yielding the solid and unanswerable arguments based on *the past* fulfilment of prophecy (to which God appeals), uttered as it was hundreds of years previously and fulfilled in persons and nations unconscious of their anterior defined destiny, we ask the reader to consider *the present* results of professedly inspired prophecy. Does not prophecy find its mate *to-day?* Look at prophecy what it foretells, and is it not verified in the continued present removal of the Jews from their land, in their scattering among the nations, in the existing times of the Gentiles, in Jerusalem and Palestine remaining under Gentile control, down-trodden and sadly cursed, in the Arabs continuing in their semi-civilized condition, in the existing Turkish rule, in the divided state and headless condition of the Roman Empire, in the Church with its institutions and ordinances, the gathering of an elect, the Antichrists or characters and powers portrayed in their antagonism. Compare these and similar fulfilments with the Record, and are they not described as things that shall occur; delineated too by writers, some of whom lived thousands of years and others at least eighteen hundred years ago; and realized in persons and nations who either know nothing of the predictions, or care nothing about them, or deny their credibility. If these things exist, and stand thus related to the Word, is

it unreasonable to admit the claim of that Word—viz., that they were foretold by God through men who were inspired by God, and thus enabled to give them through the medium of language. Man himself has no power to foresee the distant future; God alone possesses it, and in aiding man respecting the unknown, He gives play to what is called "inspiration"—which is, an employing of powers and language, already existing, in stating Divine things, or things known only to God. Such a line of argument, briefly indicated, alone convinces us that the Bible is an inspired book, confirmed, as it is, by its reasonableness, necessity, historical and moral unity, worthiness of the Divine character, tendency and perfection.

These are given in Horne's *Introduction*, Birk's *Bible and Modern Thought*, Stowe's *Books of the Bible*, Christlieb's *Modern Doubt*, Elliott's *Treatise*, Alexander's *Evidences*, Spring's *Bible Not of Man*, Butler's *Analogy*, etc. We are old-fashioned enough to believe, with the primitive Church and a long line of revered names, that inspiration was confined to a few chosen individuals (2 Tim. 3 : 16; Acts 1 :16; 2 : 30; Heb. 3 : 7; 9 : 8; 10 : 15; 1 Pet. 1 : 11; 2 Pet. 1 :21, etc.), that instead of being general it was exceptional, confined to a limited number. And, moreover, so wedded are we to "the old ways," that we believe that the highest possible proof of inspiration is that found in a personal appropriation of the truth, so that self-consciousness impressed by happy experience testifies in its favor. And in addition, we believe, on the one hand, that if the heart is indisposed to obedience all the reasoning in the world cannot change it to receive the Word as inspired; and, on the other, that a heart can be unaffected even when reason accepts of the Word as given by God. In reference to the latter unhappy class, it may be well said, in the expressive language of Bernard (*Bampton Lec., The Progress of Doctrine*, closing of Lec. 3d): "Does it wound our hearts to see this wondrous record misapprehended, its unity denied, its glory darkened? Perhaps it is a sadder sight in the eye of Heaven, when its inspiration is vindicated, its perfection appreciated, its majesty asserted by one who at the same time neglects the great salvation. Such a case is not impossible, perhaps is not uncommon. The day will declare it. At least, let it be remembered, that the study of the testimony is one thing, and the enjoyment of the salvation is another, and that the record of the things which Jesus did and said has attained its end with those only who believing have life through His name."

Obs. 2. The doctrine of the kingdom is based on inspiration, because it is a doctrine which, as delineated, we ourselves, unaided, could never have produced and developed. It embraces (Prop. 2.) a Divine purpose or plan, extending from creation into the eternal ages. The things pertaining to the kingdom contain facts, preparatory stages, historical connections, relations to the future, ideas above human capacity, that could not possibly have been known if God had not revealed them. The kingdom is simply that which the Almighty designs to have accomplished as *the grand result* of the Divine economy. From the nature of it, its dependence upon God, its being the work of God and not of man, its having a theocratic king, we must go to God Himself to learn *what it is, and how it shall be manifested.* Man can only throw light on it as he gives us the ideas of Him who designed its establishment. The thoughts, purposes, and works of the Creator are not ours, and can only be known and appreciated to the extent in which He has deemed it proper to disclose them. Realizing this, we cannot do otherwise than consider an appeal, if well grounded, to the Scriptures on the subject, or a statement given by the Bible respecting the kingdom, as the essential proof required. Our belief has thus something to rest upon that does not come from fallible man, but from Him who overrules all things. An authoritative argument is, therefore, only founded on *the express language* of Scripture; and to

it, consequently, application will be made, claiming that only *in so far* as the words of God are produced in substantiation of our doctrine, is assent also to be given. The ground of such a position and claim lies in the fact that "the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2 : 11), and that hence man can only know them as that Spirit has divulged them. Believing that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3 : 16), that "holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1 : 21), our doctrine is exclusively derived from such inspired Scriptures. Through our entire argument this will be our posture, and finally in the concluding propositions, after having passed over the record, there will be submitted to the reader, as one of the strongest proofs of inspiration, the harmony and intimate connection existing in the historical progression relating to, and the doctrinal unity of, the kingdom.

There is no half-way house on the inspiration of the prophets, the utterances pertaining to doctrine and the Will of God. It is a dimming of the gold, a mere praising of the counterfeit, for persons to profess to accept of the utterances of Jesus and the sayings of the prophets under the color of a universal human or intellectual inspiration, to eulogize the same most highly, and yet deny a Divine inspiration. This, too, is done for purposes that are dishonorable ; it proving an insidious and expert way to undermine Christianity. Simple honesty and integrity demand that such utterances and sayings should be received under the claim assumed of being divinely inspired, or else they should be rejected with the already declined belief in such inspiration. Alas, many are critical only to find fault, friendly only to stab more severely, lauding only to lower and demoralize ; these are prevalent characteristics of the present day. Transformations into religious forms of thought, but meaning naturalistic things ; professed worship of the divine but denoting nature ; reverence for law and redemption but referring to the inexorable, immutable laws of the universe and human progress—these and similar phases are exhibited in those who magnify inspiration, but mean by it intellectual power or the force of genius. A careful perusal of the books of such writers leaves the decided impression that all such would greatly rejoice in the downfall of Christianity. The laudation of such authors by the Church is a weakness ; for while disinclined to treat them with scorn or abuse, yet those who dishonor Christ in this way deserve—however they may praise Christ as a mighty genius, Reformer, etc.—no eulogy from believers. If the Scriptures are to be received at all, they must, in consistency, be received *as the Word of God*. This, and this reiterated, is their foundation, and it cannot be ignored or transformed. And this too should not be applied to any other book ; hence those theories which extend inspiration to eminent men are antagonistic to the truth. Recently, in an edition of Bunyan's works, we are gravely told : "Bunyan's thoughts are inspiration of God," an idea which Bunyan would have rejected as abhorrent. The *Christian Union* (May 21st, 1877) makes inspiration to be in all things created, and it "runs through all ages, all climes, all nations." It scouts the idea of inspiration being exceptional, and says : "The Bible is more than a work of genius ; it is the work of God, but of God speaking in the experiences of the devoutest and best instructed souls ; of a God who is not merely here and there, in special men and places, but is All in all." This Pio-pantheistic theory is very prevalent. The looseness with which "inspiration" is attributed to all believers—the same in kind, but probably not in degree, that was given to holy men of old—is well illustrated in Beecher's sermon (*Christian Union*, April 10th, 1878), "Inspiration Immanent and Universal." We reproduce but a sentence : "So then, when you ask me if the inspiration which men receive from God nowadays is the same which men received from Him in olden times, I say that it is the same in kind. If you ask me, whether it is the same in authority, I say yes, so far as their own conduct is concerned," etc. Compare a criticism of Morell's *Philosophy of Religion* (*North Brit. Review*, August, 1849), who, while rejecting the extreme of Gerhard, Buxtorf, and others (who made even the vowel points inspired), falls into the opposite one of making inspiration to consist, not in the communication of God's will but in reception. What distinction can be drawn between such utterances, and those of confirmed unbelief, as expressed *e.g.* in F. W. Newman's *History of the Hebrew Monarchy*, or Greg's *Creed of Christendom*, which make inspiration to be a sort of

"divine afflatus" peculiar to all men, specially believers and men of genius. Thus Greg (p. 226 and 235) remarks: "When it is His will that mankind should make some great step forward, should achieve some pregnant discovery, He calls into being some cerebral organization of more than ordinary magnitude, as that of David, Isaiah, Plato, Shakespeare, Bacon, Newton, Luther, Pascal, which gives birth to new ideas and grander conceptions of the truths vital to humanity." "In a true and simple, but not orthodox sense, we believe all the pure, wise, and mighty in soul to be inspired, and to be inspired for the instruction and elevation of mankind." As illustrated in Greg himself. This is but a reproduction of Parker, who affirmed: "It (inspiration) is coextensive with the faithful use of man's natural powers. Now this inspiration is limited to no sect, age, or nation. It is wide as the world, and common as God. It is not given to a few men in the infancy of the world to monopolize inspiration and bar God out of the soul."

Obs. 3. Deny the inspiration of the Word, and then it becomes merely the word or conjecture of man. The kingdom predicted in its pages may then fail, because man is liable to mistake. It also will not answer to save inspiration by the principle of accommodation (Farmer), or by arbitrary exegesis(Storr), or by moral interpretation (Kant), or by allegorical interpretation (Steir), or by pan-harmonic exposition (German), or by confining it to essentials (Herder), or by embracing mere belief and elevation of soul (De Wette), or by making it talent developed by speculation (Schelling), or by constituting it a rational spirit which receives more and more its due form in succeeding works (Billroth), or by contending for a verbal inspiration (Dick), or by restricting it to intuitional truths (Morell), or by identifying it with genius under the influence of truth (Parker)—because none of these find a support either in the grammatical sense, or in the declarations respecting inspiration in the record itself, or in the contents of the Scripture taken as a whole. Formerly, too, inspiration was utterly denied and derided by infidels; at present, under the assumed leverage of comparative religion, they have shifted their ground, and in numerous works admit that it is inspired, but with the same kind of inspiration that accompanies all truth and all human efforts; some even adding, that men have existed and now exist who possess this inspiration to a greater degree than the prophets and apostles. Some, through a refined pantheistic theorizing, make it to proceed from God and loudly boast of their God-given, Spirit-derived inspiration. While all this profession and misuse of old terms cannot affect the intelligent believer, it is eminently calculated to deceive and mislead the multitude. What makes the rebutting of such claims the more difficult is the unfortunate and ill-considered position occupied by otherwise able leaders of Christianity. On the one hand, the extreme so strenuously contended for by some, that even the words themselves were inspired,[1] is evidently burdening inspiration with a load that is unnecessary. Indeed, in the light of the modest introduction of Luke (1 : 1–3), the request of Paul for his MSS. and cloak, the personal references of Paul and John, the salutations, the special (1 Tim. 5 : 23) recommendation to Timothy, the unimportant variations in the gospels, the differences in MSS., no two being exactly alike, the retention of a distinctive personal style, the difference of relation of the same event—these things, dispassionately considered, go far to show that we must not necessarily assume that every word or sentence is inspired. On the other hand, the concessions made by many intrude doubt and undermine confidence in the credibility and inspiration of the Old and New Testaments. Some *e.g.* maintain that only a small

portion is directly inspired, the rest being of human origin ; others, that the record that we now have is given from recollection of a previous inspired one ; some, that the main truths were given by revelation but are incorporated with much that is human appended to it, including even error ; others, that the inspiration only consisted in a restraining influence from error in general, or a guidance into truth without removing the possibility of falling into error ; some that the moral portion is alone inspired (which some contend is an inspiration common to all religions); others, that it only consists in the Divine approval and adoption of writings composed by men, because of the important truths contained. The most fanciful conjectures, without proof, are submitted as theories to satisfy the demands of inspiration.[1] The only safe conclusion to which a believer in the Word can come, amid the variety of conflicting opinions and on a subject which certainly has its difficulties, is to adhere to the utterances of the Word itself concerning it, and to frame a definition which neither exceeds nor lessens the extent given to it by Scripture. There is no reason why the definition given (*e.g.* by Horne, vol. 1, *Introd.* p. 92) long ago should be discarded—viz., that it is "the imparting such a degree of Divine assistance, influence, or guidance, as should enable the authors of the Scriptures to communicate religious knowledge to others, without error or mistake, whether the subjects of such communications were things then immediately revealed to those who declared them, or things with which they were before acquainted." A definition which embraces the ideas taught, freedom from error, an essential unity in teaching, sufficiently covers the ground.[2] Taking the Scriptures as they teach, we must, if believers in the same, receive them as given, even under the peculiar style, learning, disposition, etc., of the writers, through a Divine guidance and aid, so that they contain revelations imparted, through human mediums, by the Holy Spirit ; and that the ideas or truths are portrayed in words familiar to the writers, and sufficiently precise in expression to give a correct meaning to what God intended. Taking such a view, it is not necessary to insist that every specific word or phrase or sentence is directly inspired ; that God gave no freedom to the writer in choice of language, and no latitude in the manner of conveying ideas. There may even here be an exception. In covenants, promises, distinctive prophecies, etc., asserted to come directly from God in messages to individuals, we may reasonably affirm, that being of special importance and significance, and coming thus from God, the ideas themselves would be clad in language suggested by the Spirit. The longer a student compares Scripture with Scripture, the more will he become impressed that even in the very language of the more important and essential portions of the Word a peculiar care has been exercised in their choice, resulting in a harmony that cannot otherwise be explained.[4]

[1] Thus *e.g.* Baylee, *Verbal Inspiration*, Tregelles in Preface to *The Book of Revelation*, Gaussen's *Theopneustie*, Haldane's *Verbal Inspiration*, Lord's *Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures*, and others. "The Believer's Meeting for Bible Study" laid down (*The Truth*, vol. 4, No. 10, p. 452) the following as essential : "We believe 'that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' by which we understand the whole of the book called the Bible ; nor do we take the statement in the sense in which it is sometimes foolishly said that works of human genius are inspired, but in the sense that the Holy Ghost gave *the very words* of the sacred writings to holy men of old ; and that His divine inspiration is not in different degrees, but extends equally and fully to all parts of these writings, historical, poetical, doctrinal, and prophetical, and to *the smallest*

word and inflection of a word, provided such word is found in the original manuscripts. 2 Tim. 3 : 16, 17 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 21 ; 1 Cor. 2 : 13 ; Mark 12 : 26, 36, and 13 : 11 ; Acts 1 : 16, and 2 : 4." These brethren, avoiding one extreme, certainly fall into another by pressing the word "all" (comp. usage in Scripture) to denote "the very words" and "the smallest word and inflection of a word," thus loading the doctrine of inspiration with a burden that the Word *does not* impose. The statements in the Obs. already indicate this, but it may be added, that the repetitions of the same ideas (said to have been delivered at the same time and place, and stated to have been given "in these words"), with decided verbal discrepancies, show that the thought was inspired and some latitude (covering style, personal peculiarities) was allowed to its expression—the sense is the same, although differently expressed. Moreover if this verbal theory be correct, then it plunges us into the greatest difficulties to ascertain what is Scripture or inspired. No translations can be really the Word of God, for the words in which the same was given are replaced by a substitution. More than this: what original MS. is then authoritative and infallible, seeing that no two (of the ancient) are alike in their verbal statements. (It seems to the writer that if the theory were true, then God would have providentially preserved a sufficient number of MSS. to be indicative of the fact.) The reason assigned by Lord, Carson, and others, in favor of verbal inspiration being founded on the supposition that thoughts are only conveyed in words, is sufficiently met by various writers, *e.g.* article on "Inspiration" in M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopædia. Rev. Dr. Sprecher (*Groundwork of Theol.*, p. 383, etc.) rejects a mere mechanical theory and adopts "the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures, as extending to words as well as things," but he explains and modifies as follows: "The Bible, with all its ideas and all its words, is God's book of revelation; that is, He so moved, influenced, controlled, and used the faculties, the mode of thought, and the style of language of the sacred writers, as to make them His organs through which to give a written revelation of His Word, of the plan of salvation. They did not speak as they were *dictated to*, but they did speak as they *were moved* by, the Holy Ghost." He thus unites the human and divine elements in a definition, which he thinks (p. 385 and 389) is consistent with "the little discrepancies and inaccuracies which some think they see in the minor details of historical circumstances, etc." Being "moved by the Holy Ghost" does not necessarily imply that the Holy Ghost, in all cases, taught or dictated the identical words used, for it seems that in connection with inspiration (guarding the truths pertaining to salvation) an inspired man could, as Paul evidences, introduce matter suggested by his own mind (*e.g.*, in reference to marriage, greetings, remembrances, direction to Timothy respecting his health, requests concerning personal matters). Our position is fortified by Luke's introduction to his Gospel; by the liberty allowed (preserving the idea) of quoting from the Septuagint when differing (thus indicating mere human origin unless the translators were also divinely inspired, which no one affirms) from the Hebrew; by the differing phraseology in which the same language (said to have been uttered at the same time) and the same events are recorded; by the compression of detailed matter previously given; and by the manner in which some of the writers refer to their own writings, claiming a distinct personality in their construction.

[2] It is a sad illustration of human infirmity to notice not only how inspiration has been interpreted, but even claimed from the earliest period down to the Spiritualists and Parker school. Between those who claimed (Prop. 4, Obs. 3 and notes) the direct Divine influences of the Holy Spirit, and Parker (*Discourses*, p. 160–5), who asserted that God, more or less, inspires all men, there are indeed great diversities, but they can all be traced back to a mystical, transcendental, Gnostical element held in common. They differ only as to the agency employed and the degree experienced. Parker, *e.g.* would undoubtedly recoil from the extravagances of the Philadelphian Society established by Pordage (1651), the mummeries of Antoinette Bourignon, Jane Lead, Poiset, Hoker, "the navel light" or illuminations mentioned by Dr. Young (Stilling), the vagaries of the French prophets (1708–30), the Irvingites, the Inspiration Congregation of Wetteraw (Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 277), the Shakers, the Mormons, Swedenborgians, Inspirationists of Iowa (Nordhoff's *Communistic Societies*), etc., but they all held to an "inward vision"—a reception of the divine—and this is precisely what Parker and others do, only in an ordinary manner and not in the extraordinary asserted by these enthusiasts. The difference is, that the one occupies a lower plane than the other, but they all agree that outside of the Bible, in their own persons, through a divine bestowal, they also have inspiration. All that profess themselves to be inspired and not entirely dependent upon the inspiration of the Word, can be legitimately placed in the same category. The Renan, Parker idea of inspiration is only a revival of an old opinion. The Spiritualists claim that through their mediums and writers they obtain "Living Gospels from

Modern Saints." A specimen can be seen in Davis' *Sacred Gospels of Arabula*, forming *Inspirations of Original Saints*. Owen, the most moderate, still asserts (*Deb. Land*, p. 242, etc.), that this continued inspiration may be mixed with error. The London *Spiritual Magazine* has for its motto: "It (Spiritualism) recognizes a continuous divine inspiration in man." A convention of Spiritualists at Rochester, N.Y., September, 1862, in a resolution said: "That no inspired communication in this or any other age (whatever claims may be or have been set up as to its source) is authoritative any further than it expresses truth to the individual consciousness—which last is the final standard to which all inspired or spiritual teaching must be brought for judgment. That inspiration, or the influx and promptings from the spiritual realm, is not a miracle of a past age, but a perpetual fact, the ceaseless method of the divine economy for human elevation." The *Lyceum* (Toledo, O., vol. 1, No. 11) says inspiration is a product of "the immortal souls of mortal men," and says that instead of ceasing, "inspiration has increased, for man has attained higher spiritual development than he enjoyed in past ages." There is a large and growing class of able writers (Dean Stanley, Robertson, Service, Jukes, Brown, etc.), who endeavor to soften down and apologize for numerous statements in the Word, on the ground of making allowance for the age, the traits of character of the writers, ignorance, etc. To illustrate: Mozley's *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, and their Relation to Old Testament Faith*, interprets the Old Testament in such a manner, in accommodation to prevailing beliefs influencing the writers, that we must often reject the letter, but still can—if we wish to—hold fast to the spirit. This sets aside all inspiration, excepting that which is common to all books. German destructive critics, in order to eulogize and magnify Naturalism (which to them is a sufficient divinity), teach a "Natural Inspiration," because it can be made subservient to the removal of the supernatural and miraculous element. "Broad Church Liberalism" in *The Monthly Religious Magazine*, (quoted *Princeton Review*, January, 1861, p. 84) lauds the writers of *Essays and Reviews*, whose pernicious tendencies are so apparent and widespread, and gives the epitome of their teaching: "Their doctrine is, that the race is a collective man, to outgrow, in time, the regulative discipline of childhood, and be moved by the spirit within, and not subject to authority without; that the Bible is not a book of plenary inspiration, or Christianity a universal religion, specially authenticated in Palestine; but that God inspires men ever and anywhere; that there is only one kind of inspiration, and all good men have it, as well as prophets and apostles; and that the doctrines of the Church, such as the Trinity and the fall of man, are to be held in the light of a 'philosophical rendering.'" Gail Hamilton (*What think ye of Christ?*) affirms an inspiration common to all men, and gives us no infallible, authoritative Word. Greg (*The Creed of Christendom*) allows that in religious doctrine the writers may have been guarded against error, but even vitiates this by allowing human judgment to decide what is, or is not, inspired. Thus writers from the earliest period down to Priestley, and from him to Renan, have either denied inspiration, or made it universal, or attached to it such limitations as practically to lessen our confidence in scripture statements. This work is widening and extending, men and women, talented and learned, unbelievers and professedly believers, are engaged in it, presenting definitions and distinctions which are designed to undermine and destroy the teaching of the Word.

[3] For alleged error and discrepancies, see works like Horne's *Introd.*, Birks' *Bible and Mod. Thought*, etc., specially devoted to their consideration. The argument of this work is intended to develop from the doctrine of the kingdom alone, a sufficient proof for inspiration in the remarkable unity of doctrinal teaching, and of the revealed Divine Purpose. This materially confirms the reasoning of Birks, Horne, etc., and also shows that the variations of MSS. (pointed out by the warmest friends of inspiration, but now seized by destructive criticism) are only incidental in transmission, and do not affect a single doctrine. As illustrative of the diversity of views entertained, the reader's attention is called to the six articles on the question "What is Inspiration?" in the *North American Review* (1879). Rev. Dr. Hedges' view virtually degrades the Bible, for, making inspiration to be equivalent to faith and its expression, or the outgrowth of a divine higher life, he reaches this conclusion: "There are other Bibles than those which contain the records and the types of the Jewish and Christian faiths." This leaves us no authoritative and infallible rule. Rev. Dr. Washburn denies a verbal inspiration; waives the question "What is Inspiration?" and simply appeals to Christian experience as evidencing inspiration. Rev. Giles makes inspiration to consist in the truths revealed by the Lord to man, and "a man is inspired when the Lord takes such possession of his mind and utterance, that he writes or speaks what the Lord commands him; and what he so writes or speaks is divine truth in natural forms." He does not sufficiently discriminate between inspiration and its resultant, and attaches to his view the Swedenbor-

gian idea of "correspondences." Rev. Newman affirms inspiration to be "a divine revelation" which did not depress or silence the individuality of the sacred writers, and which led into all truth. Sometimes the thought was divine and the language human; again in some instances so direct was the influence of the Spirit that both thought and language were divinely impressed; and then again utterances were given without divine aid, "as when St. Paul expressed his intention to visit Spain but was providentially hindered, as when he had forgotten whether he had 'baptized any other,' as when St. John expressed the uncertainty of hope: 'I hope to come to you.'" The sacred writers were aided in "recollection," in "suggestion," and in "revelation," and this assistance presents us with an infallible record. The article is excellent, and the only serious objection to be urged against it, is, that he allows a continuation of inspiration by the same Spirit down to the present day, which (however guarded by the expression, 'No original truth has been given since John wrote his Apocalypse") is too much in favor of unbelieving, and special Spirit-derived, claims. The fifth article, by the Most Rev. Gibbons (Archb. of Baltimore) says: "To the question 'What is Inspiration?' a Catholic theologian would answer, that it is a supernatural help whereby God, at various times, down to the end of the Apostolic age, enlightened the minds of certain men that they might know the truths which He wished to deliver in writing to His Church, and moved their wills to write them and nothing else. Thus raised to a supernatural level, these penmen, through divine assistance, fulfilled with unerring accuracy the counsel of God, and consequently is He truly said to be the author of these books." (The critical student will be interested in noticing that he expressly asserts that no books, saving those thus given, whatever truth they may contain, can become Scripture and thus infallible authority—and that inspiration is limited "to the end of the Apostolic age." How this bears upon making tradition authoritative with the Scriptures is easily seen, and how it opposes the claim of his Church to continued inspiration can readily be appreciated.) The article is excellent in many respects and ably meets some of the erroneous statements made in the previous ones, but is vitiated by making the Church the infallible interpreter of the inspired Word. The last article, by John Fiske, is from the unbelieving stand-point, and makes the Bible the work of fallible men, denying divine inspiration and refusing to look at the Scriptures as a whole. These and other attempts to define inspiration remind us that since the Scriptures are silent as to the *modus operandi*, any effort to explain must simply remain conjecture. Whatever truth there might pertain to degrees in inspiration or to no degrees (simply quantity—so Whately) in the same, to superintendence, suggestion, direct revelation, invigoration of memory, etc., one thing is self-evident that the Scriptures themselves claim—what we must allow—a Plenary (*i.e.*, full, complete) Inspiration, which being miraculous, is, as to mode, above our comprehension, but commends itself to us by *its results* as evidenced in the book itself, in the history of mankind, and in the personal experience of believers. (Comp. the writings, on inspiration, of Elliott, Candlish, Harris, Eadie, Henderson, Wescott, Dick, Lord. The North Brit. Review, Nov. 1st, 1852, Browne, Ellicott, Woods, Haldane, etc.)

[4] Dean Alford's (Gr. Test.) view of Inspiration, thus amended, seems to be near the truth. Such an emendation is required by the greater importance of such portions over others. Thus *e.g.* in the Covenant the singular "seed" is purposely chosen instead of the plural form, which would the most naturally suggest itself to man. The singular is remarkably significant, and, as traced, demanded in God's plan. Prof. Christlieb in his address, "*Mod. Infidelity.*" before the Ch. Alliance, has some good remarks on Inspiration and also discriminates between portions of the Word. Compare Horne's *Introd.* Ap. vol. 1, p. 443, etc., Knapp's *Theol.*, Birks' *Bible and Mod. Thought*, Van Oosterzee's *Ch. Dogmatics*, etc. The human element must not be discarded, just as little as the language employed, but while this presents us peculiar, distinctive traits and characteristics, it at the same time includes freedom from positive error. Hence Bp. Goodwin's concession that inspiration may be consistent with inaccuracy in physics, etc., must be rejected; for no inspired book can contain decided error, although, without explaining, it may employ language and ideas, as currently understood and comprehended, which, from a purely scientific view, is not scientifically correct. This is done, more or less, by all writers, and is an accommodation to the human element. Hence Webster's and Wilkenson's (*Introd. Gr. Test.*) definition is objectionable: "It will be understood, that an inspiration which may be truly characterized as direct, personal, independent, plenary, is consistent with the use of an inferior or provincial dialect, with ignorance of scientific facts and other secular matters, with mistakes in historical allusions or references, and mistakes in conduct, and with circumstances forming discrepancies between inspired persons in relating discourses, conversations, or events." We fail to see how all this can be consistent with inspiration. If true, it leaves us no infallible guide. The truth lies in a due

medium between those extreme views, recognizing the human element on the one hand, and on the other the Divine, and the latter as so controlling that nothing is presented to justify decided error.

Prof. Stowe (*The Books of the Bible*, p. 19) after stating that the Bible is not a specimen of God's skill as a writer, adds: "It is not the words of the Bible that were inspired; it is not the thoughts of the Bible that were inspired; it is the men who wrote the Bible that were inspired. Inspiration acts not on the man's words, not on the man's thoughts, but on the man himself; so that he, by his own spontaneity, under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, conceives certain thoughts and gives utterance to them in certain words, both the words and thoughts receiving the peculiar impress of the mind which conceived and uttered them, and being in fact just as really his own, as they could have been if there had been no inspiration at all in the case. The birth and nature of Christ afford an exact illustration. The holy Infant in the womb of the Virgin, though begotten of God directly without any human father (as it was said, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee')—this Infant lived by his mother's life, and grew by the mother's growth, and partook of the mother's nature, and was just as much her child as he could have been if Joseph had been his father, the human and the divine in most intimate and inseparable conjunction. It is this very fact of the commingled and inseparable union of the human and divine which constitutes the utility, which makes out the adaptedness to the wants of men, both of the incarnation of Christ and of the gift of the Word. Inspiration generally is a purifying and an elevation and an intensification of the human intellect subjectively rather than an objective suggestion and communication; though suggestion and communication are not excluded."

Obs. 4. Occupying this position at the outset, we insist upon it that the apostles were fully and accurately acquainted with the doctrine of the kingdom, *i.e.*, as to its nature, and hence were qualified to teach it. Aside from their being specially called to preach the kingdom, this inspiration influence bestowed upon them (*e.g.*, Luke 12 : 12, John 16 : 13, 14, 15, Luke 24 : 49, 1 Cor. 2 : 12, 13, Eph. 3 : 4, 1 Pet. 1 : 12, etc.) would *most certainly* preserve them from error on this great, leading subject of the Bible. This becomes the more important, seeing that unbelievers, on all sides, declare that they were mistaken, pointing to the history of the Church as proof; and that many of the greatest Christian Apologists (Neander, etc.) admit that they misconceived the subject, misapprehended the doctrine, and refer us to the same history as evidence, but endeavor to save the credit of the apostles by a philosophical development theory. The express declarations of the apostles themselves that they were guided by the Spirit, the positive promises given to them to guide them into the truth, forbid our receiving such estimates of the apostles' knowledge. While they undoubtedly could receive additional revelation from time to time as circumstances demanded, yet this has nothing to do with their knowledge of the nature of the kingdom. The gospel of the kingdom was preached by them before and after the death of Jesus; it was a familiar subject, leading and fundamental, and therefore one that *they must have known sufficiently* to describe it without mistake or decided error. The object of this work of ours is to show this, by an appeal to Scripture, receiving the plain grammatical sense as our guide, and thus vindicate the inspired teaching of the apostles both against the charges of infidels and the unwarranted concessions of Apologists. The reader, after passing over the entire proof presented, can see for himself whether this is successfully done or not. It would be premature to decide on the amount of knowledge possessed by the apostles respecting the nature of the kingdom, without first allowing the testimony contained in the Bible to be duly considered and weighed.

There is a large and growing class of works (like *e.g.* Draper's, Leckey's, etc.) which endeavors to break the force of Scriptural inspiration by caricaturing Religion and Christianity. The latter are made synonymous with bigotry, intolerance, superstition, ignorance, and persecution, and this caricature—which is not Christianity—is attacked and in their own way satisfactorily demolished. The unreflecting—who never consider that inspiration itself long before foretold these things and warned us against them—are impressed by the illogical reasoning and deductions. It is sufficient to say that all the painful evidences of human infirmity and passion, so learnedly paraded by these men, are most pointedly condemned by inspiration. (In view of this, Cook—*Lects. on Biology*, p. 183—calls Draper's "*His. of Conflict*," etc., "a most painfully unfair volume." Fiske in *the Unseen World*—himself an unbeliever—severely criticises Draper's method, saying: "the word 'religion' is to him a symbol which stands for unenlightened bigotry or narrow-minded unwillingness to look facts in the face," adding: "it is nevertheless a very superficial conception, and no book which is vitiated by it can have much philosophical value.") The perversions and misinterpretations of Christianity are not Christianity; the tares mixed with the wheat do not change the latter; religion because abused and distorted is not the less a reality; the multitude (Matt. 7:22, 23, etc.) who simply profess to do God's will and do it not, only stand in contrast (Matt. 7:24-27, etc.) with "the few" (Matt. 7:14; 20:16, etc.) that are truly obedient and faithful.

Obs. 5. The reader, also, is urged to suspend his judgment until he comes to the majestic end designed by the kingdom of God, received in its strict grammatical sense. Unbelief is not willing to wait until the mystery of God is finished; it is not desirous of contemplating the grand end designed; it is afraid to study the Divine plan as unfolded in this doctrine of the kingdom to its consummation, but (as Strauss, Bauer, Renan, Froude, etc.) criticises details without noticing their connection with the end contemplated, and rejects the whole without due examination because of alleged flaws in the individual parts. The *design* intended is kept out of view, and the *Divine plan* which binds all together is sedulously ignored. The building which God determines to erect is not observed, but attention is directed exclusively to the material gathered, the preparations made, etc., without observing the architectural plan and the connection that such gathering and preparation sustain to the end. Is this wise or prudent? Is it doing justice to the Word of God? Perfection, completeness, is not found in transmissions, transcriptions, translations, human language, details, etc., but only when the whole plan, entire design, is received. It has been justly observed by Martensen (*Ch. Dog.*, p. 77), that "the teleological is the fundamental category of thought in its developed state," and "in its deepest significance it is the category of Christianity itself." The deepest thinkers take this ground, that immediate causes or present agencies must be considered as moved "by the eternal rational ends" which God purposed, and that we cannot even properly appreciate present realities without looking into the future to see what results are to be gained by them. This gives prophecy—which points to the end to be attained—and eschatology—which portrays the end—a deep significance and prominency.

Apologists (*e.g.* Row, *Ch. Evid.*, p. 92, etc.) have well stated that Christianity differs from all other religions in that it is based on the personal life of its Founder, and not, as others, on mere dogmatic teaching. The founders of other religions (over whom unbelief professes to go into ecstacies, provided they can be employed to disparage the life of Jesus) may be left out of their respective systems without affecting them, but Jesus, "the Christ," cannot possibly be removed without destroying Christianity. Upon this fact, valuable proof corroborating Divine inspiration is based. But we assert that the doctrine of the Theocratic Kingdom, in which Jesus is the central figure, brings forth equally forcible evidence in behalf of the same, seeing that in this kingdom exists the

realization of that for which He came, labored, died, etc., and for which He shall return again. The apologetic argument limits itself too much to the past and present, and overlooks the life of David's Son in His own inheritance as predicted; whereas we extend our view to the future life as portrayed to us in this kingdom, and, from *the perfected Redemption and the consummated Glory* revealed, draw forth additional reasons favoring the special inspiration of God's Word. We admire the admirable spirit of Ellicott (*Aids to Faith*, Ep. 9—Comp. Ep. 8), who makes inspiration to embrace such an influence of the Spirit that the will and counsels of God are made a matter of knowledge, so that through the human media the truth is made recognizable, and that, while the individuality of the writer is conserved, the subject matter is presented in the fittest manner consistent with its commendation and reception. But to show—as in the doctrine of the kingdom—the Will and Counsel of God as fitted in all respects to commend itself to our reception, because most wonderfully adapted to man's necessities, to society's need, to a nation's want, to the Church's help and exaltation, to the saint's happiness, and to God's honor and glory—is forcibly extending such a definition in the line indicated by it. This we propose to perform.

PROPOSITION 6. *The kingdom of heaven is intimately connected with the supernatural.*

The whole Bible, whose leading theme is the kingdom, is grounded on the supernatural. Remove this, and you destroy, if not the book itself, the chief characteristic, the distinguishing excellency of the Scriptures.

By "the Supernatural" we include both the existence of God as the great First Cause of all things, and that He is able to, and does, work above, in and through what are known as "the laws of Nature." It is more than "the Superhuman," since the latter is found in Nature itself (*i.e.*, in exerting powers, introducing forces, and bringing forth results beyond man's ability and comprehension), while the former exists independent of Nature (*i.e.*, the seen and experienced in Creation) and yet sustains to the Natural a most intimate relationship as its framer and upholder.

Obs. 1. The Word begins with the supernatural (the presence of God) and the natural in harmony. It shows how an antagonism was produced, causing the withdrawal of the supernatural from the sight of man, and yet how in mercy it at times exhibited itself to man, in and through and for man, especially in giving revelations of its will. It even condescends, in order to secure redemption, to veil itself in humanity and manifest the fact by suitable demonstrations. It indicates its presence by fulfilment of predictions and promises, by the conversion of men, by the existence of the Church, by the consciousness of man excited in contact with truth and providence. It will, in a still more striking and direct way, exhibit itself in the future, after all the preliminary preparations are made, in order to fulfil the remainder of Holy Writ. Now the kingdom being designed to restore and manifest the original concord once existing between the natural and supernatural, the Bible closes with that kingdom *in such accordance.* Without the supernatural the kingdom *cannot* be produced, for it requires, as predicted, *a supernatural king,* who has been provided in a supernatural manner, and rulers who have experienced a supernatural transforming power. Even in its conception and the preparatory measures, as well as in its final manifestation, is it indissolubly bound with the Divine. Death, which is to be destroyed in it, tears, which are to be wiped away in it, nature which is to be fashioned anew in it, these, as well as a multitude of other promises, *can never* be realized without the attending supernatural. The kingdom and the supernatural cannot possibly be dissevered. The inception of it arises from the supernatural, and under the guidance of the same, consistently with human freedom, not only revelations are given, manifestations of its reality are vouchsafed, exhibitions of its power are foreshown, but that all these are mere shadowings, foretastes of a living, vital relationship, now invisibly maintained, which shall ultimately *be visibly shown* in the kingdom itself by affinity no longer concealed, owing to the mediumship of a glorified humanity,

which serves as the connecting link between the visible and invisible. The supernatural is held in abeyance as to its outward manifestation until the time arrives for the restoration of the forfeited blessing, the personal dwelling of God with man, which will be experienced in this kingdom. When Jesus, of supernatural origin and glorified by supernatural power, shall come the second time unto salvation, His supernatural might shall be exerted in behalf of this kingdom in the most astounding manner. Holy Writ constantly appeals to *this union*, and no scriptural conception of it can be obtained without conceding this fact.

When science confines itself to the material universe, making law or force the result of nature and not of intelligent will; when it rests satisfied with the material and ignores a higher sphere indicative of conscious relationship to the Infinite—then it can and must (in logical consistency) deny the Supernatural. (Comp. Dr. Sprecher's *Groundwork of Theol.* Div. 2, ch. 6.) But we are not thus bound, preferring "the old paths," which alone impart comfort, hope, strength, and blessing. It is still true, as Theirs (Pressense's *Relig. and Reign of Terror*, p. 326) remarked: "It is *the privilege* of intelligence to recognize marks of intelligence in the Universe; and a great mind is more capable than a narrow one of seeing God in His works." The host of intelligent men, who in the past have substantiated this declaration, are witnesses that such a reverent recognition is in accord with the highest mental development. Nature, Religion, Christianity, man's moral nature, Personal experience, all unite in calling for a Higher Will, Higher Reason, a God, whom we gratefully acknowledge as our dependence—our All in All. Prof. Bowen (*Modern Philosophy*), reviewing the phases of philosophy from Descartes down to Hartman, informs us: "I accept with unhesitating conviction and belief the doctrine of the being of one personal God, the creator and governor of the world, and of one Lord Jesus Christ in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily'; and I have found nothing whatever in the literature of modern infidelity which, to my mind, casts even the slightest doubt about that belief." Just as in Nature, nature herself is sustained and interpenetrated by forces which come from vast distances beyond the earth, and to which she gives conscious evidence in light, growth, etc., so in moral and spiritual things influences come from heaven itself which sustain light, life, growth, etc., and to which man—if receptive—consciously responds. To this *self-consciousness* the Bible confidently appeals (Comp. *e.g.* Williamson's *Rud. Theol. and Mor. Science*, ch. 9), as teaching the Supernatural.

Obs. 2. Men may call this foolishness, incredible, etc., and we admit that it is a "*strange work*" (Isa. 28 : 21), "*a marvellous work and a wonder*, for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid" because "their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men" (Isa. 29 : 13, 14). Moreover, such a "strange work" *is required* if the heart-felt longings of suffering humanity, and the exceeding precious promises, the only consolation we possess in the darkest hours of trial, are to be realized. It is admitted, that outside of Revelation, we have no decided promises that the groanings of creation can ever be removed, and that, if this is ever performed (*e.g.* death abolished), it must be done by a higher power than is now manifested in and through nature. The necessity for such a power is allowed by all; the desirableness of securing information and knowledge on the subject is granted by all; why not then tolerate the reasonableness of the Bible on these points until a clearer, brighter light is found? In looking over the extended field of controversy between faith and unbelief—while admitting that faith, in its eagerness to vindicate God's Word, has sometimes, urged on by the consciousness of personal experience, employed arguments that are logically inadmissible, yet we can apologize for the same on the ground that it evinced "zeal without knowledge" in an ill-directed effort

to sustain truth. On the other hand, unbelief has too often shown a swiftness and unnatural avidity to bring discredit upon the same Word; resorting to a most unscholarly criticism, employing arguments often refuted, without the least notice of attempted refutations, ignoring what is alleged in vindication, etc., for which we can make no apology, seeing that the effort itself, and the peculiar spirit in which it is made, is indicative of a bitter hostility to the Gospel. We might the more readily excuse them if, in place of the faith and hope so rudely and remorselessly destroyed, they could bring us light to dispel the darkness which otherwise overshadows man's destiny. But instead of light they only give us increased darkness.

It has become quite fashionable to designate the old method of proving the existence of God and of the supernatural by an appeal to design, contrivance, the adaptation of means to an end, etc., as "the production of a clock-making Divinity." While it is true that the moral nature of man affords us the most decisive proof of a higher agency and of the moral nature of the Being who has called us into existence, yet man is not yet *so far* advanced in knowledge that he can do without the argument that God *in His wisdom* appeals to, and which has commanded the reason and strengthened the hearts of multitudes. If the argument in proof of the Divine Existence drawn from design in Nature commends itself even to such men as John Stuart Mill (Cook's Lect. *Huxley and Tyndall on Evolution*, p. 30), then surely the far more comprehensive argument that can be founded on evidences of design in the Divine Purpose (as *e.g.* seen in the redemptive arrangements, the Theocratic ordering, etc.) ought specially to be of force. Besides this: when the much lauded criticism of unbelief plants itself upon the broad platform "that the Great First Cause never breaks through the chain of finite causes by an immediate exertion of power," it is certainly right to wait for *the proof* of such a position. If the boasted intellectual groundwork of unbelief can produce nothing better than mere assumption to sustain such a position, men of reflection may well ask, Who informed the creature that God never interferes, over against the testimony of the past and the general conviction, impressed by moral consciousness, that He can do so? Suppose this to be a fact, and that unbelievers are gifted with superior wisdom, it then follows: (1) that man is firmly bound in an eternal chain of necessity and fatalism; (2) that the motives presented by religion and morality are all vain, being under the power of irreversible destiny; (3) that the First Cause elevates His work to an equality with Himself, or, at least, subordinates Himself to a constituted necessity; (4) that a power inherent in a Creator (the will or pleasure to do as He pleases) is thus lost and bound up in that which is created; (5) and that we attribute to God less control over His work than man exerts over the labor of his hands. Strauss lays it down as an axiom, "that, according to sound philosophy, as well as experience, the regular chain of conditional causes is never interrupted by the absolute Causality through special acts." The question, however, is whether sound philosophy or common-sense requires that the great Cause must thus be rigorously bound by His own creation? Does such a limitation of "the Absolute" really constitute Him or "it" the Absolute? Does it require, admitting the existence of evil and the desirableness of its removal, that this Cause should feel no interest in the removal of evil existing in creation? Does it insist upon a God, stern, inflexible, cold and distant, binding humanity by unalterable law to a sad, dreary, consecutive fate, or can it bring this Cause into vital relationship with intelligence, morality, religion, the noblest feelings, impulses, aspirations and hopes of man?

Obs. 3. If we had a Revelation and a kingdom proposed by it, without a supernatural element claimed and exerted, then the objection would be urged, without the possibility of contradiction, that it was merely of human origin. God knew this, and hence stamps the one given with something above nature and the power of man. Some charge us with superstition and a low, degrading belief when, acquiescing in the supernatural, we look beyond the natural law to its Creator or Institutor. But *justly* the charge cannot be preferred against us, seeing that it is not we who, stopping short at the natural laws, regarding them as the real causation of

all things, and utterly unalterable in their workings, tender to the laws what reverence and worship we are capable of, so that the laws virtually become *our gods*, our eternal divinities, and in their sum, totality, constitute the high-sounding "Absolute." Who is the most superstitious or who has faith the lowest in the scale, the one who bows down to physical law, or the other who looks beyond such laws to the Lawgiver Himself? Can it be shown, without mere assertion, that the supernatural never exerted its power in creation—that these laws were self-producing, eternal —that man never comes under its influence—that it is not needed—that its manifestations are physically impossible—that they are morally impracticable—that it is unworthy of God or man, etc.? These and similar questions must be *fairly* answered before we can give up a precious faith and hope, affording the richest of consolations and blessings needed in our pilgrimage here.

Unbelief makes much of Natural Religion, but as Christian apologists (*e.g.* Bp. Butler's *Analogy*) have abundantly shown, it is insufficient (as unbelief sadly confesses) to solve the most essential problems concerning the present and the future in reference to man s happiness. Now when Christianity does not destroy Natural Religion, but confirms it, adding to it that which it was impossible for it to produce, is it *not strange* that men devote themselves to a persistent, life-long exertion to demolish the labors of intelligent, pious men, without the least effort—owing to, sometimes confessed, inability—to substitute something better? Is it not remarkable that such will deliberately deny the fundamental ideas underlying our subjection to moral government, simply because such are constantly appealed to in Scripture—no matter how destructive their repeal would be to society? The Realism, Utilitarianism, Naturalism of the day does not stop to consider *how necessary* to man's welfare the Supernatural is, in order to insure deliverance, complete and continued, from evil. A Religion that proposes such a Supernaturalism connected with redemption (which unbelief acknowledges, in view of the permanency of natural law, is not to be found in Nature) surely should be met with respect and not with unrelenting bitterness.

Obs. 4. The objection that a supernatural interference would argue imperfection in creation and Providence, is purely one-sided. It has its limits, and when pressed too far is at once forged into a double-edged sword which cuts both ways. Imperfection is found in nature, but this is overlooked; it is found in man, but this is ignored, in order to find it in the plan of redemption, and not in the creature and creation which it is designed to save.[1] Is this wise? If the theory is correct, then those eternal laws, so magnified, should have avoided imperfection—those complete and perfect forces of nature should have removed the ills and woes and sufferings and antagonisms now so abundantly prevalent—those unchangeable and eternal laws should, long before this, from the beginning have elevated man to knowledge, truth and happiness, removing from him ignorance, error, and misery. But not satisfied with this objection, another is brought from the opposite extreme (showing how *easily* objections are formed when *the heart desires* them) viz., that fixed and invariable law without intervention indicates the absolute sovereignty of God, His wisdom, goodness (so Dr. Draper and others), etc. In the one case, intervention indicates imperfection in the work performed by God; in the other it shows the same in the Creator Himself. Law unchangeable, etc., certainly gives us a high opinion of God, of His absolute power, sovereignty, wisdom, etc., that was able thus to constitute them. But we have still a higher and more majestic view of God, if we regard (as the Bible) the same power, sovereignty, etc., equal to adding to, or controlling, or

reversing, or altering, or staying for a brief period any of the laws or forces which He has constituted. In the general invariableness is a fact established to enforce His government, to provide for and contribute to the happiness of His creatures, but in every particular instance it is not true; for if that were the case it would *limit* His own power, and make the laws *equal to* if not *superior* to the Lawgiver. If we could place Christianity and the kingdom which is to result from it under such law without Divine interposition or aid, the foundation of all hope would not only be overturned, but men would justly say, you can expect nothing more than what these laws can give; God's sovereignty is only in them, He can do no more for you, and therefore it is idle to pray, to expect a resurrection, to hope for freedom from evil, etc. (This many do say at the present time.) In brief, such a theory, put into its mildest form, places God in the posture of a cruel Being, giving us unchangeable law from which we can see no escape from misery, and this law being eternal, we dare not comfort ourselves with the idea that evil is temporary, that God will ultimately remove and destroy it. From such hope-crushing reasoning, we turn with relief and joy to the comforting doctrine of the Word, that while God has created this world and man, placed them under laws which in the general are unchangeable, yet when the time arrives that the necessity of man or the Divine purpose requires it, He can exert a higher law still—His Omnipotent Will—and control or bend or reverse, in short, do what He pleases with His own creation. Man cannot describe a greater, more perfect, more absolute sovereign *than the Bible* in its simplicity does, when it makes Him so all-powerful that He is able, and does, at any time *He chooses*, intervene in *His own* workmanship. To deny this is to degrade and not ennoble God. Believers in the Bible are warned against just such reasoning. Thus *e.g.* 2 Pet. 3 : 3, 4, unmistakably foretells that "scoffers"* will arise who shall claim that "all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (most probably with the plea that otherwise imperfection exists either in the works or in the Creator). The same apostle traces its origin to *willingly are ignorant of*—*i.e.*—wilful ignorance—desiring, wishing, willing it; and charges us that it is worthy of marked, special attention ("knowing this *first*," etc.,) being a distinguishing characteristic of the last days.[2]

[1] Excepting by Mill, and some others, who, however, to account for the evil, boldly argue (as in "*Literature and Dogma*") that the Creator or First Cause was limited in ability to create—thus making an imperfect, weak God, the product of their reason over against *the majestic, perfect God* of the Bible. Another class also admit the evil, and find no hope, advocating a despairing fate or nihilism over against the cheering prospects held forth by the Word of God. Generally, however, the position is assumed as stated in the text. In the Art. "*Immortality*," in Littell's Liv. Age for 1872, taken from *Brit. Quarterly Review*, the Optimist Philosophy, that evil will be eradicated, is opposed.

[2] In the paper contributed by Merle D'Aubigne to Christ. Alliance at New York, reference is made to the wide-spread nature of infidelity and the critical posture of the times, and to the remarkable characteristic of infidelity of the present period: "Until now, the eighteenth century—the age of Voltaire—was regarded as the epoch of most decided infidelity, but how far does the present time surpass it in this respect. Voltaire himself protested against the philosophy which he called atheistic, and said, 'God is necessarily the Great, the Only, the Eternal Artificer of all nature.' (*Dialogues*, xxv.) But

---

* The earliest and most reliable mss. make it still more emphatic, "scoffers in scoffing."—Tischendorf's N. T.

the pretended philosophers of our day leave such ideas far behind, and regard them as antiquated superstitions," etc. Taking Prof. Tyndall's eloquent address in favor of materialism, it almost seems that we have his atomic theory fulfilled in himself, viz., that the atoms formerly composing Democritus have conjoined again in forming a Tyndall. The Egyptian transmigration theory, modernized to suit prevailing tastes, may, for aught we know, again be revived.

Obs. 5. Before entering upon the consideration of the miraculous, it is necessary, first of all, to come to a decision respecting the supernatural; whether indeed a Higher Power exists in addition to nature which can introduce the miraculous. The Bible takes this for granted as something indirectly taught by nature itself (in works, design, etc.), but more directly by our mental and moral constitution (in moral and religious impulses, a consciousness of being under moral law, etc.). The simplicity of the Bible teaching, corroborated by the religious feeling, prayer tendency, and experience of ages, has not been invalidated by the recent prevailing attacks of unbelief, because reason itself, unbiased, must, in the contest now raging, determine in favor of the Scriptures. Which, *e.g.*, is the most reasonable, to believe in a Creator who takes a continued interest in His creatures, and can at pleasure exert His power in their behalf; or to believe that nature has no intelligent personal Producer, or if it has such an One, that He keeps aloof from His own workmanship? Which is the most reasonable, to affirm that the world is produced by God, who can order and control it according to His will; or to say that it is somehow *unexplained*, the result of natural laws (also unexplained), and that such laws are alone causative and operative? Which is the most reasonable, to declare that an intelligent Designer, with an ultimate glorious end in view, created all things, and, to indicate and vindicate the intended end, gives intimations of His power and goodness; or to say that atoms (necessarily endued with intelligence) come together by forces (also intelligent), and combine to form an intelligent, related design (as seen), and this goes on eternally?[1] Which is the most reasonable, to announce that reason existed before the creation of the world, designed it, and evidences itself in the varied works thereof, and that the same reason has access to its work, and can, in accordance with an announced plan, manifest its presence in new acts and new performances; or to assert that reason is only (Büchner) in nature? (Zollman in *The Bible and Natural Science* justly observes, that such a theory virtually makes the atoms individually possess the greatest reasoning power because of their forming combinations which man is incapable of wholly searching out and understanding.) Which is the most in accord with reason, to acknowledge that the world has a personal Sovereign Ruler, or that impersonal, *unexplained* forces and laws form such a Ruler? Reason, as evidenced in the gifted intellects which have bowed in reverence to revelation and in the studious sons of science who have made nature subservient to the Word, can cordially receive, as the highest reason, the biblical idea of a God, the biblical conception of the power and freedom of intelligence, the biblical will as manifested in a divine purpose unfolding toward redemption. It is assuming too much to suppose, that the reasoning in favor of the supernatural from the earliest days down to more recent writers (as Butler, Argyle, McCosh, Cook, etc.), and that the concessions even of the ablest opponents of the miraculous, of a great first cause, existing prior to, and forming, nature, should be but folly. The assumption, by its absurdity and antagonism to

reason, defeats itself. Independent of the Scriptures, relying simply upon the constitution of nature and man, our deepest thinkers of all classes and ages, even those unprepared to receive the entire biblical conception, have still taught a theism.[2] The acknowledgment of the supernatural prepares us for the next proposition. Admit the supernatural, of a higher power of existence and intelligence over and above nature, and then the way is prepared for reason to accept of this power manifesting itself in that sphere relating to the highest interests of man. Reason finds a sufficient cause in the God of the Bible to explain not only the existence and continued operation of law, but how *the Creator of law* can exhibit His all-pervading power and presence, at any desired moment, through the electric flashes of a Divine Providence, thus visibly manifesting that the creative spirit is a God, not afar off but nigh at hand.[3]

[1] To indicate the contrast between our views and those of the free-thinking class, we select a recent writer, Winwood Reade, who (*Martyrdom of Man*) thus gives the final result of making man an atom, a cell growth of nature: "We teach that there is a heaven in the ages far away, but not for us single corpuscules, not for us dots of animated jelly; but for the One (*i.e.* Humanity) of whom we are the elements, and who, though we perish, never dies, but grows from period to period, and by the united efforts of single molecules called men, or of those cell groups called nations, is raised toward the Divine power which he will finally attain. Our Religion, therefore, is Virtue · our Hope is placed in the happiness of Posterity; our Faith is the perfectibility of Man." With this view is allied the teaching that we are the product of natural laws, that we cannot discover or define the Creator or First Cause (if there is such), and that the Supreme Power is "something for which we have no words, something for which we have no ideas," "to whom it is profanity to pray, of whom it is idle and irreverent to argue and debate, of whom we should never presume to think save with humility and awe, being that 'Unknown God,'" etc. What admirable humility and convenient ignoring of the testimony of man's moral nature and God's revelation!

[2] Man cannot without violence to the history of the past and to his own moral nature refuse such a view of a Power existing above Nature. The religions of the past and the present, the experience of the civilized and uncivilized, the expressed opinions of a Plato and a Newton, a Socrates and a Kant, a Xenophon and an Anselm, a Cicero and a Descartes, a Galen and a Leibnitz, an Aristotle and a Fenelon, besides an innumerable multitude, clearly indicate this feature. Even Pantheism, in its varied forms, however it may neutralize the biblical idea, still admits and enforces the notion of a superior, infinite intelligence, all pervading, etc. Pure Atheism is something rare, and forms an exception, seldom found, to a general, universal rule. Those alleged to be decided atheists sometimes (as Voltaire, J. Priestley, etc.) express themselves in a manner indicative of Theistical notions. Hence such a challenge as "Asmodeus" gives in the *Cin. Commercial* of Dec. 27th, 1875, is simply ridiculous, viz., for any one to prove the existence of a God and His Personality, the existence of the soul (allowing only "a higher physical organization"), and the existence of sin. This is simply ignoring, with the utmost self-complacency, what the leaders of intelligence have presented on the subject. Some of the followers of Darwin have been exercised that he has not excluded the idea that a personal God may have created the first forms of vegetable and animal being, thus still leaving a bond of union between him and Kepler, Newton, Davy, Haller, Cuvier, the Wagners, Liebig, etc.

[3] No mythology, no philosophy, no human production has ever presented such a sublime portraiture of the Deity and His attributes as the Scriptures give us. Take the Bible conception and contrast it *e.g.* with Mill's imperfect, impotent God, and what an immense distance exists between them. Contrast the same with a thousand others, and the God of the Bible stands forth immeasurably grand and complete—lacking nothing. Contrast the perfect, lovely, holy Redeemer Jesus, so simply but strikingly presented to us, with the Saviour tendered by unbelief, and the former is light in the midst of darkness. This alone is sufficient, as Apologists have noticed, to vindicate the Supernatural (*e.g.* Roger's *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*). But allow this God (as Creator and Redeemer) to present the Divine Purpose, *the End*, contemplated by creation, *then* He is seen in a new aspect commending itself to reason and the moral nature of man. Such a

presentation makes a necessity of revelation supernaturally given and supported ; for the Creator, and not the creature, must inform us what are the ends contemplated by an Infinite Mind. Hence the basis of Revelation, indicating the intelligent moral purposes held in view, commends itself to us as the one required, and as proof of its being God-given. This feature has additional weight given to it when it is observed that God works after *a definitely laid down Plan*—a Plan, too, extending through many centuries, evidencing foresight, provisions, providences, etc. This Plan, whose origin cannot be accounted for as proceeding from the Jewish race ; which makes God and His glory the dominant idea ; which brings Him in sympathy with man and expresses the highest possible evidence to promote man's welfare ; which subordinates ethics to theology (the former being derived from the idea of God, His will, and our relations to Him) and enforces as essential morality and piety ; which appeals (as to a thing self-evident) to the self-consciousness implanted by moral nature and recognized by society ; which opens before us the most exalted destiny and eternal inheritance, must, in the very nature of the case, demand, what unbelief so persistently objects to, a cordial recognition of the Divine rights and claims, and of the dependence, obligations, and obedience of the creature. If Revelation occupied a lower plane in its delineation of God and in its demands, infidelity would be *the first* to indicate it as a radical defect. A Divine Revelation with God and His interest in, and relationship to, His own Creation stricken out, would remove its heart and life, leaving the creature in ignorance and hopeless. Man, burdened by the influence of evil, subject to calamity and death, looking for some way of deliverance, finds in the Scriptures and in the doctrine of this kingdom a Revelation most honorable to God Himself, and most conducive to the highest interests and happiness of His creatures. Many receiving this in the past, have found peace and joy ; many rejecting, have realized unrest and unhappiness. Humility, such as becomes a creature, is fundamental to gain the former position ; pride, such as makes the Creator subject to the creature's judgment, is invariably conducive to the latter. In reference to the teaching of Science, its very statements respecting the inability of discovering the intelligent power back of nature and natural law, only indicates, as the Bible claims, the necessity of a Revelation to bring man to a correct and ample comprehension of that great Power. So also the confession of seeing no hope of release from death, the grave, etc., through the fixedness of law ; that man being in possession of a moral nature needs more than the facts of nature ; that if God exists the possibility of a revelation must be admitted ; that the non-existence of a God is not susceptible of definite proof ; that if an intelligent reason is back of nature, it would be desirable for such reason to reveal itself ; that if such a revelation would be made, it is reasonable to suppose that it would present us things that man cannot discover, etc.—these confirm our position. Whatever difficulties—as alleged—on the side of pure reason there may be to prove the existence and the revelation of God, far greater difficulties are met in the effort to show that there is no God or no Revelation, for the latter leaves nature, man, world, the Universe an inscrutable enigma.

PROPOSITION 7. *The kingdom being a manifestation of the supernatural, miracles are connected with it.*

Miracles are not to be regarded simply as evidences of the truth —this it indeed subserves—but as *necessary parts* of revelation itself, evincing with a fulness, stronger than language can impress, that the supernatural is indispensable for the establishment of the kingdom, and that it will be exerted in miraculous power whenever required. It is plainly declared in numerous passages, that before this kingdom is set up, events of an astounding miraculous nature, far exceeding the ordinary power of nature, directly occurring through Divine agency, shall be witnessed. In a book recording such anticipated occurrences, there would be an evident lack, a sad deficiency—which infidelity would eagerly seize if it existed—if it contained no statements of miracles. Especially would this be the case, when He who is the King of the promised kingdom appears. The grave question then, if no miracles were given, would inevitably arise: What assurance have you that those miraculous events predicted to take place in the future—so intimately connected with the highest welfare and happiness of man—shall ever be realized, when we have none heretofore displayed and described, and none combined with the previous personal coming of the King? The cry would be triumphantly raised: Your King once came, and as He performed no miracles, although they are so intimately blended with His kingdom, none can be reasonably expected.

The correct position in reference to miracles is that taken by some recent writers. Thus *e.g.* Fuchs (*Bremen Lectures*, L. 3) says that "the world's course requires miracles" owing to the introduction of sin and evil, and to indicate and enforce the Plan devised for the removal of the same; and that hence "into the world's history of sin and death the golden threads of Salvation have been interwoven, a continued chain of divine acts of revelation for the saving of the world, which form a living organism of miracles." Christ Himself, in this connected series, is *the greatest miracle*. Such an attitude, sustained by a personal experience of the preciousness of the greatest miracle, Christ, is impregnable. Our line of argument is designed to uphold the miraculous as *a necessity* in the world's Redemption through the Theocratic Kingdom; and therefore only presses the relationship that the one sustains to the other. When Prof. Powell (*Essays and Reviews*) tells us that "miracles were, in the estimation of a former age, among the chief supports of Christianity; they are at present among the main difficulties and hindrances to its acceptance," the reply is, that they still remain chief supports, and that the latter arises from overlooking the indispensable connection that they sustain to *the whole* Divine Plan. Considering miracles isolated from the intent they subserve, is but a narrow view; and if they did not exist in a Book relating to the Supernatural, this would be speedily claimed as a main difficulty to its acceptance. It will not answer to simply contend, as Röhr (so Castellar), that we need not give the miraculous to Christ, it being sufficient to follow Him, for this utterly destroys the distinctive Biblical Christ. It is the miraculous, miracle-working Christ, or none; there is no half-way reception possible *with consistency*.

Hence the position of some Christian writers is fatal to the integrity of Scripture. Thus *e.g. The Ch. Union* (July 11th, 1877) regards miracles as unessential; so that Jonah's account (referred to and indorsed by Jesus) may be rejected without detriment, and so Elisha's miracle of the axe-head, etc. Such laxity invalidates Scripture, engendering grave doubt, etc. (Comp. Art. Recent Rationalism in the Church of England, in the *North Brit. Review*, 1860); and the antagonism resulting is not lessened when it is said that "the miracles are historic fact, but they are not proofs of Christianity" (so J. Freeman Clarke in *The Ch. Union*, Sept. 12th, 1877). Unbelief and doubt is, as predicted (see Prop. 180), extending itself. Leathes (*The Religion of Christ*, Pref. p. 49, etc.), in reply to the author of *Supern. Religion*, who declares "the Revelation rests upon miracles, which have nothing to rest upon but the Revelation," shows how the establishment of Christianity, before and since the New Test. literature was given, in and through Jesus Christ, is corroborative of the miraculous, and that the miraculous must, as *an antecedent*, have preceded in order to account for the literature and the results. Various writers (*e.g.* Row, *Ev. Chris.* p. 137) have remarked that those unbelievers who attribute, owing to the introduction of miracles, so much credulity, superstition, and ignorance to the Jews and primitive Christians, only "increase the difficulty of accounting for the moral teaching of the New Test. as the natural product of the soil." The greater the abuse heaped upon the inspired writers, the greater the embarrassments of unbelief to explain how such could possibly give us the doctrines produced. This obstacle to consistency is evidently felt by unbelievers, and, therefore, some of them (as Renan and others) highly eulogize before condemning, praise in eloquent terms while undermining the miraculous. Dr. Sprecher (*Grundw. Theol.* Div. 2) points out the contradictions, concessions, etc., in which unbelieving Theists involve themselves in trying to invalidate the historical evidence of miracles, and to explain Evangelical history without their admission. In this able Apology in behalf of Divine Revelation and the Supernatural, he contrasts the vast revolution produced by the same in human life and society with the teachings and results of the great philosophers, and asks *how* we are to account for the great difference, whether through Naturalism or through Christian ideas given by special revelation and supported by the miraculous.

Obs. 1. God in kindness accommodates Himself to human weakness; for telling us that the supernatural is closely allied with the natural in the kingdom; that the kingdom itself shall be pervaded with a power above nature in order to control, recreate, and make nature subserve the Divine purpose; He, knowing that if *direct* testimony is not given a serious flaw will remain, bestows us evidences, through miracles, of the all-pervading supernatural. These are so related to the kingdom that they cannot be separated from it without mutual defacement. Thus it is represented by Jesus Himself (Matt. 12 : 28), "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, *then* the kingdom of God is come unto (or as some, upon) you." Here we have, 1. The relationship existing between the kingdom and miracles; that without the latter the former cannot be revealed. 2. That miracles are a manifestation of possessed power, which Jesus will exert when He establishes His kingdom. 3. That the miraculous casting out of devils, or Satan, is an event connected with the kingdom, and its accomplishment through Jesus is thus verified as predicted, *e.g.*, Rev. 20 : 1–6. 4. That the miraculous casting out of devils by Jesus is a premonition, anticipating, foreshowing, or foreshadowing (Greek, Lange, Com. vol. 1, p. 223, conveys idea of anticipating, etc.), like the transfiguration, of the kingdom itself. The miracles then are *assurances* vouchsafed that the kingdom will come as it is predicted. The miracles of Jesus are so varied and significant in the light of the kingdom that it can be readily perceived *how* they give us the needed confidence in its several requirements and aspects. The resurrection of dead ones is connected with the kingdom; that the keys of death hang at Christ's girdle is shown in the miracles of the raising of the daughter of Jairus, the widow's son, and of Lazarus,

when just dead, carried out to burial, and already in the corrupting embrace of the tomb. Sickness and death are banished from the inheritors of the kingdom; the numerous miracles of healing various sicknesses and of restoring the dying, establish the power existing that can perform it. The utmost perfection of body is to be enjoyed in the kingdom; this is foreshadowed by the removal of blindness, lameness, deafness, and dumbness. Hunger, thirst, famine, etc., give place to plenty in the kingdom; the miracles of feeding thousands attest to the predicted power that will accomplish it. The natural world is to be completely under the Messiah's control in that kingdom; the miracles of the draught of fishes, the tempest stilled, the ship at its destination, the walking on the sea, the fish bringing the tribute money, the barren fig-tree destroyed, and the much-ridiculed one of water changed into wine, indicate that He who sets up this kingdom has indeed power over nature. The spiritual, unseen, invisible world is to be, as foretold, in contact and communication with this kingdom; and this Jesus verifies by the miracles of the transfiguration, the demoniac cured, the legion of devils cast out, passing unseen through the multitude, and by those of His own death, resurrection and ascension. Indeed there is scarcely a feature of this kingdom foretold which is to be formed by the special work of the Divine, that is not also confirmed to us by some glimpses of the Power that shall bring them forth. The kingdom —the end—is designed to remove the curse from man and nature, and to impart the most extraordinary blessings to renewed man and nature, but all this is to be done through One who, it is said, shall exert supernatural power to perform it. It is therefore reasonable to expect that *as part* of the developing of the plan itself, that when He first comes, through whom man and nature are to be regenerated, a manifestation of power—more abundant and superior to everything preceding—over man and nature should be exhibited, *to confirm our faith in Him and in His kingdom.* This is done, and an appeal is made to it. We are confident that the best, most logical defence of the miracles of Christ and of the Bible is in the line here stated, viz., regarding them *as indicative and corroborative of God's promises relating to the future destiny of the Church and world.* The miracles are thus found to be *essential,* to answer a divine purpose, to supply a requisite evidence; and hence in the Scriptures they are called "signs" (*σημεῖα*) of something else intended; signs that the Word shall be fulfilled in the exertion of power.

We do not hold with Paley and others that the miracles were only indispensable as the credentials of the divine mission of Jesus. At the same time we have no sympathy with those who assert (*Essays and Reviews*) that miracles cannot prove that men are divinely sent as messengers or teachers. As to the former, they subserve much more; and as to the latter, it is sufficient to oppose Christ's sayings, Matt. 11 : 5, 20; John 5 : 36; Matt. 10 : 1–8; John 20 : 30, 31, and 10 : 25, 37, 38; Acts 2 : 22, etc. They possess this tendency to a certain extent (for, after all, He was rejected as unbelievers have remarked, Duke of Somerset's *Ch. Theol.* p. 48), but they retain a higher significancy which includes that of His coming from the Father and the Father being in Him, viz., that He truly possessed *the power to establish the kingdom as foretold;* and therefore these credentials are operative, for believers, to the time when this same power will again in large measure be manifested. Wardlaw (*On Miracles*) takes the position that the miracle proves the doctrine, while French (*On Miracles*) makes the doctrine prove the miracle. Our view combines the two, seeing that they are *inseparably* related (Comp. Art. *Miracles and their Counterfeits,* Princeton Review, 1856). Doctrine, as contained in prophecy and promise, brought forth the miracle, and the latter confirms the truthfulness of the former. The doctrine developed the "signs," and the "signs" are a testimony of the

verification of the doctrine. The miracle-working power of Jesus was the more necessarily exerted in view, as we shall show hereafter, of the postponement of the kingdom. For, the Power not being exerted in erecting the kingdom as predicted by the prophets, —a kingdom free from all suffering and evil—*a sufficiency* (John 14 : 11) is shown to convince the thoughtful and reflecting that it *will yet be* accomplished ; that the teaching of the Bible leads us to expect miracles, and that their occurrence shows that we do not misapprehend the things taught. They consequently have force only with those who are willing to receive the Bible in *its connected* teaching. They are not, in themselves, primary truths, but are given to attest to and enlarge truth previously given, and which still remains to be fulfilled. Such is their position in Revelation itself, that they attest to its truthfulness, not only to the past (*e.g.* that creation is a miracle, that prophecy is a miracle, etc.), but to the future (*e.g.* the kingdom), and become part of the truth itself, revealing and manifesting the agency through which the promises of God are to be realized. Fred. Den. Maurice, in his works, has well observed that the signs of the kingdom are identical with the miracles of the kingdom, but he misapprehends the nature of the kingdom and makes the signs emblematical of the coming of a spiritual power. They, of course, include a spiritual power through which they are exerted, but the work itself, as all prophecy and promise insists, will be externally manifested. The miracles, therefore, are *not types* of something else, but *signs, real earnests, inchoate foretastes*, of something in *the same* line, greater, in the future. Thus, *e.g.*, the much sneered at miracle of Cana, which some writers, in the *West. Review*, assert cannot have any moral teaching, most strikingly shows Christ's power over nature, its subjection to His control, and one too which is necessary to be wielded if the Millennial predictions are ever to be realized (Comp. Farrar, *Life of Christ*, vol. 1, ch. 11). Therefore the attack against miracles is also one of primary importance ; if those attacks are successful and miracles are to be discarded, then the truths which lead to the miracles, and to which the miracles attest, suffer ; Christ's power is lessened and no assurance is given of His ability to fulfil the prophets. The miraculous, however some semi-believers may close their eyes to the fact, is *a vital* one. But to make the attack complete and the defence perfect, the real point for both is too much overlooked, viz., Does the kingdom which the Bible predicts as the Divine Purpose, really require miraculous intervention, and is such a kingdom, in its Plan and adaptation to the wants of humanity, worthy of credence? If it can be shown that the kingdom does not demand them, that they are not desirable to be pressed into the service for man and nature, that there is some other way to secure the blessings contemplated by them instead of a resort, to the Supernatural, then the miraculous may be discarded as a superfluity, an excrescence ; otherwise, until this can be alleged, prudence and wisdom dictate that they be regarded as *an indispensable portion* of a connected Divine Plan, *an integral part* of Revelation, the main purpose of which is to instruct us concerning the kingdom, giving us confidence in its ultimate establishment. If man and nature can form such a kingdom, free from existing evils, without miraculous power, or if such a kingdom manifested by miraculous power is not desirable, not what man craves, not worthy of man and God, let this be established by adducing proof, and it will at once destroy, what other arguments fail to do, the credibility of miracles. Until this is done it would be folly to yield up that which is founded on the very nature and manifestation of the kingdom of God. The deliverance and entrance of the Jews into the promised land, Canaan, was preceded by miraculous events of the most astounding nature ; these are only "*signs*" of those of a still more extraordinary character, under the One greater than Moses, at the future deliverance and entrance of the people of God into the promised inheritance of the kingdom. The Head of a Theocracy is a Supernatural Being, and when such a Theocracy is established, the Supernatural will, more or less, exhibit itself in behalf of the same, and as indicative of the existing Rulership. But however much we may advance this reasoning in favor of the miraculous, it must ever be remembered that an appeal to reason can never overcome prejudice excited against the supernatural, through aversion to moral and religious truth, so intimately blended with it. Jesus, who knew man, teaches us, in the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the impotency of miracles to benefit those who wilfully turn away from the truth already given. The fact is, that to appreciate miracles properly, there must first be some knowledge of other and preceding truths.

Obs. 2. The number and variety of definitions given to miracles indicate the limited nature of human knowledge ; we are not greatly concerned in the adoption of any one specially, seeing that from our standpoint we could

accept of nearly all, even of some of those given by infidels. Strauss's might be received, viz., that a miracle is "an event which, inexplicable from the operation of finite causalities, appears to be an immediate interference of the Supreme, Infinite Cause, or of God Himself." Renan's might be adopted, saving the word "deranging" (which unbelief suggests), viz., that it is "the special interposition of Deity in the physical and psychological order of the world, deranging the course of events." To oppose the attacks of unbelieving scientists, some writers (as *e.g.* Birks in *The Bible and Modern Thought*) oppose the old idea that miracles are a reversal or suspension of nature, contending for a higher law operating in union and harmony with nature, and that it is not requisite to insist in any case upon "a direct act of God in contrast to all agency of second causes, and by an exercise of power strictly and exclusively divine," on the ground that it would otherwise require too great knowledge both of nature and God to tell when a miracle is performed. Hence miracles are divided into immediate, mediate, and improper, and a definition, sufficiently comprehensive, to include them is given: that they are "unusual events not within the ordinary power of man, nor capable of being foreseen by man's actual knowledge of second causes, and wrought or announced by professed messengers of God to confirm the reality of the message." The explanations of the older theologians (excepting Augustine's and a few others) are discarded as not covering objections. The interesting and valuable writings of the Duke of Argyle (*The Reign of Law*), Dr. McCosh (*The Supernatural in Relation to the Natural*), Thompson (*Ch. Theism*), etc., take the position, undoubtedly correct, that laws exist outside of those known, and that the Divine Will can employ such laws whenever it is desirable. Others (*e.g.* Proctor, *Other Worlds than Ours*) make miracles a resultant of physical law, being included in the predetermined scheme. The miraculous is therefore made a resultant of the exercise of other unknown laws superior to those known in nature. Whatever truth there is in such a position, and however admirably adapted to meet the objections of unbelieving philosophy, the biblical statement (*e.g.* Acts 2 : 22, Jno. 3 : 2, Rom. 15 : 19, etc.) does not require it. The following reasons urge us to discard the commendable and suggestive efforts in this direction: 1. It too much limits the power of God, exalting law in place of God. For the Bible, on its face, assumes (Ex. 10 : 2, Eph. 3 : 20) that God is able both to work with existing, seen and unseen, means, agencies, and laws, and to create and perform through *His will alone* (Heb. 2 : 4, 1 Cor. 12 : 11, Dan. 4 : 35) all things, even, if necessary, to introduce new laws (Matt. 19 : 26, Mark 10 : 25, Luke 1 : 37, and 18 : 27), etc. We are expressly told not to limit the ability of God and not to place the Creator in an attitude which binds Him subserviently to His own creation, even if the latter be law. 2. It in a great measure destroys the personality (*e.g.* Deut. 4 : 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, Ex. 15 : 11, Deut. 3 : 24) of Divine interference, attributing that to law which the Bible represents as the result of personal Divine attributes (*e.g.* Dan. 2 : 19–23, Ex. 7 : 5, and 15 : 1). 3. It diminishes the force of scripture language that expressly asserts the immediate agency of God (*e.g.* Ex. 3 : 20 and 6 : 6, 7, Phil. 3 : 21, Gen. 18 : 19). 4. It is to some extent contradictory, since it in some cases allows immediate miracles. 5. It lowers the validity of miracles by making them the results of causes now beyond our knowledge, but which as knowledge increases may, after all, be found natural. 6. With all the concessions

that it makes, it is unable to point out the laws through which the miracles are performed, and asks us to take them for granted. 7. But the main reason which leads us to a rejection of prevailing theories is the following: miracles are designed to throw light upon, and confirm the predictions of God relating to the final result, the glorious, miraculous establishment of the kingdom. Now in the prophecies pertaining to this kingdom we have *the most explicit declarations* that Jesus Christ Himself will change, renew, re-create all things; that laws of nature now existing shall be reversed, or modified, or suspended; that new laws and new forces shall be introduced; that the present order of things shall give place to a renewed order; and that the power which produces all this *is not found* in nature or in laws outside of nature, but *only* in God. Jesus is represented as personally coming (just as God personally came at the establishment of the theocracy at Mt. Sinai), and directly intervening in the performance of this mighty work of restoring forfeited blessings and adding new ones, and this is claimed as a peculiar, *distinctive personal* prerogative. Looking thus at the contemplated end, and seeing how the miraculous power then exerted is so far removed from such definitions, it is impossible to receive entirely explanations which attribute to law what the Word applies to Christ personally—thus introducing a defect, which, *if logically carried onward*, forbids our receiving the predictions relating to the future as presented. The final manifestation of the miraculous, which includes a re-creation, a removal of law under which a sin-cursed earth groans, *determines for us* that the miraculous proofs given to show that it will be realized are precisely *in the same category*, and thus confirmatory of it. The unity of Scripture is thus preserved. By this attitude it is not denied that God may and does also work through higher laws already established and beyond our present domain of knowledge (which Birks, Dr. McCosh, etc., have eloquently portrayed), but with this it is insisted that He may and does, independently of established law, exercise His power in the suspension, reversal, or removal of existing law, or, in other words, that His power as Creator, in the domain of the miraculous, is *not limited* by what He has done or has established, but is exercised according to His own pleasure. It seems to us, according to the biblical idea, a low estimate of God, which would make, either in nature or in that beyond it, all things under fixed, invariable, unchangeable laws, through which alone the Divine Institutor of them can work.

This position of the author may be regarded as "ultra" or "old-fashioned" after so many recent writers making miracle no violation or suspension of the laws of Nature, but simply "the intervention of some higher law, superseding the action of some lower one." This definition may indeed (Woollaston, Butler, Babbage, Arnold) apply to some cases, but it is too sweeping to embrace all; it is opposed to the notion of miracle as entertained by the ordinary Bible reader, and to the conception of Omnipotence as given in the Word. No one, unless urged to it by a theory, can fail to see that the power to work a miracle is ascribed to direct Divine power, for with God, it is alleged, *all things are possible*, nothing is too hard, and He is placed above all existing laws, able to suspend, control, etc., them at Will. The appeal only to a higher law, however true in some instances, is not sustained by the spirit of the narratives. Thus, *e.g.*, Jesus is represented as possessing the power of working wonders in Himself, and not as using and applying some existing but hitherto unknown law. The resurrection of the dead, the miraculous conception of Jesus, etc., are not claimed as the exertion of some higher law making miracles "parts of some more comprehensive system," but as the result of *direct* Divine power, introducing a new arrangement according with a previous plan. The

primitive and ordinary Church view (*e.g.* Bacon, Boyle, Newton, Locke) of miracles, ascribing them to God's power, making all laws subservient to His will, gives *a more exalted and ennobling* conception of God, superior to all law, etc., than more modernized ideas. All concessions, away from the Biblical notion, will never make a single convert of unbelievers, since such are wise enough to see the departure from the Scripture, and they feel that the laws, so much insisted upon, are to be received as an inference.* The Word, if it possesses any force whatever, does teach that miracles are the evidence or result of Divine interposition, of the direct interference of a Power which, notwithstanding the ordinary laws of nature in existence, is able to do all things. The opposition to this Biblical conception is varied, extending from gross unbelief to concessions to unbelief. Thus, *e.g.*, we have miracles (1) denounced as imposition or juggling tricks; (2) denied as impossible and incredible, owing to the fixed laws of nature; (3) rejected on the ground, not of impossibility but of weakness, imperfection in the Creator; (4) resulting from the intelligence of the parties performing them taking advantage of laws of Nature, etc., unknown to their fellows; (5) mythical, being introduced to exalt certain characters; (6) the product of a superior knowledge of the laws of nature and of spirit, being wrought in harmony with both; (7) the work of mesmerism, spiritualism, etc.; (8) phenomena (Proctor) that occurred in a fixed series through laws which are above our comprehension but act in unison with those of which we have cognizance; (9) a preformation (Bonnet) "according to which God has *a priori* included the miracles in the course of nature;" (10) a "quickening of the processes of nature"—what Olshausen applies to some are made by others to suit all; (11) left undecided (Kant), "it being neither possible absolutely to prove the reality of miracles, nor can their possibility be absolutely denied;" (12) deviating (so Augustine, Hagenbach's *His. of Dog.* vol. 1, s. 118, and adopted by Schleiermacher) not so much from the order of nature in general as from that particular order of nature known to us; (13) the results of higher and unknown laws either in nature or in the spiritual world. These and others (Comp. *e.g.* Lange's Com. vol. 1, pp. 266 and 271) are all opposed to the Biblical idea. This is seen (*a*) in the Scripture language; (*b*) in the definitions so generally and at one time universally held as the teaching of the Bible, and which were only modified to suit mod-

---

* Christian Apologists, who make such dangerous concessions to unbelief (under the delusive hope of conciliating), may learn a lesson from the acknowledgments of unbelievers. Thus, *e.g.* Dr. Carpenter in his Art. *On the Fallacies of Testimony respecting the Supernatural* (*Pop. Science Monthly* March, 1876) denounces the miraculous, and, referring to these Apologists who deem it requisite to justify them by weakening their force, scornfully remarks that "orthodox theologians" are regarding "the miracles of the New Test. rather as incumbrances than as props to what is essential to Christianity." While rejecting miracles as a delusion, he frankly makes this acknowledgment: "But the Scientific Theist who regards the so-called 'laws of Nature' as nothing else than man's expressions of so much of the divine order as it lies within his power to discern, and who looks at the interruptedness of this order as the highest evidence of its original perfection, need find (as it seems to me) no abstract difficulty in the conception that the Author of Nature can, if He will, occasionally *depart* from it. And hence, as I deem it presumptuous to deny that there might be occasions which, in his wisdom, may require such departure, I am not conscious of any such scientific 'prepossessions' against miracles as would prevent me from accepting them as facts, if trustworthy evidence of their reality could be adduced. The question with me, therefore, is simply, 'Have we any adequate historical ground for the belief that such departure has ever taken place?'" He shields himself behind the "prepossessions" of the writers and witnesses, and makes a parade of contemporary wonders (arising from spiritualism, mesmerism, etc.), which cannot endure scientific scrutiny (being explained by odylism, electrobiology, physic-force, etc., as natural results), thus ignoring the higher testimony, appealing to reason in favor of miracles, viz., their relation to a historical Divine Plan, which corroborates and enforces the witnesses. He confines himself to a continuity and perpetuity of nature which (as Mansel says of Schleiermacher's position) makes nature rigid, not elastic, opposed to the introduction of new forces and incapable of adaptation—an opinion contrary to experience, as seen in the voluntary actions of men. (Comp. Cook's Lec. "Huxley and Tyndall on Evolution," M'Cosh's "Supernatural in relation to the Natural," Fisher's "Supernatural Origin of Religion," Fowler's "Mozley and Tyndall on Miracles," the Archb. of York on "Limits of Philosophical Inquiry," etc.)

ern thought; and (*c*) in the fact that the most determined attacks upon the miracles, from the days of Spinoza and Hume. proceed on the assumption that if they can be discredited, it goes far to prove that there is no overruling Supernatural Power which can and does control all things. Miracles too are invariably represented as dependent upon God, and not as the result of a fortuitous or happy coincidence. Hence such definitions as given by the Spiritualist Convention, held at Rochester, N.Y., 1868, must be discarded, viz., that they "have been produced in harmony with Universal laws, and hence may be repeated at any time under suitable conditions." A number of miracles are in direct opposition to the harmonious working of existing natural law, as, *e.g.*, in the resurrection of dead ones, etc., so that to make miracles "nature transfigured by the spirit," "nature controlled by the will," or "nature determined by the Spirit," is mere fancy, so long as it excludes the direct power of God. Therefore those definitions which include a reference to the Divine power are alone in accord with the Scriptures. One of the best is given by Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.* vol. 1, p. 127): "A miracle is an entirely extraordinary phenomenon in the domain of natural or spiritual life, which cannot be explained from the course of nature as it is known to us, and must therefore have been brought about by *a direct operation* of God's Almighty Will, in order to attain unto a definite object." Oosterzee justly remarks that the definition must be to some extent defective from our inability to see one side of the miracle, viz., its operating cause. This defect, however, is supplied to the believer by the Word, viz., that it is the exertion of God's power either directly or as communicated to others. Fuchs' definition (*Bremen Lectures*, Lec. 3) opposes the defectiveness of the current view that "a miracle is an event which cannot be explained from the known laws of nature" on the ground that (1) it draws no firm line between the miraculous and the natural, leaving the way open of having, as knowledge progresses, all the former resolved into the latter; and (2) that it is only a negative definition, telling us what a miracle is not, and leaving the nature of the miracle untouched. Hence he gives the following: "A miracle is the entrance of *the Supernatural* into the connection of the natural, the intervention of a higher order of things into the lower, *the immediate interposition of a God* above the world in the course of the world and nature." Looking at the kingdom, which is ultimately to be inaugurated by *the special intervention* of the Supernatural in the Person of the Theocratic King, it is easy to see that the "signs" proceed from the same Supernatural source. Christlieb's (*Mod. Doubt*) definition is excellent with the exception of the last clause. He says: "Miracles are unique and extraordinary manifestations *of divine power*, which influence nature in a manner incomprehensible to our empirical knowledge, but always in accordance with some moral or spiritual end. Or, more exactly, they are *creative acts of God, i.e., supernatural exertions of power* upon certain points of Nature's domain, through which, by virtue of His own might already working in the course of nature, God, for the furtherance of His kingdom, brings forth some new thing which natural substances or causalities could not have produced by themselves, but which—and this must not be overlooked—as soon as they have taken place, range themselves in the natural course of things, without any disturbance arising on their account." He correctly argues them to be "the effects of God's power," "supernatural phenomena," "isolated manifestations of a higher order of things," "a pledge of His truth and faithfulness; an earnest of the future consummation of His kingdom," etc., but the last clause, "range themselves in the natural course of things," is liable to misinterpretation. If he means that they still retain, while thus connected with the natural, their specific miraculous character, he is correct; but if he conveys the idea that they must necessarily, when performed, thus range themselves with the natural, be in harmony with it, he is evidently wrong, as seen, *e.g.* in the Sun's standing still (a temporary miracle), in the transfiguration (a prefiguration miracle), etc. We are not concerned in attempting to show that a miracle does not disturb or violate natural law; indeed when we look at *the End*, and see that under the mighty power of the wonder-working Messiah natural law, which is now so conducive to disease, death, and corruption, shall be disturbed, violated, and rooted out, it is not difficult to believe that many of the miraculous "signs" were a disturbing of natural law, showing *how* by such a disturbance the cause could be removed, and the kingdom with its inestimable blessings be introduced. The truth seems to be, that believers themselves do not fully catch *the spirit and intent* of those miracles, and are too much disposed to have them shorn of some of their strength in order to conciliate unbelievers. Let such place themselves at the proper stand-point from which to view the miraculous, and this will be noticed: Briefly, this world is under a curse—evil abounds with the good—it forms one vast cemetery with its crushed hopes, blasted life, dust-returned bodies, etc., and all this goes on under natural law instituted by God. The world needs restoration, and the Bible starts with this idea, a fallen world needing Redemption, and it ends

with a fallen world Redeemed. The kingdom of God is designed to secure this deliverance, but to do this it must necessarily embrace *a Supernatural interference* as predicted. It was God that entailed the curse, set its limits, enforced it by natural law, and it must *be God again* who removes the same ; but when He does this we are told that He breaks down *the barriers* set up by Himself through natural law. Hence Supernatural interference (*i.e.*, miracles), in the nature of the case, given as "*signs*" of that which is promised, and is to come, is really and truly an interference, a suspension, or controlling, for the time being, of natural law. They are "*signs*" *of redemption from the power of natural law* which now enchains us, and not, as many suppose, "signs" which are only to co-operate with natural law. Surveying the entire Redemptive Plan, and seeing that the miraculous is the assurance given to us of an ultimate freedom from laws under which the millions upon millions, including the saints, of earth's inhabitants have groaned for ages, it is *a lack of faith* to say that miracles do not come in direct conflict with natural law and by the force of the Supernatural in them overcome in the blessed examples given, leaving the natural law, after these isolated checks, to run on its allotted course until the Supernatural comes in *the Person of Jesus*, at the Second Advent, to "*make all things new.*" Therefore it is that we can so cordially receive nearly all definitions, because a miracle is to be regarded as an act of Divine power (so Nast, Introd. Com. Matt.), an event which the material laws of nature, without the Divine agency, could not possibly effect, which event is a "sign" or indication what the Divine power will do hereafter when natural law shall be modified, changed, etc., in "the world to come." Hence we can receive Dr. Schmucker's (*Pop. Theol.*, p. 29) definition : "A miracle is a superhuman effect, an event transcending the power of man, produced or occurring contrary to the well-known and ordinary course of nature ;" or Horne's (*Introd.* vol. 1, p. 93), that "A miracle is an effect or event contrary to the established constitution or course of things, or a sensible suspension, or controlment of, or deviation from, the known laws of nature, wrought either, by the immediate act, or by the assistance, or by the permission of God, and accompanied with a previous notice or declaration that it is performed according to the purpose and by the power of God, for the proof or evidence of some particular doctrine, or in attestation of the authority or divine mission of some particular person (Comp. definitions, Dr. Wardlaw *On Miracles*, *Ency. Relig. Knowl.*, Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, Alexander's *Evidences*, Glieg's *His. Bible*, etc.). Those writers (as *e.g.* Knapp, *Theol.* p. 59, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* Art. "Miracles") who are anxious to conciliate objections, and therefore make the miracles to be accomplished "by means of nature" without altering, disturbing, or counteracting natural law, constantly overlook not only of what really the miracles are "signs," but that many of the miracles are the direct opposite of that which would result from natural law. The continued force of natural law and the existence of a miracle are in antagonism, as seen, *e.g.*, in natural law producing death and retaining the victim in corruption and dissolution, while a life-giving miracle for the time, breaks this law, suspends it, etc. The older definitions of theologians are consequently nearer the truth than many (*e.g. Princeton Review*, Oct., 1853 ; Row's "*Ch. Evidences*;" 1877, "*The Unseen Universe,*") of the modern ones. And finally may we add, that the use made (*e.g.* by Rob. Dale Owen and others) of this concession to natural law not now recognized, is bearing its logical fruit in the denial of any miraculous power to Christ, and in the assertion that the powers exercised by Him were all "natural, as occurring strictly under law." * Our position closes the door against all such deductions, exalting the immediate agency and Will of God. For miracles are designated "*powers*"

* Thus, *e.g.*, Potter ("Christianity and its Definitions"), speaking of the changes in belief, remarks : "Rarely now by any scholarly writer of any sect do we find the old idea of miracle advocated. Instead of being regarded as a direct abrogation of natural law by supernatural will, miracle is now pretty generally interpreted as the temporary action of some higher law *just as natural* though rarer in its operations ; and some theological writers even go so far as to affirm that reason may yet explain miracles—a concession that *substantially abandons* the miracle-idea ; as does also the use by many modern theologians of the word *supernatural* in the sense of spiritual." Interesting remarks illustrative of this spirit, and in opposition to it, will be found in Uhlhorn's "Modern Repres. of the Life of Jesus," Harless's "Life of Jesus," Tholuck's "Credibility of the Gospel History," Hofman's "Examination of the Life of Jesus by Strauss," Smith's "Faith and Philosophy," and the writings on "Miracles" by Collyer, Penrose, Evans, Litton, Mountford, Upham, Belcher, Le Bas, Mansel, Haven, Rogers, Twesten, and many others, including works on "Evidences ;" as Norton, Ebrard, etc., etc.

(dunameis), evidencing *the potency of the Messianic King* to introduce the Mill. era; they are called "*works*" (erga), "*the works of God*," illustrating the divine ability to accomplish all the promises of God, and, therefore, instead of shrinking from the Biblical idea of a miracle, we accept of it with hope and joy, as indicative of glorious deliverance. The miracles of the Old Test., the subject of special ridicule (such as "the speaking ass," Samson's exploits, the destruction of the cities of the plain, etc.), are to be regarded in this light, viz., showing how God's power will be exerted in the future.

Obs. 3. Miracles are necessary to a revelation pertaining to the kingdom, a kingdom which is to be set up by an astounding miraculous display. They become parts, *essential parts* of the revelation, exhibiting *the earnests of power* that is ultimately to accomplish it. If they were missing, an important link would be gone. God engages to establish a kingdom and one too in which the supernatural shall introduce mighty changes; He promises a Messiah who is to perform this work, and who, consequently, must possess miraculous power; the forces now at work in nature, instead of tending toward it, cannot possibly accomplish what is foretold of the future, and so long as they remain unchanged the promises of God continue unrealized; when Jesus comes in accordance with Divine purpose He must necessarily, not only in person, life, etc., but in *actual exerted power* exhibit His ability to be *the fulfiller* of prophecy; His attestations of the possession of such power are sustained by their connection with the Divine plan, past and future prediction, moral aim, lack of self-contradiction, public performance, etc.; the power displayed is of a character corresponding with that required by the predictions, power over nature, over evil, over all things; the unity of the Word, promising restoration from evil now suffered under natural law, makes these miraculous representations essential, so that we can have faith and hope in the promised kingdom, in His being the promised Messiah, who shall set it up, and in the certainty of a future miraculous demonstration in our behalf in that kingdom—all which is again corroborated by the fallen condition of man requiring Divine interposition, by the necessity of its possession to constitute a perfect Redeemer, by the personal experience of believers in receiving a moral and providential "earnest" (comp. remarks by Eaton, *Perm. of Christianity*, "On General and Special Providence"), and by reason conceding that a Divine purpose, extending from creation into the eternal ages and embracing *restitution as its glorious end*, cannot possibly do without them. The general sentiment of mankind has always expressed itself as favorable to the idea of the miraculous, because deliverance from evil, now entailed by natural law, has ever been felt as the special work of the supernatural. Hence the miraculous incorporated, more or less, with all religions.

Designing simply to direct attention to the relation that the miraculous sustains to the kingdom, several features of the subject are left for other Propositions, as, *e.g.* the Patristic miracles (Prop. 168), the miracles of the Old Test. (Prop. 182). Some additional reflections may be presented respecting the methods employed to depreciate miracles. We are told by Renan and others that the miraculous occurred to persons who believed in the same, whose faith and credulity made them incapable of a proper judgment. Such, however, overlook (1) that "*ignorant*" men should be able to incorporate them *as essentials* in a developed plan of Redemption; (2) that they do this without eulogy, only stating the simple facts without enlarging; (3) that they do this against their strongest Jewish and national prejudices, as, *e.g.*, in ascribing these to a dead, crucified Jesus, in the miraculous conversion of Paul, in showing how little effect they had upon the nation, etc.; (4) that this was done when it had the tendency to crush the fond expectations of a present kingdom as anticipated, to turn them from the prejudiced

nation to the Gentiles, to yield up all and proclaim ruin, etc., to the chosen nation; (5) that only after the crowning miracle of the resurrection of Jesus showed them that the Divine Procedure as covenanted made these miracles *indispensable links* to a comprehension of the Redemptive Plan in the Messiah, did they unhesitatingly receive and indorse them as the highest proofs of the Christship of Jesus. Froude (*Short Studies*, p. 187) informs us that the question about miracles is simply "one of evidence," and demands more evidence because "antecedently improbable." By this evidence he means, as his Essay indicates, "human testimony," which he proceeds to undermine and render worthless by saying: "Human testimony, we repeat, under the most favorable circumstances imaginable knows nothing of *absolute certainty*." Hence no testimony, no number of witnesses can have any weight with this class, for they tell us, as Renan, that the crucial test of "conditions which science can accept" (*i.e.*, a repeated scientific examination or investigation by unbelievers) has not been complied with, and therefore they cannot be accepted. (It is a wonder that such do not propose to subject the Plan of Redemption to a scientific investigation.) The old argument of Hume's is revived and steadily urged without considering the arguments of Butler, Campbell, Vince, Adam, Douglass, Alexander, Horne, and others, while Froude, Renan, etc., in their published works contradict themselves in the acceptance of testimony on all subjects outside of the miraculous. It is true that the main reason alleged for such a rejection of testimony arises from its supposed disagreement to the uniform, unchangeable laws of nature.* But are those laws so unalterably fixed as these men tell us? If so, then "the unchangeable laws of nature" that produced the naturalistic origin of man, beasts, etc. (now such a favorite with this class) ought to have remained "unchangeable," and they ought to-day under our own observation to originate such men, beasts, etc. At least we ought to behold some of the radical transformations, new modifications, etc., going on; for (Comp. Martensen, *Ch. Dog.* S. 77) eternal laws ought certainly to work as favorably and effectively now as in ages past. Here then at the very outset something is taken for granted as a false premise. Again, it certainly requires great assurance in any man who is utterly unable to explain the nature, extent, source of power, etc., of natural laws to arrogate to himself the ability of deciding that those in part known to himself by experience are the only source of power; that nothing higher, able to modify, shape, or suspend these laws, is in existence. It is arguing in a small circle: the testimony of a limited, personal experience is employed to upset the testimony of others' experience; for it is Hume's, Froude's, Renan's experience over against Paul's, Peter's, and John's. The circle of the former, like the Asiatic who refused to believe that water is changed to ice, refuse all that is opposed to their experience or notion of experience, and in the act deliberately shut out avenues of knowledge, seeing how largely man is dependent upon testimony. If general experience is appealed to, that is simply a begging of the question, seeing that the question at issue is that the experience of some has made them conversant with miracles. Leaving this question of testimony and experience for Treatises specially devoted to its discussion, let the reader observe two things: (1) That the uniformity of nature's operations through established law is one of the essentials to enable us to discriminate a miracle, *i.e.*, the latter is based on and confirmed by the former. A uniformity suddenly arrested, and in isolated instances broken, and then again resumed, is

---

* J. S. Mill, in his Essay on "Theism" (and "Logic"), himself unfriendly to the miraculous, declares that Hume's argument against miracles, based on testimony, is of no weight, provided the existence of God is assumed and a sufficient exigency arises for His making an interposition. This concession, from such a source, is valuable, although Mill refuses to consider the higher testimony, viz., the connection of miracles to the whole. Even the Spiritualists reject Hume's reasoning, as seen, *e.g.*, in Owen's "Footfalls," etc., ch. 3, on "The Miraculous." Rev. Dr. Sprecher (Groundwork of Theol. Div. 2) in a masterly argument shows that when a theistic position is assumed, it is utterly inconsistent to deny the possibility of miracles, which alone can be done from a naturalistic ground, introducing a hard mechanical theory, such, *e.g.*, as Fiske proposes in his "Unseen World," Art. 5, "A Word about Miracles." (Hume has been answered by Brown, "On Cause and Effect," Campbell, "Diss. on Miracles," Whately's "Logic" (Ap.) and "Historic Doubts," Farrar's "Crit. His. of Free Thought," Trench's "Notes on Miracles," and others. Comp. Rev. Powell's "Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation," in which Hume's argument is reproduced, and then, in reply, the Art. in the North Brit. Review, by Prof. Baden Powell, "The Order of Nature.")

requisite. Uniformity then is one of the conditions required in order that a true miracle may appear. (2) That to say, as Science does through some of its representatives, that this uniformity is forever unchangeably the same, that it cannot be intermitted, is to pass from the domain of facts (as evidenced in the naturalistic theory of the origin of things when, it is asserted, law produced *what it does not now*) observed, into that of mere inference and deduction, which may or may not be true. It is only gross materialism that assumes this to be true, and against materialism other arguments indicative of Divine Reason, Will, etc., are requisite before that of miracles is touched. A writer in *Blackwood's Mag.* (1873) on "The Issues raised" by the Prot. Synod of France, briefly, but well expresses these last features. But, after all, the miracles of the Bible are *not dependent* on witnesses, for there is evidence immeasurably more satisfactory in their behalf than that derived from *mere human testimony*. Passing by that which satisfies the believer (viz., an experimental knowledge of the truth that it has power, etc.—for that truth and the miraculous are united) it may be remarked: (1) That if the Divine Purpose is carried on for ages in accordance with the Word given, *then* the Supernatural element which brings forth and carries on the said Purpose amply covers the subordinate ground of the miraculous, as *the greater* includes *the lesser*. (2) That miracles in virtue of such a Divine Purpose being carried out are not "antecedently improbable," but *the most reasonable*, being in full accord with the purposed Plan. (3) That the Divine Purpose being not intended for a scientific test, the adjuncts, as, *e.g.*, miracles, were not designed for the same, but that they are to be regarded *as necessary developments* to insure faith and hope in the Redemptive scheme. (4) Hence, they can only, in the nature of the case, be confirmatory of the faith and hope of those who receive the Redemptive Plan. (5) And that such adjuncts are sustained (*a*) by a Plan that we now see progressing toward completion just as predicted, and (*b*) by individual features pertaining to the Divine Purpose, as, *e.g.*, in the condition of the Jews, the city of Jerusalem, the Church, etc. It is unscholarly when dealing with miracles to refuse to look at that Divine Plan which develops them, at the intent ascribed to them, and at the events connected with them and still perpetuated. It is uncritical to overlook that miracles are addressed to an already exercised faith in the Redemptive Purpose. It is uncandid to separate the miracles from the Being and the Mission of Jesus Christ as represented in *a continuous Divine Work*.

The efforts to undermine miracles are suggested by the most opposite inferences. The objection that a miracle is beyond our comprehension and therefore contrary to reason (which Scientists waive when they propose a scientific test), is now in many quarters superseded in the attempt to lessen their value by approvingly quoting Augustine as saying that they are not suited to every age and mind, being designed as proof only for the ignorant and not for the wise. In the one objection reason cannot grasp them, and in the other they are only suitable for the lowest reason. And we have been pained in noticing semi-believers and believers so influenced by this leaven that they disparage the use of the miraculous. Thus even Farrar (in his excellent *Life of Christ*, Pref. p. 16) says that "to us such evidence is needless. To the Apostles they were the credentials of Christ's mission; to us they are but fresh revelations of His Will. To us they are works rather than signs, revelations rather than portents." (In the body of the work, however, Farrar makes them both, and neutralizes his concession, as, *e.g.*, p. 170, when making "the miracles of Christ as resulting from the fact of His Being and mission no less naturally and inevitably than the rays of light stream outward from the sun.") Regarding them *as essential parts* of a consistent Revelation, and *as earnests* of the fulfilment of God's Word, such lowering concessions of the miraculous, and such a questioning of the adaptability of the same must be discarded. They are just as necessary for "the wise" as for the ignorant; and if they were missing certain "wise" ones would speedily detect their essential nature, and would be the first to raise a cry at their absence, and learnedly show that a revelation claiming to come from a Supernatural source and a kingdom proposed to be set up by Supernatural power must have, as necessary proof or adjuncts, some indications of the miraculous. No man is so wise or learned that he can possibly dispense with miracles. Reason, common-sense, tell us that if lacking it would prove a grave defect. Thus, *e.g.* what assurance could we have respecting the fulfilment of the Redemptive Plan, as given, if the miracles of Christ's birth, person, and resurrection were wanting? How could the Scriptures be fulfilled without them? Suppose prophecy and miracle were stricken out of the Record, what would be the hope that the future could inspire? Let men bring forth all the reasons that hostile ingenuity can frame to lower and degrade the miracles from their prominent position; let them, like Strauss, Bauer, and Renan, declare that the Absolute Cause "never disturbs the chain of secondary causes by single arbitrary acts of intervention," that God never interposes by "any particular

intervention," but that all things fall under eternal unchangeable laws; we fail to see how wisdom is justified in a course of reasoning (which coming from a creature indicates "arbitrary freedom") that removes by one stroke the most positive knowledge that we have of an existing God (for if God never intervenes, our knowledge of Him must be solely inferential), and that if logically carried out, destroys the connection existing between the Creator and creation, God and man, crushes the fondest hopes of humanity in the giant arms of irresistible Fate. The truth is, that in a subject connected, as it must be (for no one can explain *how* the miracles were performed) with difficulty, no explanation, or reasoning, or argument can be so complete but objections can be urged against it if *the heart* desires it to be done. If this is true of the simplest propositions, how much more is this so in a subject which in some of its aspects exceeds human comprehension—the latter a feature, too, that is requisite in order to be indicative of a Supernatural element and not of mere human origin. Hence the part of wisdom is, while candidly weighing objections, not to allow a destructive process, which removes from man the most cherished hopes—sustained by moral law—unless they can be replaced by more substantial ones. To deride the faith or belief of any one, without being able to point out a better one, more solidly based, is certainly not characteristic either of *wisdom or prudence*. To sit as Judge over God and decide what is proper and what improper for Him to do in reference to His Creation or Purpose, is, to say the least, to arrogate to ourselves a lofty, giddy position.

Obs. 4. The solution of miracles is found then in their connection with God and His expressed Will. This Will is especially noticeable in the doctrine of the kingdom. The kingdom, as *the product* of the supernatural, demands miracles; so that faith and hope in the kingdom, as covenanted and predicted, requires belief in the miraculous. Faith in miracles is embraced in an intelligent utterance of the prayer, "*let Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven*," and the assurance that the same will ultimately be realized is expressed in "*Thine is the power.*" The believer gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to miracles; for proceeding from the Divine Will, they teach us in the most forcible manner that in this Will all forces, all life, all things exist; that in this Will is found an overruling, all-pervading Providence capable of general and special energy and supervision; and that in it will be found the most ample resources to meet the requirements as predicted and promised, of the blessed kingdom itself. The miracles strengthen faith, enliven hope, and, amid the pressure of natural laws which entail evil, cheer the heart of the pilgrim with joy at a coming *miraculous restitution*. The Scriptures can never, never be fulfilled without miracle; the earth can never, never be freed from its curse without miracle; man can never, never be delivered without miracle; and, therefore, the Redeemer in whom we trust for redemption is, *as history to-day attests* in the minute and wondrous fulfilment of His miraculous words, *a miracle-working Saviour*. Let infidelity separate God and the world from each other (and even deny that the latter had a Creator), so that the one is not directly interested in the other, it may content itself with the unreasonable, cold, cheerless, dark prospect that this view imparts, its darkness only deepened by the loudly sung deceptive praises of "cosmic force" and a death-devoted humanity; faith in preference takes the soul-inspiring Biblical conception of a creation that has its origin and continuance in a personal, intelligent, loving, all-powerful God; that this is sufficiently indicated in the Word, in miracles of knowledge and work, in history indicating a progressive plan, in the personal experience of the believer, in the person, doctrine, and works of the Messiah; and that this will ultimately be visibly manifested in the kingdom of God, *when God again dwells with man*, man is rescued from his ruined condition, and placed in a renewed

creation where no (unalterable) natural law shall exist to burden him with evil.

Such is the importance of this subject that some additional remarks are in place. With the author of "Supernatural Religion," we have no sympathy with the argument of Dr. Irons and others, that the miraculous is to be received on the authority of the Church. Nor do we rest, as shown, the miraculous upon mere human evidence; for while the latter is a necessary adjunct, yet testimony, as Hume assumed, may be false. Nor do we propose simply to exalt the credibility of the miracle by the doctrine that it sustains, however important the union between them. Miracles are placed on higher ground, viz., as reasonable, requisite features or parts of a developing and progressing Divine Plan (fully announced) which is now in actual course of unfolding and in a certain stage of advancement, so that the ultimate End intended by the Plan is insured by the progress already made. The test to be applied to the miracles, therefore, is the following: (1) Observe the nature of the Redemptive Plan, especially as revealed in its consummation as contemplated; (2) notice the fact that its completion demands the miraculous, seeing that it proposes to do what natural law in itself can never accomplish; (3) hence, the importance and necessity of sustaining faith and hope in the Divine Purpose by indications, especially in the Person of the King, of the miraculous. In this way reason appreciates their pertinency and force, for their reality is evidenced by the just relationship that they sustain to a proposed perfected Redemption—teaching us, more strongly than words that (being "signs" or appendages) the Supernatural will not be lacking in power at the culminating period or time of manifestation. Locke in the *Commonplace Book* (pub. by Lord King) gives this aphorism: "The doctrine proves the miracles, rather than the miracles the doctrine." Our view is this: The doctrine of the kingdom (the contemplated Theocratic ordering) demands the miracles, and the miracles are added to enforce our faith in the doctrine. Hence the twofold appeal in the Scriptures, viz., to believe the miraculous because of the doctrine associated with it, and to believe in the doctrine because of its being justified by the miraculous connected with it. Taylor has even in the title of his work (*The Miracles: Helps to Faith, not Hindrances*) expressed an important truth, for it is pre-eminently true that our faith in the doctrine delivered is sustained by the miracle of knowledge evidenced in the prophecies, in the Person and Life of Jesus, in the signs or earnests given of a glorious future. These form the basis of a firm hope of ultimate deliverance, making the promises of a Sec. Advent, resurrection, renewed earth, etc., *realities*. To all this is added the corroborative personal experience of every one who receives and obeys the truth, which is amply conclusive evidence to every one, even the most ignorant, unable to see how the miraculous is an essential part of a related consecutive Divine Plan in actual course of development and fulfilment. (Comp. Experimental evidence as presented, *e.g.*, in Rogers' *Eclipse of Faith*, Mozley's *Bampton Lects.*, Chalmers' "*Evidences*," etc.) The self-appropriation of the truth (inseparably united with the miraculous), and the resultant experience in the heart and life, amid the trials and sorrows of earth, is in itself so satisfactory that the child and the philosopher, the unlettered and the learned, alike feel and admit its force. The lapse of time instead of weakening (as some assert), really adds power to the testimony favorable to miracles, seeing that the personal experience of many has verified, century after century, the truth of revelation. Reason and Faith both confirm the miraculous. As Walker (*Philos. of the Plan of Salvation*, ch. 3) has well enforced by interesting considerations, "Man cannot, in the present constitution of his mind, believe that religion has a divine origin, unless it be accompanied by miracles." Bushnell (*Nature and Supernatural*) has well placed, as a conclusive proof in behalf of the miraculous, faith (experimentally realized in its transforming power) in the Superhuman character and work of Christ. These two united—reason appreciating the Divine Plan and its relations, and faith realizing the earnest bestowed—are *irresistible,—soul-satisfying*.

PROPOSITION 8. *The doctrine of the kingdom presupposes that of sin, the apostasy of man.*

The prophets with one voice proclaim, that this kingdom is to be established in order that in it man may find complete, perfect deliverance from sin and evil. The kingdom is to be set up, so that man and nature may be happily rescued from the curse entailed by sin under which both labor and groan.

Obs. 1. It is needless to discuss the difficult problem of sin ; the fact of its presence and power is amply sufficient. It is a fundamental fact, and the superstructure of the Bible is in a measure[1] reared upon it ; for the Bible is a revelation of God's plan *to save man from his fallen condition.* The kingdom in its conception, preparation, and ultimate establishment implies, and constantly keeps in view, a recovery from sin and its resultant evil. The kingdom originates in God's merciful desire to deliver us from the reign and power of sin ; to bring us back into a state of *entire restitution and perfect salvation.* It is the manifestation of such salvation, in which man's will shall be in accord with God's, and in which unspeakable blessedness, flowing from such a restoration, shall be realized. It has for its chief ruler a Saviour who saves from sin, and for its associated rulers and subjects those who are redeemed from sin. It is a kingdom which in its preparatory measures calls for repentance of sin (Matt. 3 : 1), conversion from sin (Matt. 18 : 3), self-denial of sin (Mark 9 : 47), perseverance against sin (Luke 9 : 62), and most emphatically refuses admittance into the kingdom of those who indulge in sin (1 Cor. 6 : 9, 10). The scheme of redemption is founded upon the principle annunciated by Jesus : " They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." The disease, as well as the physician and remedy, must be kept in view in order to appreciate the provision made for us.[2]

[1] Hence Schleiermacher, as Tholuck (in *Address* to Evang. Alliance, N. Y., Harper's Ed.) remarks : " All philosophical terms and definitions, all physical investigations, all theses whatever, that could not be derived by strict inference from the profound feeling of sinfulness and the certainty of redemption, were excluded from the dogmatical system of Schleiermacher." Fred. Den. Maurice regards it as a defect in theology that it should start from and build on sin instead of proceeding from God. While there is force in the objection, and while we show in this work that the idea or Plan of the kingdom was something anterior to the fall of man, yet it must also be admitted that this Plan is projected and developed in accordance with the foreknown fall. As the Bible is a book given to indicate the recovery of man from the fall—hence beginning with the fall and ending with the recovery—the fact of the fall should certainly be allowed its due prominency without however overlooking and discarding the antecedent facts. The true basis is *the Edenic state* and what it contemplated. Sin intervened, but the Divine Purpose is to restore man to the state forfeited by sin. Hence the Bible opens *with Paradise and ends with Paradise ;* it does not begin with sin and end with sin.

[2] A believer in the Scriptures must concede that without freely admitting the fallen, sinful, ruined condition of man, the kingdom itself cannot be appreciated ; that the

latter contains within itself perfected Redemption, completed Salvation from the former and its direful results. Sin with its deadly train of evils is found at the opening of the Bible; the kingdom, with its attendant deliverance and blessings of restitution at its close; creation comes to us marred by sin, travails in pain waiting for its rescue, when the sons and daughters of the kingdom are manifested. The one precedes the other; and the one calls forth the love and mercy of God to produce the other. While the kingdom antedates sin and evil so far as the Divine Purpose is concerned, practically it follows as a delivering medium.

Obs. 2. The introduction of sin and its continued existence is a deep mystery.[1] The strongest intellects have endeavored to solve it, but in vain. The most subtle theories respecting its eternity, its necessity, its naturalism, its fatalism, its relation to a moral system, its "creational imperfection," its phenomenal nature, its tendency as a trial of faith, etc., are presented, but none of them entirely remove the difficulties connected with the subject. It still remains an unexplained mystery, so much so that Mill, rejecting the Biblical conception of the mighty God, explains (*Dogma and Literature*) the introduction of evil by limiting the power of the God he reverences, and thus leaves the dreary, hopeless prospect of no future deliverance. The Bible makes *no effort* to explain it; only speaking of it as a painful *fact*, allowed by the permission of an Omnipotent God, and which shall be by His power ultimately crushed. No labored effort in the way of proof is given by inspiration, but a constant appeal is made *to our own consciousness* of the necessity and truthfulness of Divine interposition in view of *the sense* of moral guilt, the evils to which we are subject, the helplessness and limited duration of man, the otherwise inexorable embrace of nature, etc. A fundamental teaching on almost every page is this: that man *unaided* cannot deliver himself from sin and its sad consequences, but *imperatively* requires Divine help in his need. This is most unmistakably presented in the Word; in the conditions and limitations surrounding us; and in the experience and life of every person who will but take time for reflection and self-appropriation of the truth. If sin, its results, and the need of a Redeemer are ignored or denied *after* the dreadful and merciful language of the Bible; *after* the costly provision made for us through Jesus Christ; *after* the testimony given by conscience and the world's history; *after* the universal distinction observed between natural and moral evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice, merit and demerit, praise and blame; *after* the propitiatory sacrifices of the ancients and heathen; *after* the manifested antagonism to that which is good and holy exhibited in the strife between duty and passion, love and selfishness, moral obligation and a violated conscience; *after* the confessions of the most devoted and pious of mankind; after the ten thousand warnings, threats, appeals, and invitations pressed home to a respondent consciousness by the Supreme Ruler Himself, *then nothing* that we can add will influence the heart and mind of the unbeliever.[2]

[1] Compare the candid remarks of Hudson (*Debt and Grace*, p. 20): "It (sin) is essentially *without reason*—an act *of unreason*. To assign a good reason for it would be to justify it as a thing reasonable, which is contrary to its nature. It knows no rational or logical connection. It knows no law; it is pure anomaly. It is the surd quantity which no theologic algebra *can determine*. It can be reduced to no intelligible principle; it baffles explanation." Hudson aptly quotes Neander (*Pl. of Ch.* B. 6, ch. 1, note) as saying: "According to my conviction, the origin of evil can only be understood as *a fact*—a fact possible by virtue of the freedom belonging to a created being, but not to be otherwise deduced or explained. It lies in the idea of evil that it is *an utterly inexplicable thing*,

and whoever would explain it nullifies the very idea of it. It is not the limits of our knowledge which make the origin of sin something inexplicable to us, but it follows from the essential nature of sin as an act of free-will that it must remain to all eternity an inexplicable fact. It can only be understood empirically by means of *the moral self-consciousness.*" Julius Müller (*The Ch. Doc. of Sin*), with Neander, holds that the existence of evil is *inconceivable* in its actuality—that the abuse of free-will is *essentially irrational*, an act *of unreason*. Bushnell (*Nat. and Supernat.* p. 128) concludes: "We find then—this is the result of our search—that sin can *nowise* be accounted for; there are no positive grounds, or principles back of it, whence it may have come." Schlegel (*Philos. of His.* p. 391) calls it "the greatest historical *mystery*—the deepest and most complicated *enigma* of the world." (Comp. Martensen, *Ch. Dog.*) The student's attention is directed to Keerl's *His. of Creation and Doc. of Paradise*, and Art. in Bib. Sacra, Oct. 1863, *Doctrine of the Fall of the World* (with which Comp. Kurtz's *Bible and Astronomy*, Beecher's *Conflict of Ages*, etc.) Keerl claims many eminent Philosophers, Naturalists and Theologians as holding to the idea that physical disorders and evil resulted from the fall of a previous (to this one) holy earth, which was precipitated into a chaotic state, owing to the fallen estate of Satan and his angels. However such a line of defence may be adapted to remove some naturalistic objections (as, *e.g.*, in reference to death existing previous to the trial of Adam, etc.), yet every appeal to a pre-existent state only shifts the mystery farther back and leaves it unsolved.

[2] Alas, many taking advantage of the mystery of evil, and overlooking *how* the terrible fact is supported by incontestible evidence, even in their own experience, utterly deny the existence of sin, and pronounce evil to be simply an imperfection of nature. Materialistic views, as, *e.g.*, in Moleschott, Paine, Vogt, etc., necessarily lead to such contradictory conclusions, making conscience a delusion, the sense of moral obligation a vain deceit, and thus overriding the respect shown by ages to moral law and man's self-consciousness. It is only extremists, who make little of the Supernatural, that take such a position; for multitudes who deny the authority of the Bible, still cling, under the sense that some kind of Religion is a necessity, to the notion that sin and evil, however explained, are a resultant of our connection with a Power outside of us—a Supernatural source—that has placed us *under moral law*, and made us susceptible to its behests. No matter how the origin of it is explained, as an imperfection, or a dualistic antagonism, or an eternal corruption, or a necessary offset of free-will, or a developer of good, trial, discipline, divine attributes, etc., or the result of temptation, or the necessary accompaniment of a moral system, etc., both unbelief and belief cannot fathom the mystery. Unbelief cannot do it, for it leaves us in the dark why it should be introduced in the manner asserted by it; and belief is equally powerless to assign a satisfactory reason. The difficulty, so long as we allow a Supreme Being of Love and mercy to have been the Originator of all things, is beyond our solution, and perhaps Laurentius Calla (quoted by Hudson) was not far wrong when he said, "I doubt if the angels themselves know it." Dr. Johnson (*Works*, vol. 2, p. 604), in reviewing the reasons assigned for the Origin of evil, concludes: "For the Evils of Life there is some good reason, and in confession that the reason cannot be found."

Obs. 3. The wisdom of the Bible is justified by its silence respecting the origin of evil. Had it condescended to such explanations as are given in various theodicies, it would have indicated a mere human opinion, and not a divine inspiration. A painful defect would then be visible, which infidelity would eagerly seize, and urge against its authority.

The Bible, therefore, in its reticence shows itself superior to the vain, limited efforts of man in this direction; it simply states the fact, explains the nature of sin (as the transgression of the law, the perverse act of the free-will, etc.), tells us that it was permitted by God, and that He has graciously made provision against it. The Scriptures teach that sin and its results are hateful to God; that they exist only through divine sufferance; that forbearance and mercy now allow their manifestation; that enduring long-suffering will at an appointed time end; and both shall be rooted out of this world. Pascal (quoted by Dr. M'Cosh in reply to Huxley), after showing that man has both greatness and misery, and that his condition is not one of absolute grandeur or of hopeless degradation, adds: "So manifest is it that we were once in a state of perfection from which we are now unhappily fallen. It is astonishing that the mystery which is the farthest removed from our knowledge—I mean the transmission of original sin—should

be that without which we can have no true knowledge of ourselves. It is in this abyss that the clue to our condition takes its turnings and windings, insomuch that man is more incomprehensible without this mystery than this mystery is incomprehensible to man." The painful, sad fact is one of general conviction, however explained by ancients and moderns (Leathes' *Relig. of Christ*, sec. 1). Williamson (*Theol. and Moral Science*, p. 118, etc.), a Universalist writer, fully admits a natural conflict, into which every man falls, between the law of love and the law of animal nature, from which personal sin arises, and declares, "that conflict exists as *a constitutional fact* in every human being;" hence, as all men, more or less, violate the law of love in this conflict, all men are sinners. However we may attempt to expound this subject, the Biblical conception that we are sinners needing Redemption is one enforced by *moral consciousness*, provided the truth as given by God is allowed to exert its designed influence *by self-appropriation*. Rogers (*Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, sec. 2) assigns as one of the reasons that the Bible is given by God, that the moral portrait of man as presented in it is one *utterly opposed* to the natural man. The indictment that *all* have gone astray, that *all* are sinners, that *all* are worthy of condemnation, is too sweeping for man—owing to pride, etc.—alone to have generated. To this we add, that if man had produced this portrait within his own knowledge, he would, as multitudes in their efforts attest, have entered into explanations, definitions, interpretations, opening out endless metaphysical and philosophical discussions. The admirable simplicity and silence of the Bible upon a subject, which, in the nature of the case, demands the highest intellectual development, is a collateral and decided proof of its divine origin. Man, unsupported and unguided, would have overstepped the limits assigned, and introduced confusion and difficulties.

Obs. 4. The problem of evil, which has so greatly exercised and perplexed the wisest of men, is connected with the mystery that will be finished (Rev. 10 : 7). Until that predicted period arrives, unsatisfactory conjectures must suffice. God has not yet seen fit to give us the reasons for its origin and continued existence, excepting in broken hints respecting free agency, trial, mercy, long-suffering, etc., preferring to deal with it as *a constantly experienced fact*. With this we must rest content, assured of one thing, that in some way it will be found promotive of His own glory. Reason can already gather and assign (as various writers, Müller, Tholuck, Oosterzee, etc., have done) considerations and arguments indicative of the same, but as our object is merely to direct attention to those derived from the kingdom, such may be passed by without remark. The kingdom being designed to restore the harmony existing before the fall between God and man, and man and nature, it also deals with the fact of evil without entering into its origin. Looking at the final result, the end as attained in the kingdom, it may well be allowed that God permitted the entrance of evil and its continuance because He could overrule it gloriously. Sin is opposed to the theocratic idea, it is hostile to it, but God seeing that He could still, with honor to Himself, restore the designed theocracy even in a most splendid manner, permitted sin,[1] only restraining it within certain limits by entailed evils. Sin brought forth, as a counteracting potent agency through extended love and mercy, the humanity of Jesus, the Christ, *i.e.* it created the necessity, in order to produce a successful and powerful theocratic kingdom, of God identifying Himself with man in the Son of David, thus bringing Him into a nearer and most intimate relationship with humanity, and preparing the way for a manifested theocratic rule over the world. In brief, it led to the bringing forth a God-man as the theocratic King who should, in virtue of His distinguished position, be able to deliver us from all evil. God's forbearance and love is justified in this wonderful union of the divine and human, and the correspondent restoration of His theocratic rule in the form best adapted and most honorable to humanity.[2]

[1] We cannot limit the power of God. Thus, *e.g.*, Williamson (*Theol. and Moral Science*, p. 204, etc.) endeavors to vindicate God by making evil a necessary result of creation, and conceives it impossible for God to have created a universe like ours, limited in space and conditioned by time, "without involving the necessity of the relations of evil that emerge from its process and movements." This, however—while not so derogatory as Mill's impotent God—is too sweeping, being forbidden by *a previous Paradisaical state, God's abhorrence of sin, its entailed curse, and the future deliverance of creation.* We must fall back upon the position assumed by Leibnitz (Knapp's *Theol.* p. 265) in his Theodicy, viz., to look at the end attained, which, in view of the good results produced (e.g., in the King brought us, in the kings and priests developed, in the Theocracy it establishes, in the Redemption of the race it brings forth, in the praise and glory it causes, etc.), influenced God, who knoweth all things, to allow its introduction. (Comp. Oosterzee's *Ch. Dog.*, Herzog's Ency., Art. "*Sin*," Julius Müller's "*Ch. Doc. of Sin.*")

The permission of sin—however it may be founded, as eminent writers endeavor to show, on personal liberty, free-will—is certainly based on the fact—as taught in the Bible—that God can and does overrule it to be ultimately promotive of His own glory (so, e.g., "Greybeard" (Graff), "*Lay Sermons*," No. 42, on "The blessings of the Fall"); otherwise He would not have tolerated its existence for so many burdened centuries.

[2] God's ways, however mysterious to us now, will be justified in "the age to come;" and that justification will be found in the Kingdom as constituted under the Messiah. Sin has beaten down and perverted the Theocratic ordering of God as originally designed, and anciently unfolded in its initiatory; it caused the postponement of the same for many centuries; it will resist with increased power at the period of its revelation; it will band the kings of the earth and their armies against the Theocratic King, but it will ultimately be vanquished, and *then* the deep mystery will be unfolded. *Then* it will be seen that the strength of sin is so great that nothing short of Omnipotence can meet and destroy it; that nothing less than unspeakable love and mercy can provide means commensurate to overcoming it; that nothing but the Theocratic power lodged in King Jesus can triumphantly resist and crush it. The co-heirs with Christ have shown their qualification by a voluntary renunciation of sin for co-rulership in a kingdom which is expressly designed to destroy all evil. When this time comes, *then* all will be made manifest; until then *patience and hope* must be ours. Now we see "through a glass darkly," but then—after a few thousand years' experience showing that without God's personal government, the race cannot be happy—all will be explained—just as Joseph's antecedent trials—consistently with the Divine Sovereignty and a superintending Providence. Faith, with child-like trust, receives the fact, and leaves the explanation with a returning God.

Obs. 5. Taking the Bible account of sin and its results, it is important to notice what are the forfeited blessings, and then to see whether the kingdom, which embraces the practical realization of the plan of redemption, *restores all* that the race lost. The enumeration of the most weighty are the following: 1. The loss of moral purity; 2. The entailment of physical degeneracy; 3. Subjection to toil, disease, death, and corruption; 4. The withdrawal of the personal presence of God; 5. Divine intercommunication with angelic beings removed; 6. The infliction of a curse upon creation; 7. A struggle for life and its blessings under uniform natural law, *i.e.* the special provision of Eden under the supernatural no longer afforded; 8. The loss of Eden itself; 9. The non-perpetuation of the race in a state of innocency and purity; 10. The non-erection of a perfect government because of resultant depravity. These are the sad fruits of sin, impressed by the consciousness of guilt. Now the primitive Church doctrine of the kingdom, fully sustained by the plain teaching of the Scriptures, affirms *a complete restoration of all these blessings.* The reader's indulgence is asked until we pass over the doctrine as given in the Word, and by the early Church. This much, however, may be said, 1. That *such* blessings forfeited can only be restored through Divine interference; 2. That *such* a restitution indicates the completeness of the

Divine plan; 3. That *such* a removal of evil shows forth the might and perfection of the Saviour; 4. That *such* a Divine purpose contained in the Bible and established by the inestimable gift of a Redeemer, ever keeping in view this completeness, never contradicting itself, extending through every book of the Scriptures, and given in successive ages and by men in varied circumstances and conditions of life, must be, as claimed, an inspired one.

In addition: Observing the ultimate end contemplated by the Divine Purpose, and noticing the remarkable provision made already for the removal of sin and evil, several things, resulting from a consideration of the dealings of God in preparing for the consummation, must be impressed upon our minds. (1.) The remedial measures introduced and enforced by Divine Sovereignty, finding their climax in the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, show that man must have fallen from his former estate, thus making them necessary. (2.) The call to repentance and faith to conform to the remedial provisions, indicates in the trial given to man that sin is voluntary. (3.) A Plan of Redemption culminating in the blessings of the Kingdom, and flowing from God's wisdom, love, and mercy, is eminently worthy of man's consideration and acceptance. (4.) This Plan to be properly appreciated ought to be contemplated as a whole, and not merely in some of its particulars. (5.) That if the Plan, as a whole, is adapted to secure the end designed, and if carried out will inevitably produce the result (Redemption perfected) aimed at, then the subsidiary parts (including the fall, etc.) are also worthy of reception as being related to it—the greater including the lesser. (6.) The manifestation of a visible Theocratic ordering is alone capable of crushing sin and removing it from the world. (7.) That evil under which man and the world labors—however subservient as a punishment, as testing faith, character, etc.—is the result of God's disapprobation of sin, and is only tolerated in view of the ultimate result that God brings forth from its existence.

The favorite theory of many (Lubbock, and others), to invalidate the Biblical account of a fall from a higher to a lower position, is to advocate a constant and invariable rise and progression from a lower to a higher state, *i.e.*, from the lowest savageism to the highest civilization. But this is only recognizing one factor in the past, viz., that such a rise and progress can be the result of favorable circumstances and proper moral and religious appliances. But another factor, that vitiates the universality of the theory, is purposely overlooked, viz., that man has also degenerated into savage life, dwindled from power into weakness, from vast numbers into a small number and even into extinction,—as exemplified in the works of past ages, the labors of extinct races, the remains of past nations, Assyrian, Egyptian, Persian, Roman, Mound-workers, etc. Man (as e.g. Frothingham, Art. in *North Amer. Review*, 1878, p. 46, "Is man a depraved creature?") may deny the natural depravity of man, and designate the first Adam "a fiction" and "myth," a "creature of speculation, and as a creature of speculation his existence dates back no farther than a century or so (!) before Christ." Our line of argument will amply meet such heart-wrought objections; for the present it is sufficient to observe that upon this "myth" is based by "ignorant and designing men" a most wonderful plan of restitution, with such a unity, so astounding in its manifestations through many centuries, and so well attested by a continued and existing fulfilment of prophecy and of personal experience, that such writers are utterly unable to account for "the fiction" that so many esteem the precious truth.

Obs. 6. Latterly it has become fashionable in the works of Naturalists, Free Religionists, etc., to ignore evil and enter into a laudation of nature, its harmony, its goodness, uniform beneficence, etc. This is purposely done, so that Christianity, which holds forth, in connection with the good, the dark side of nature, may suffer by the comparison. The contrast, however, is imperfect; and the spirit suggesting it, if not dislike to the Bible, at least does injustice to its teachings. The ostrich is said to deem itself out of danger when its head is thrust into the sand and its pursuer for the time is unseen; so these, by simply closing their eyes to the inevitable of nature, consider themselves the highly favored sons and daughters of

natural law and development. The suffering, misery, sorrow, destructive agencies, voracious grave entailed by and experienced through nature, are sedulously kept out of view, and nature or the absolute is nothing but manifested, realized love, while in Christianity the God, who is represented as making provision for deliverance from such evil, is nothing but a tyrant, a gloomy despot! Is this fair or candid? Without pausing to inquire how far theology with its deductions and inferences added to the Word is responsible for driving men into such a state of antagonism, it is sufficient to say: if nature, or the absolute, is all that they claim, although evil and death are allowed, why not apply the same criticism to the God of Revelation, who also has permitted the same, that they do to nature? And the more so, because the God of the Bible proposes a recovery from evil which the other, in no shape or form, suggests? Evidently, because it does not suit their purpose; and because it would inevitably weaken and destroy their own argument. Before applying their destructive criticism to Revelation, let them first reconcile with their own theory of love, etc., the evil that is in nature, its destroying forces, diseases, pestilences, agony, and devouring death. If they cannot reconcile this with their own notion of a loving nature or absolute, let them frankly confess it; if they can explain and reconcile all this with their theory of goodness, thousands would gladly welcome the solution. Until such a solution is given, they of all others, because relying upon reason, should not object to *the mystery of evil* as related to Divine revelation. If a reconciliation were attempted, avoiding ultra naturalism and admitting an intelligent first cause, it would evidently fall in the line of those attempted in behalf of the God of the Bible. We are content to receive the Biblical account that evil is the resultant of a rejection of the theocratic idea (*i.e.*, a violation of God's rule), that it continues until God has, by a course of testing, gathered out all the material requisite to establish the theocracy in a most glorious and triumphant manner, and that when all things are prepared, the postponement caused by sin will close by *the complete overthrow of evil* through the appointed King and His co-rulers.

It is true that those who advocate the Nihilism of the individual man, his perishing, admit the evil in Nature, and from it, owing to unchangeable law, are forced into their theory of gloom. But even such are again divided into two classes. One party, as some German writers, present no hope of the future, being logically driven to it by the fact that the evils are so inexorably related to eternal natural law that they are beyond man's power of removal. Another party, however (as *e.g.* Winwood Reade in *Martyrdom of Man*), while giving no hope to the individual man (mere "animated jelly"), somehow, in a Pantheistic idealism, dream of a glorious future for Humanity. How illogical this is, needs no explanation, seeing that inevitable natural law which promises no deliverance from evil for the individual, presents none for humanity in the future. Rather than humbly to receive the Word of God, men will seek out and trust in the most extravagant theories.

It is worthy of notice that some unbelieving philosophers give as dark a portraiture of human nature as the most ultra theologian. Passing by the Nihilists, we select e.g. Mill, who, in one of his Essays, remarks: "Man, viewed as a simple production of nature, has in him but one good thing, the capacity of improvement; he is naturally devoid of a sense of truth, a coward, cruel, selfish, and even a lover of dirt. The truth is, there is hardly a point of excellence belonging to human character which is not decidedly repugnant to the untutored feelings of human nature." "Whatever good thing man now possesses, either in himself or in his outward surroundings, he has attained not from the gift of nature but from his having conquered and subdued her." Then contrast the laments of Nihilism, and the shading of the picture is immensely darker than that given by the Word; and yet men accuse the Bible of gloom, etc. Now

which class of our opponents are we to credit? The one, that eulogizes, or the other, that depreciates human nature? Or, is it the safest to take the medium and explanation given in the Word, viz., that man, although fallen, possesses noble characteristics worthy of being redeemed and employed in his Creator's service; that fallen, he is unable to deliver himself from the sinfulness and evil entailed without Divine Help; and that accepting such aid, tendered in love and mercy, it restores him to a position of moral worthiness and excellence by directing his capacities and powers in the way of holiness and love.

A word of caution in conclusion: The attacks of unbelief come from all sides, and one of the most despicable that has fallen under our observation is that which endeavors to charge the Word of God with advocating sin or rather fleshly lusts. Whatever may have been the sinful practices of professors or of the church in the past, the Bible *pointedly condemns all such*, warns us that they shall be witnessed, and urges us to purity and holiness. This is so plain, that he who denies it does deliberate violence to a distinguishing characteristic of the Scriptures. The Word, which provides so costly a provision for sin, cannot and does not indulge it. Now it happens that recently some writers (as e.g. the author of *Ancient Sex Worship*) endeavor to show that the fleshly tendency in human nature to worship the sexual organs as emblematic, etc., is, more or less endorsed by Christianity. This offensive manner of bringing discredit upon the Word by linking with it the excesses of sex worship, defeats itself in the estimation of every reflecting and sensible mind, because the Bible so pointedly condemns all fleshly lusts and positively declares that those entertaining them shall never inherit the Kingdom of God.

PROPOSITION 9. *The nature of, and the things pertaining to the kingdom, can only be ascertained within the limits of Scripture.*

This kingdom is God's kingdom; it is one that *He proposes* to establish, and being the outgrowth of His Divine purpose, we must apply to Him for information respecting it. This He extends to us in His Word, and what He has said, being the only One capable of imparting knowledge on the subject, is to be received in preference to human opinions. The kingdom itself, the subject of a thousand prophecies pertaining to the future, is, as delineated by God, a prediction of that which is to come, and hence beyond human ability to portray, unless God's description of it is carefully studied and copied. Outside of the Scriptures, nothing reliable is to be found, only excepting in so far as it may be in accord with Holy Writ. Scripture, and that alone, contains the reliable, authoritative information; and therefore, instead of going to second sources, application should be made to the fountain-head itself to appreciate and enjoy the issuing pure stream of covenant and prophecy. God's words in describing what He intends to perform, are *most certainly* to be preferred to man's. We are justified in thus placing confidence alone in the Word of God, seeing that, when this kingdom is to be manifested in all its glory, the King Himself has the significant name (Rev. 19 : 13), in addition to the one upon His vesture and thigh, "*The Word of God*," for it is in Him, by Him, and through Him that the Word is fulfilled and realized.

One of the distinguishing results of the Reformation was "the resurrection of the Bible," making it, as in the Apostolic era, the object of constant citation and appeal. In view of this Chillingworth (*Works*, c. 4) said: "The Bible only is the Religion of Protestants," and Dorner (*His. Prot. Theol.* 1, 2) remarks: "Protestantism seeks, indeed, its ultimate foundation in the nature of Christianity, as it is handed down to us in a documentary form in the Scriptures." With this may be compared the utterances of Protestant Confessions and Symbolical books, as e.g. Westminster Conf., Art. of Church of Eng., Conf. Hel., Book of Concord, Neth. Confess., Heidelberg Cat., etc. For the opinions of Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, etc., see Hagenbach's *His. of Doctrines*, Vol. 2, sec. 240, who also informs us (Vol. 1, sec. 212) that "the formal principle of the Reformation, of Protestantism is subjection to the authority of Scripture." Dr. Schaff (*The Principle of Protestantism*, p. 70, etc.) discusses this "formal or knowledge principle" in an interesting manner, asserting: "If there be then any unerring fountain of truth, needed to satisfy religious want, it can be found *only* in the Word of God, who is himself the truth; and this becomes thus consequently the highest norm and rule, by which to measure all human truth, all ecclesiastical tradition, and all synodical decrees." (Comp. Art. "*The Apostles' Creed*," Princeton Review, 1852.) Dr. Schaff justly shows how this was a revival of the position occupied by the early church, by some of the later Fathers, and even, however obscured and fettered by subsequent tradition, by some of the Roman Catholic divines, forcibly quoting Moehler, etc. The usual Romish view is expressed by Bellarmine, making the Church superior to the Bible, its judge; and this is exemplified e.g. in Heefert (Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.* Vol. 1, p. 424) pronouncing the doctrinal posi-

tion of Wycliffe and Huss at their trials (viz., as solely founded on the Scriptures), "the Alpha and Omega of error." Hippolytus (Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, Vol. 2, p. 144), says: "There is one God, my brethren, and Him we know only by the Holy Scriptures. For in a like manner as he who wishes to learn the wisdom of this world cannot accomplish it without studying the doctrines of the philosophers, thus all who wish to practise divine wisdom will not learn it from any other source than from the Word of God. Let us therefore see what the Holy Scriptures pronounce; let us understand what they teach; and let us believe what the Father wishes to be believed, and praise the Son as He wishes to be praised, and accept the Holy Spirit as He wishes to be given. Not according to our own will, nor according to our own reason, nor forcing what God has given, but let us see all this as He has willed to shew it by the Holy Scriptures."

Obs. 1. The doctrine of the kingdom being one of the greatest in the Bible (Props. 1 and 2), it must, like all pure Christian doctrine, be found within its pages. No true or scripturally founded doctrine of the kingdom can possibly be at variance with the express language of Holy Writ. This is self-evident, and important use will be made of this principle, clearly showing as we proceed that no doctrine on this subject excepting that of the primitive Christian Church is in full sympathy with the Word. This correspondence, so far as one sense, the literal, is concerned, our most decided opponents frankly admit.

This work being largely composed of doctrine, it is proper, briefly, to notice the notion extensively held and strenuously advocated (e.g. Dr. Arnold in *Literature and Dogma*), that it makes no material difference what we believe only so that the conduct is right, for "religion is conduct," etc. This is a crusade renewed against the presentation of truth in a dogmatical or doctrinal form, and finds a champion in Prof. Seely, who raises the standard, "Christian morality without dogmas." This cry is raised in many quarters, being duly appreciated by the sceptical as a blow at a vital part of Christianity. (Thus e.g. D'Aubigne, in his *Address* to Ch. Alliance at N. York, informs us that "at an important assembly held lately in German Switzerland, at which were present many men of position, both in Church and State, the basis of the new religion was laid down: 'No doctrines,' was the watchword on that occasion, 'No new doctrines, whatever they may be, in place of the old; Liberty alone.'") Freely conceding the difference between doctrine and conduct, doctrine and practical religion, doctrine and Christian life; cheerfully willing to attest to the exceeding value of the latter, and that it may even exist without the entertainment of a great amount of doctrinal knowledge, yet it is folly to disconnect doctrine from religion, seeing that the latter is a natural outgrowth from the former, that they sustain *a mutual relationship*, and that to produce a symmetrical whole they must be united. Doctrine has been aptly compared to the root, and morality or conduct to the growth; for every believer must accept of some truths giving motives for conduct, which are either doctrinally stated in the Word, or dogmatically presented in the formulas of the church. Faith must, in some form, have an outward, intellectual expression in connection with its heart work. Mind and heart are both enlisted. Truth to be apprehended must be formally stated. Reason demands, intellectual culture requires, as its concomitant, a distinctive statement in language of those ideas which are given either as worthy of credence, or as inducements to action. Doctrine may indeed exist without corresponding conduct (which may be the fault of the man and not of the doctrine), but true Christian conduct cannot be produced without doctrine, as e.g. the doctrine of God, of Jesus Christ, of repentance, of faith, etc., influencing us to a certain determined course of life. To destroy this *vital union*, is to sever the tree from its roots, to remove the building from its foundation, and thus give us a sickly, dying tree and a ruined, unsafe building. The fact is, that the very men who strive to disconnect what *God has joined together* by inseparable laws; who sneer at the declaration of the Chancellor of the University of Oxford for saying that "religion is no more to be severed from dogmas than light from the sun"—these men are actually engaged in laying down doctrines, dogmatically expressed, for our acceptance. This feature alone, the resultant of a law that they *cannot* avoid, indicates the connection between the two, which, in the very act of an attempted destruction, they only confirm. Graybeard (*Lay Sermons*, Nos. 75 and 76) urges "the importance of maintaining sound doctrine," asserting truthfully that "the great fundamental framework of the Scriptures is its doctrines,"

and comparing them to the bones of the body, imparting consistency and form. He concludes: "All sound doctrine centres in Christ, and is founded on Christ. Not to know its power and value is to be a weakling, and to deny the importance of it is to dishonor God. '*Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ hath both the Father and the Son.* If there come any man unto you, and bringeth not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed; for he that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds' (2 Jno. 9–11)." The Bible commends "continuing steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine" (Acts 2:42), and persevering in "sound doctrine" (1 Tim, 1:3, 10), as promotive of strength and salvation (e.g. 1 Tim. 4:13–16).

Obs. 2. To comprehend fully any doctrine, especially that of the kingdom, there must be a diligent comparing of Scripture with Scripture. Dr. Neander (*His. of Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 623) says of Melanchthon that on occasion of the Leipzig disputation he stated, "that it is the duty to abide by the pure and simple meaning of the Holy Writ, as, indeed, heavenly truths are always the simplest; this meaning is to be found by comparing Holy Writ with itself." Dr. Dorner (*His. Prot.*, vol. 2, p. 429) justly remarks: "The work of theological criticism, especially in so far as it touches upon doctrinal matters, must always at last become a criticism, or a measuring, of Scripture by Scripture—in other words, the self-criticism of the canon through the instrumentality of believers."[1] The hermeneutical canon of the Reformers (Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, sec. 240), "to interpret and illustrate Scripture by Scripture," is ours, imitating "The Noble Lesson" of the Waldensians: "The Scriptures speak, and we must believe. Look at the Scriptures from beginning to end."

[1] This rule was early observed in the church. Thus e.g. Neander (*His. of Dog.* Vol. 1, p. 77) says of Irenæus "that the Holy Scriptures should be explained by comparing one passage with another, and that he held them to be the complete and normal source of the knowledge of Christian doctrine." We follow Irenæus, of whom Erasmus (Eras. *Epist.* prefixed to Irenæus) says: "Irenæus fought against the troops of heretics with arguments (munitions) drawn from the Scriptures alone." This was only an imitating of Christ, the apostles, and prophets, who constantly appealed to, and cited from, the Record, thus comparing the things of the Spirit. It is gratifying to see eminent men, in Europe and this country, lay so much stress on the self-interpretation of the Bible, by which alone the true analogy of it can be discovered, and a real profound acquaintance with its substance can be acquired. In such a comparison, however, a number of things must be observed in order to make it consistent and successful. All Scripture must be received, and not a portion of it be rejected (e.g. as Acts and Pauline epistles by Swedenborg) because we cannot make it fit into our doctrinal system. The connected reasoning of the writer must not give place to deductions from mere fragmentary or isolated passages. A doctrine must, by an instituted comparison, be *in harmony* both with the general analogy of Scripture and of Faith, i.e. it must not be in antagonism with the grammatical language or meaning of Scripture, or with its doctrinal teaching. The comparison must be made with due reverence for Scripture, so that a willingness to receive its meaning, without undue bias or prejudice, may exist. Passages that are strictly parallel, and not merely made such by accommodation or perversion, are to be employed, and, in brief, the cautions and rules laid down for a consistent doctrinal interpretation by such writers as Horne (*Introd. of the Bible*), Alford (*How to Study the New Test.*), Dunn (*The Study of the Bible*), Bickersteth (*Scripture Help*), Stuart (*Elements of Interpretation*, altered from Ernesti's work), etc., must be duly observed. With all this, there must be an abiding sense of the inspiration of the Word, so that there is no unjust discrimination between portions of it, as e.g. between the Old and New Testaments (Schleiermacher, etc.), between the so-called Narrator and the Commentator (Rothe, etc.), between the Gospels and the Epistles (Renan, etc.), between the Bible and tradition (Bellarmine, etc.), between the Scriptures and human opinion (Parker, etc.), etc.

Obs. 3. The doctrine of the kingdom being thus exclusively derived from the Word for reasons already assigned (others will be given hereafter), *an*

earnest protest must be presented against a spirit, widely prevalent among eminent divines, manifested in the adoption of a theory by which a doctrinal growth in the Church is made to cover up *alleged* weaknesses and misapprehensions of the truth in the founders of Christianity. Reference is made to "the development theory" as applied to doctrine, by which the idea of the kingdom is represented as "a seed" or "a germ" surrounded by "a husk," or "a rind" (*i.e.*, literal sense), out of which, however, was produced or developed the perfect tree or fruit (so *e.g.* Neander, Nevin, and others).* The reasons, evidently, which actuated pious and able men to accept of this theory and employ it, were, first, their inability otherwise to meet the tremendous shafts of infidelity levelled at the early Christianity (showing that doctrinally *it was different* from the faith entertained at present); and second, the desire through it to secure some unity in their conception of the nature, constitution, etc., of the kingdom of God. Admitting that truth can be obtained by a study of nature, science, race, etc.—by observing the development of mind, experience, the Church, etc., yet all this progress, this attestation to and amplification of truth, is not to be placed *in comparison* with the truth given by God Himself. The Scriptures are supreme authority to the believer, and no change, no variation, no substitution, under the pretence of growth, is allowable unless we have *the same indicated by God Himself.* Increase of doctrinal knowledge does not consist in altering *the form* of doctrine, but in obtaining a clearer, more enlarged apprehension of *the unaltered* doctrine. Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 70) justly grounds progress upon "amplification" and not in "alteration." Rev. Bernard (*Bampton Lectures*, "The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament") forcibly argues (Lec. 1) that the Divine teaching coincides in extent with the present canon, and that the progress of doctrine in the Church since such communication is a progress *of apprehension* by man. He clearly shows that no advance in Divine teaching after the apostolic age was ever admitted by the Church, and that all elucidations, renewed definitions, etc., indicative of a clearer apprehension of the truth, are invariably based upon, and derived from, *the original truth* in the Old and New Testaments. He also effectively points out that innovations (as in Dr. Newman's theory of development including new doctrines) even are sustained by their upholders under the plea of a tradition enforced by extending it back to apostolic days, thus implying, or inferring, apostolic sanction.[1]

The kingdom is something described by God for us to believe; and hence is not one thing to-day and another to-morrow, one thing under the former dispensation and another under this ordering. The description of it is unchangeably the same, for it is a simple declaration of *the Divine purpose* to which it is impossible, without detriment, to add anything. It is a positive revelation, portraying that when realized certain great

* We leave one of its advocates to eulogize the extent of the development theory entertained. Lecky (*His. Rational.*, p. 183) says: "This idea of continued and uninterrupted development is one that seems absolutely to override the age. It is scarcely possible to open any really able book on any subject without encountering it in some form. It is stirring all science to its very depths; it is revolutionizing all historical literature. Its prominence in theology is so great that there is scarcely any school that is altogether exempt from its influence. We have seen, in our own day, the Church of Rome itself defended in 'An Essay on Development,' and by a strong application of the laws of progress."

events are to transpire, certain promises are to be joyfully experienced, etc., and therefore, in the very nature of the case, *it cannot* be a mere "germ" which is to sprout forth into something else. The theory of development, especially when applied to the doctrine of the kingdom, must be regarded as an important concession to infidelity.[2]

[1] The fundamental Montanistic notion (Kurtz, *Ch. His.* Vol. 1, p. 132) that Divine Revelation is gradually and constantly developed, finds its extremes in such doctrinal additions as are given by Swedenborg, Joseph Smith, Ann Lee, etc. But even in those who are utterly opposed to all such extravagancies, it is still found in a modified form. It is enunciated in the principle laid down in Hagenbach's *His. of Doctrine* that "the doctrinal substance of the Scriptures" is "as a living seed, capable of the most prolific development; in the midst of the most unfavorable influences it retains the formative energy, by which it evokes new and living products adapted to the times." Now while this might not be objectionable in one sense, yet when applied to doctrine it stands forth really as an effort to reconcile the departure of the church (as e.g. in the doctrine of the kingdom) from the early doctrinal position to a later. It is *a bridge*, conveniently erected by philosophy, to cover *the ugly chasm* between Primitive and Later Christianity. The parable of the leaven is pressed into its service, as *if it* delineated doctrinal change or growth in place of the simple influence, controlling power of the truth (or of error) over the heart. The seed, blade, ear, and the full corn in the ear, of Mark 4:26–29, is made to cover doctrinal deviations, just *as if the doctrine*, full grown, were to be harvested in place of the fruit developed by the reception of the truth. Much is affirmed respecting the difference between the seed and the tree and fruit;—this analogy holds good in nature and also in grace (when truth is represented as the seed and the results in increased morality, piety as a growth into fruit), but not in the Word as to doctrinal growth. A Scriptural doctrine fully stated is the whole doctrine, or if partially given so much of it as God sees proper to reveal, *to which man can add nothing;* and that of the kingdom, dealing exclusively in things belonging to God and only known to Him, falls specially under this category. If such a doctrine is imperfectly given or is concealed under a covering, and it is left to infirm man to develop its real meaning, *who*, if we are to go outside of the Scriptures, has gained its true meaning? Out of the overwhelming abundance of dogmatic statements, *which then* is the genuine fruit? Or, are they all the legitimate outgrowth of the same "germ?" Why embrace a theory which evidently lowers the authority of Scripture by enveloping the doctrine of the kingdom in an unperceived "germ" but a very perceptible "husk;" which sends us away to fallible man for "the real truth;" which is forbidden by the Word itself when declaring its doctrines *unchangeably* the same; which makes a particular doctrine in one century to be held in accordance with the letter of the Word, and in another and following centuries directly the opposite to accord with *an alleged* spirit; and which deliberately fastens upon Holy Writ the vagaries and dreams of man as its natural outgrowth? The development producing change is not *in* the doctrine but *in* the individual; the doctrine is given to the individual and to the church that both may grow thereby, and not that the doctrine may grow into something else by the church. Doctrine as seed in the heart is productive of good works, and not of doctrinal change; *the very seed* given by God is to be retained in the heart, and it is not *to be exchanged* for improved or developed seed of man's proposing. God bestows doctrine to instruct, to guide, to change, to sanctify man, and not for man to take it and mould and transmute it according to his will. Christian, Bible doctrine ever remains the same, and can only be authoritatively changed by God Himself. *It is God's truth and not man's.* If man could add to it, modify or alter it, or even bend it in accommodation, what infallible standard or guide would there be to protect us against error and unbelief? The motive power to virtue and holiness embraced in the doctrines of the Bible, is deteriorated just in proportion as changes are introduced. The more Scriptural our faith, the more pious and devoted the life, seeing that the purest influence for good comes from God's own gracious words. (Comp. e.g. Mozley's "*Theory of Development*," in reply to Newman's "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," Sprecher's "*Groundwork of Theol.*," etc.)

[2] It is a concession to unbelief, in that it rejects the grammatical sense and makes Scripture language changeable, placing truth in a variety of aspects of antagonism (thus e.g. making the declaration of the letter to conflict with that of the spirit). It presses the parables by an analogy drawn from the vegetable world until they are compelled to "crawl on all fours." It causes a direct conflict between the express language of Script-

ure and the idea or notion advocated. And it does this to account for the variations of doctrine in the church on the subject of the kingdom, and to make the external church better than she merits. It is, to say the least, dangerous to receive a theory by which we may apologize for the introduction of new doctrines in the past and for the future; and which leaves us no Divinely constituted exponent of authority in doctrine but allows the doctrinal position to be settled by an interpretation at variance with *a legitimate* grammatical sense. It presents us (as in Neander, etc.,) the most shadowy, mystical conceptions (e.g. "the consciousness of the Church, and its authoritative utterances,") to be the true criterion of the truth. Unbelief accepts of the favorite phrase "Christian consciousness" in this development scheme. Thus e.g. Alger in his *Essay* on Jesus (*The Solitudes*, p. 380), while praising Jesus, fearfully mutilates the Messiah under the plea: "The Christian Consciousness, the collective sense of Christendom, is competent to determine what is congruous, what incongruous, with the true idea of Christ; to cut off superfluities and supply defects in the transmitted form," etc. We, on the other hand, assert that the Christ and His kingdom are not to be tampered with under any such a plea, but are to be received just as God has given them to us. Besides this, Alger informs us that a few favored ones are "the authoritative representatives of this totality of Christian perception and feeling." We recognize no such "authoritative representatives" excepting as they fairly coincide with the authorities of the Bible, and as to "the collective sense" and "totality," the diversity existing and the claims proposed forbid the idea of such unity in the church. The majority rule cannot apply to doctrine as seen e.g. in the rejection of Jesus, the dark ages, etc. The fact is, that the development theory as applied to doctrine is one that cannot be confined within limits; it is a sword entirely too unwieldy for the believer to handle; it is a net so widely sweeping that it cannot be managed, and hence, with due deference to its originators (Hegel, etc.) it may be rejected without causing Christianity to suffer. The latter needs no such weapon for defence, no such system of apologetics, for its best defence and apology is, as one (Dunn) aptly remarked: "The Bible can never get behind the age." It is true that men of great intellect, of vast learning, have and do advocate it, but such too, as thousands of cases past and present testify, are liable to error. It is the more needful to direct attention to this matter, seeing that our more recent church histories, Sys. Divinities, etc., are thoroughly leavened with its spirit and deductions. So far as it is applied to the doctrine of the kingdom, we protest against it, because the doctrinal things of the kingdom are subjects of direct revelation and not of growth; because Revelation itself on this point is not subject to growth, being merely declarations of God's purpose; because to make the Revelation in its grammatical sense a mere husk is a virtual belittling of the Word; because doctrinal truth is always the same, and is only to be found in its purity in Holy Writ; and because error, antagonism, division, etc., find their best apologist in this theory.

Surely believers ought to reject this development theory when they see how a host of men (Ammon, Strauss, Parker, etc.,) are employing it, to show that Christianity is only in the course of development, and must by the aid of science and reason give place to something higher. When the notion leads multitudes, not to content themselves with a legitimate progress (drawn from study, comparison, criticism, experience, etc.,) in knowledge, but to change the doctrines of the Bible (under the plea of spirit, reason, enlightenment, progress, etc.,) at will, introducing a vast body of conflicting opinions and sects; when under its influence the covenants, oath-bound, are either denied in their grammatical sense or totally ignored; when the theory is flatly contradicted by the predicted closing of this age, for instead of finding a childhood, youth, manhood, and matured manhood, resulting in perfectability, the outcome as given by the Spirit is the direct opposite; when it is utterly opposed by the manner of the kingdom's introduction, coming suddenly and supernaturally, with numerous additional fatal reasons—we, certainly, can only regard the theory, with its specious reasoning, as one of *the most dangerous* ever broached; and one, too, destined to bring about still greater evil in the hands of recent writers. Incorporated with this view, and going hand in hand with it, is that of general, universal Inspiration, under which new revelations may be expected, and though guarded (as Beecher in *The Ch. Union*, Ap. 10, 1878) by the declaration that such must be in accord with the Scriptures, yet this position (as shown Prop. 5) is dangerous, opening a wide door, through which unbelievers are pressing with exultant hopes. Felix Adler in *The North Amer. Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1877, Art. "Reformed Judaism," under the influence of such an inspiration theory, discriminating (as he thinks) between "the letter and the spirit," and by adding "the process of evolution," most pointedly denies the covenants and predictions in their plain sense, resolves the Jewish nation into the Messiah, etc.

Obs. 4. Allowing a development of doctrine in the Bible itself (*i.e.*, given in respective dispensations, and by different writers), made *under the auspices* of the Spirit, the same, by the principle of interpretation adopted (Prop. 4), shows, by its completeness and manner of presentation, that the Bible is designed to be a book for the people, for all men, both learned and unlearned. It is addressed to the masses, to the ignorant, to all classes, and, therefore, is not merely designed for the educated. It assumes upon the very face of it, that its important doctrines can be easily comprehended, and that to realize their force and value it is unnecessary to make additions or alterations. It takes it for granted that it contains all that is requisite for us to know concerning the kingdom, and that every person can obtain this knowledge by its perusal and study. It assumes, that it is correct in its claim of being *an infallible guide* (Ps. 119 : 105, 2 Pet. 1 : 19, Gal. 1 : 8, Isa. 8 : 20, 2 Tim. 3 : 17, etc.), as endorsed by the early Christians, Reformers, etc., in the things pertaining to God and the everlasting happiness of man. It distinctly teaches that without a due acceptance of its doctrines, we are regarded by the Almighty as those, however learned in other respects, who lack understanding. It urges upon us, in view of its Divine origin, purity, veracity, power, duration, etc., the obligation that we are under to know God's Word. It professes to enlighten every one who receives it respecting God and our personal relationship to Him, the Messiah and our need of Him, the kingdom and the manner in which to gain it, the duties pertaining to God and man, the future destiny of ourselves and the world, etc., and that to obtain this enlightenment we do not absolutely require, valuable as they may be in many respects, those cumbersome systems of interpretation, those diversified and ponderous exegetical commentaries, etc., which are given as helps to the student.

The Bible assumes, then, that it can be understood, so far as its essential, important doctrines are concerned, by all men. If so, then instead of a recondite meaning being intended, the plain grammatical sense, common to all men, must undoubtedly be received. The infallibility it places in its own utterances expressed according to the usual laws of language, and not in a superadded sense bestowed at the pleasure of the interpreter. It does not allow it to exist outside of itself in an authoritative declaration of the church (excepting only as it corresponds with the Word), or in what is called "the infallible consciousness." If we were to accept of the latter, *in what* confession or writing is it incorporated? The interpretation of the Word must not be hampered by a philosophical generality, glittering in conception and well adapted to lead us away from Holy Writ, and to cause us to put our faith in mere human opinion, thus also covering up deficiencies, difficulties, antagonisms suggested by the Word. Such a consciousness does *not* exist, as is proven by the opposite confessions and theological writings of past centuries, and which differences continue down to the present day, even on points the most important, as e.g. the sacrificial death of Christ, the sacraments, the order of salvation, etc. Amid this diversity, the sad result of human infirmity, one consoling feature alone remains, that, notwithstanding the differences of opinion, so much of the truth of Scripture, *in its plain sense*, is cordially received, that faith in, and obedience to, Christ is characteristic of all believers. The failure to show where this "consciousness" is lodged, in order to make it available for direct reference and appeal, should guard us against a theory well intended but really derogatory to Scripture. Scripture must ever retain its position as paramount, sole authority, and care must be exercised lest the helps intended to facilitate Scriptural investigation become *hindrances* instead of valuable aids, by being too much relied on without *a personal searching* of the Word of God. Any substitution in place of Holy Writ, is, in so far, lowering the supreme standard. Compare some excellent remarks on the supremacy of Scripture in Bridges' *Chris. Ministry*, Saurin's Sermon on *The Sufficiency of Revelation*, Graybeard's (Graff) *Lay Sermons*, etc. We reproduce one sentence from Graff (No. 62, "Search the Scriptures") : "A man may

become a theological tinker by studying theological books; but in order to become 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed rightly dividing the word of truth,' there can be no substitute for the habitual, personal study of God's Word." How true this is, when we look at the history of godly men and women of the past. How many with vast stores of learning have been eclipsed in advancement of true knowledge and usefulness, by those who have constantly drawn divine things from a persevering perusal and study of God's Word.

Obs. 5. All believers admit that in the study of the Scriptures there must be, to secure success, a reverent, prayerful spirit maintained, a reliance upon Divine guidance into truth. There must be a moral preparation (John 8 : 47) to appreciate their force and beauty (Ps. 119 : 12, 18). Such a direction, although given by God Himself (Jas. 1 : 5, Luke 11 : 13, etc.), loses some of its weight in the estimation of unbelief, since parties the most antagonistic in doctrine and practice *profusely profess* to have poured forth earnest prayer, and to have been guided by the Spirit in their expositions. A modest student, and one too who really prays and is morally aided, will scarcely set up such a standard, or refer to Him in such a connection. Prayerful study of the Scriptures will evidence itself, *not in profession, but in fruits.* It, too, will be found that error may be conjoined with *even* fervent prayer, if the Bible is neglected, if the simplest rules are rejected for ascertaining its meaning, if the grammatical sense is violated, if reason is not properly used, if intellectual activity is not combined with faith, and if the formulas of men are substituted for the Word. Prayer is a help, but not so directly that *we need not search* for the truth. So also mistake may be connected with the assumed guidance of the Spirit; for if a man expects "direct spiritual illumination" or an "intellectual light" by which he can know the truth without an acceptance and patient study *of that* which the Spirit has *already* given, he only shows that he is self-deceived. Prayer and the Spirit indeed are of great avail in their moral bearing, in preparing us for the perception and reception of the truth, but they are not given *to supersede* the searching of the Scriptures (John 5 : 39), the reasoning out of the Scriptures (Acts 17 : 2; 18 : 4, etc.), the using of our faculties in noting the oracles of God (Heb. 5 : 14), the taking heed unto the Word given (2 Pet. 1 : 19), the daily receiving and study of Holy Writ (Acts 17 : 11). Indeed the fact of our dependence upon the Spirit to enlighten us and enable us to savingly appropriate truth, to trust and to rejoice in it, does not allow us *to neglect* the means of enlightenment which He has already furnished in the presented Word. It forbids a passivity of our mental faculties, and enjoins upon the man of God, in order "to be perfect, thoroughly furnished," to let both mind and heart receive "all scripture," (2 Tim. 3 : 16, 17).

The Spirit reveals Himself, and the truth He is commissioned to impart *through* the Word already given, and *in proportion* as that Word is pondered, studied, and received, *just in that proportion* will true enlightenment follow; and even love will be excited (2 Tim. 3 : 15, Luke 24 : 32, Phil. 1 : 9), and growth promoted (1 Pet. 2 : 2,). For, if man is in a reverent, prayerful, teachable attitude, desirous for the truth, the Spirit will impress that same truth given by Him, not by directly revealing it (for that He has *already* done), but by morally qualifying him for its reception and retention. (See this illustrated in the Controversy—Tyerman's "Oxford Methodists," p. 95—between the Moravian Molther and Wesley, on the question whether penitent inquirers should search the Scriptures—Wesley affirming, and Molther denying, the necessity and importance of the same.) Bible truth, inasmuch as it relates to our moral constitution, demands both

mind and heart to receive it. Three things are requisite to make truth practically effective. Lord Bacon says: "The inquiry of Truth, which is the love-making or wooing it; the knowledge of Truth, which is the presence of it; and the belief of Truth, which is the enjoying of it;—is the Sovereign Good of human nature." The Spirit aids us only in the line of revealed truth, *never in contradistinction to the recorded things of the Spirit.* The sword of the Spirit is the Word of God (Eph. 6 : 17), and there can be no revelation given, however plausible and advocated, which runs in opposition to Holy Writ. There is no proof whatever, amid the multitude of claims proposed, saving that afforded by the personal assertion of the interested parties themselves, that a single person since the days of the apostles has received a new or modified doctrine, *not found* in the Bible, *directly from* the Spirit. A very suspicious fact in those who claim it, is, that every such doctrine advanced they still desire, in some way or other, to fasten to Scriptures given, thus unconsciously (e.g. Mormons, German Inspirationists in Iowa, etc. Comp. Prop. 4) testifying to its supremacy over their own utterances.

This subject is the more worthy of attention, since advantage is taken of this supposed additional bestowment of doctrinal truth outside of the Bible to lower the supremacy of the Scriptures. This is done by receiving the concessions, intentional or not, of various parties, opening a wide door for endless additions, because of the introduction of a Divine authority outside of the Bible. Those who undermine the authoritative position of the Scriptures, are the following: (1.) It is claimed by good men (as e.g. Dr. Bushnell, *Sermons on the New Life*, p. 46) that every man is also inspired, not indeed having the same inspiration as the writers of the Bible, but still a continued inspiration, imparted by the Spirit, by which we interpret the Scriptures, etc. (2.) Another class (*Essays and Reviews*) assert that "inspiration is a permanent power in the church" which by a constant "illumination," kindred to that of the Bible, develops confessions, doctrines, liturgies, etc. (3.) The Roman Catholic Church affirms that the Holy Spirit is so given to it, that the Pope in his official or doctrinal utterances cannot err. The same is asserted by many respecting General Councils. Tradition is thus elevated to inspired truth.* (4.) Infidels adopt the language of Scripture, and declare that all men are inspired equal to and even superior to the apostles, as e.g. the Parker school. (5.) Men of a mystical tendency in various centuries and denominations, who, professing a special guidance and enlightenment of the Spirit, ask for their utterances a corresponding faith. The history of Mysticism, separate and combined with scholasticism, presents numerous painful instances, of "an inner light" exalted to Scriptural authority. (6.) The Mormons, and other sects,† who give us long pretended revelations of divine truth. (7.) Swedenborg, who constituted himself the first and sole interpreter of the Word, whom the angels could not instruct (*Div. Prov.*, pub. 1764, p. 135), and who, by an inner sense and revelations professedly received, inaugurated a new Gospel. The grammatical sense is but a worthless husk, containing the highest mysteries which were revealed to him. (8.) The Society of Friends, who, with many excellencies, frankly acknowledge the superior light granted by the Spirit.‡ (9.) The Spiritualists, who elevate the revela-

---

* Some of the Popish bulls, decisions of Councils, etc., directly claim to have been given under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Comp. Dr. Doellinger's Essay "*Ex Cathedra*" definitions in Ap. E. attached to "*Fables, and Essay on Prophetic Spirit*," for the infallibility doctrine. In Didron's *Chr. Iconography*, Vol. 1, p. 448, Pope Gregory the Great is represented as inspired by the Holy Ghost (the latter under the form of a dove), taken from a French statue of the XIII. cent. in the church of Notre-Dame de Chartres. Gregory VII. enjoys the same distinction, and even Jerome is represented with a dove breathing inspiration into his ear, reminding us of Mahomet's tame pigeon.

† *E.g.* Joanna Southcott, who, in her declaration, claims, "that all my writings came from the Spirit of the Most High God;" the Anabaptists encountered by Luther (*Lives* of Luther, D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, Giesler, *Ch. His.*, note 64, etc.); the account given by the Shakers of Mother Ann Lee; the followers of Jane Leader, especially John Pordage; besides others given in our Eccl. Histories. The extravagances of the past are repeated at the present day. Works on Fanaticism, Religious Enthusiasm, etc., give us gloomy details of man's infirmity and presumption. The most recent is the following: *The Times-Star*, Oct. 19, 1881, says, that a new sect has arisen in Michigan, called "the Living Church of God" or "the Chosen;" and "the members profess to possess some grave secrets with reference to the near approach of the end of the world, which they say were given to them by inspiration."

‡ The esteem that the author has for the amiable intentions and life of the Quakers,

tions of the spirits, supposed to be given for special enlightenment, above the Bible. All these, whether they design it or not, bring to us an authority equal to or superior to that of the Scriptures. Advantage is quickly taken of this opening, by arguing (as e.g. *Essays and Reviews*) that as inspiration, the imparting of the Spirit is now accompanied with error, so it was also in the days of the apostles, and, therefore, only so much authority is to be allowed to the Scriptures as good men can approve of as credible, thus really allowing no unity of doctrine, etc. Advantage is also taken of it, by pointing to all these contradictory professions, *all under professed spiritual guidance*, as evidence of the uncertainty of any Spirit-derived truths. Advantage is taken of the wide gap thus opened for pretended revelations and new doctrines, for greater sanctity, holiness, and exclusiveness, until *the heart saddens* at the fearful sight. The simple truth of God has been outrageously perverted, mutilated, and abused by these processes. No! No!! our only safety is *in strictly adhering to the Word*, as containing all the doctrines in their true teaching grammatically expressed, and that prayer and all other things, including the moral aid of the Spirit, are subsidiary to the eternal Word itself, acting only favorably and efficiently in connection with it.

But while avoiding one extreme, we must not fall into another, and deny that the Holy Spirit may, if He chooses, impart mental aid, or perception, or knowledge. He did this to others, to prophets, apostles, and others, and it would limit His freedom and power to say that He cannot do it now *if He so pleases*; especially He has not told us that He will not do it, and many passages (Eph. 1 : 16, 17, 1 Cor. 12 : 7-11, James 1 : 5, 1 Kings 3 : 9-13) seem to indicate that, not however without seeking, prayer, searching, that God can and will at times directly aid in the attainment of the truth. But let it never be forgotten that even such aid and moral law, enforced by the Spirit, is placed within restrictions, viz. : it is *subsidiary to the Word itself*; it embraces *no* new revelations or new doctrines, but only leads to a fuller comprehension and appreciation of the Revelation already given ; it retains and enforces *the supremacy* of Holy Writ. Dunn in his excellent treatise (*The Study of the Bible*) takes the position that there is no mental enlightenment, no "direct spiritual illumination" to be expected at the present day, and brings in the analogy that we obtain truth as we do bread, "that as God now showers not bread from heaven as He did in the wilderness, so He showers not truth upon our minds as He did upon the apostles," that we must labor for it, etc. This ordinarily and generally is true, but universally the analogy drawn from the bread does not hold good, for God did, *after* the manna was given, provide bread for Elijah, the widow, and others, and in

---

induces him to add this note. How largely Barclay may be endorsed by them he knows not, but Barclay in his Apology, Prop. 3, p. 81, plainly asserts that the Scriptures are to be *subordinated* to the spiritual revealings given to men, and hence they are not "*the principal ground* of all truth and knowledge, nor yet *the adequate primary rule* of faith and manners," but that "they are and may be esteemed *a secondary rule.*" Comp. Gurney's "*Observations*," p. 38, 47, Fox's "*Journal*," p. 476, etc. The redeeming feature, however, is that Barclay insists upon it, that as the Scriptures are given by the same Spirit the revelations afforded by the inward light never contradict the Scriptures. In much of their doctrinal writings constant appeal is made to Holy Writ, so much so that this principle seems to be ignored. The common mistake with many persons is, that they confound the extraordinary operations of the Spirit with the ordinary, the direct communication of truth with the moral appreciation and reception of the truth, the intellectual working vouchsafed to the few chosen ones with the spiritual apprehension and application of the Word. (Comp. for the Quaker's statements in full, Art. *The Doctrine of the Inward Light*, in the "Princeton Review," 1848, Rupp's *Orig. His. of Relig. Denominations*, where two Quaker writers affirm the subordinate position of the Scriptures, and Art. *Quakerism, Past and Present*, in North Brit. Review, 1860.) A very plausible and insidious error in this direction presented by pious men (e.g. Ullman, etc.)—far removed from the position of Seb. Frank Schwenckfeld, Thamer, and others, but not the less misleading—is the following : the Scriptures are not the only or exclusive rule of faith, but Christ as manifested to faith (an inward principle) is an additional rule—thus changing from the Quaker principle of the Holy Spirit to the Christ. It is sufficient to say, that we only recognize and appropriate Christ in His person, life, doctrines ("Thou hast the words of eternal life"), work, and promises as they are *contained in the Scriptures and received by faith.* This self-appropriation of the Scriptural statements, produces *the fruits*, the same mind which was also in Him, and thus confirms the superiority of the Holy Scriptures as *the only infallible rule*—Christian experience verifying its truthfulness.

answer to prayer He can yet do it, quite out of the ordinary way, in cases of necessity, without man laboring for it. Take e.g. Luther, as he painfully toiled up the steps on his knees, suddenly impressed with "the just shall live by faith," or the extraordinary preparedness of the Sandwich Islanders for the Gospel, or the remarkable conversions of some of the heathen and others—these and other examples can only be fully explained by accepting of a direct mental aid afforded by the Spirit, but, in every case, subordinate to, and in support of, the Scriptures given. Admitting, therefore, that when necessity requires it, or the pertinacity of faith secures it, or the pleasure of God bestows it, that such may be the case, yet we have one decisive test to which even these must bow, viz., all enlightenment must be in the direct line of the Scriptures, not in opposition to, or in conflict with them, because they are given by *the same Spirit*, and cannot be antagonistic. This e.g. was Luther's position when he encountered the fanatics who pretended to new revelations by the Spirit, that they were contradictory to the utterances already bestowed by the Spirit and hence unreliable, and that being different, a variation from the Bible, they were not proven authoritative by the mighty works of the Spirit and therefore could not supersede the truth presented (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.* Vol. 3. B. 9). The apostles themselves appeal to the Scriptures given as bearing testimony that they speak in the Spirit, in unison with Him, and that the same are abundantly able to afford us all the light, direction, etc., that we need. Any effort which professes to be from God, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, if it lowers the standard, or places in a subordinate position any of the teaching, of Holy Writ, is open to the gravest suspicion, and should at once be rejected. True enlightenment advocates the supreme authority of the Bible; false revelations either endeavor to supplant it, or wrest it from its meaning, or attach to it irrelevant, contradictory, and extravagant matter. Fortunately for the truth, most pretended revelations and additions are borne down by the weight of their own palpable ignorance, foolishness, and error. Calvin (*Insti.* Ch. 9, C. 1) characterizes the pretensions of immediate revelations as "subversive of every principle of piety;' while we dare not, in charity, give so sweeping a criticism, yet it may be held that they are subversive of the Scriptures, of all hope of possessing, what man needs, an intelligent, reliable, infallible doctrinal guide, leading often, as illustrated in Ochino and others, to a sad shipwreck. Infallibility in doctrinal utterances, whether claimed as a divine right, or as proceeding from an imparted Spirit, or as coming in any other way, is something that belongs exclusively to Holy Writ, which not merely asserts its possession but proves it in a variety of ways (comp. e.g. Props. 179–183). The subject matter of the Bible, its entire tenor of teaching, its decided authoritative statements, its injunction not to add or take from it, its continuous Divine Purpose, its unity of Plan in Redemption, its provisional portion amply realized in personal experience and the world's history—all clearly show that it is *not* to be supplanted by any other authority. We are therefore abundantly satisfied with the position occupied by the church for the first three hundred years (so Mosheim, Neander, Killen, Giesler, etc.), by the Reformers, and a host of able men, viz., that the Bible is the sole, supreme authority, and that every Christian doctrine, including that of the kingdom, must find its *true basis* within its limits.

Obs. 6. It has been sufficiently intimated that in the elucidation of the Scriptures, man's agency is also required. It is needed in a variety of ways: in the criticism of the text to indicate its purity and meaning, in securing the evidences pertaining to it, in comparing one portion with another, etc. The Word is indeed given by God, but to comprehend and ensure its blessings, we must, like with His gift of nature, bestow upon it thought, meditation, labor, and research. It contains deep things requiring careful study, and even mysteries beyond our limits; it discusses the most profoundly interesting questions within our mental power; it gives us plain statements, which are to be contrasted with others, lest we fail to realize their full significancy; it deals with the sublime, the beautiful, the emotional, the moral, the spiritual, the eternal, the seen and the unseen, the past, present, and future, and hence calls for both mind and heart in its interpretation. Reliance upon the Word does not forbid progress, advancement, but ensures it; for our entire argument indicates, that just in proportion as man accepts of Holy Writ, and his writings or expositions

are based on it, in *that proportion* will he be in the way of real progress, obtaining a clearer, more comprehensive view of the truth. The doctrines of the Bible, too, are corroborated not only by comparison, study, etc., but by the additional knowledge bestowed by personal experience and the history of the Church and world, *i.e.* they are truths confirmed by a degree of realization.

Those who object to the Scriptures being an infallible standard bring in (as Owen, *Deb. Land*, p. 146) this comparison: "Science sets up no infallible standard; if she did, there would be an end of all scientific progress." The fact is, that this is both an unjust comparison and conclusion. Science cannot do so, since all its knowledge is derived through human instrumentality; it deals with Nature, and yet amid the diversity of scientific teaching respecting Nature, in view of the many unknown problems suggested by Nature, it would be glad to avail itself of the teaching of an infallible standard, if it were possessed. On the other hand, the Bible, which professes not to be a teacher of science, deals with another and higher sphere—the moral, spiritual, and eternal interests of man, the most essential for happiness, and in which man needs assistance and guidance. God condescends, in compassion to our necessities, to reveal Himself authoritatively in this direction, especially in view of our being under moral law to Him. But this does not forbid progress in man, in knowledge, etc., as is seen in the results of comparison, deduction, inference, experience, etc. Even an infallible standard in science would not prevent progress in the same way. No! the truth is, that men wish to introduce and enforce novelties, etc., that are contradictory to the Word, and, therefore, they are desirous to get rid of its authority in order that their own opinions may be the more readily received. Dr. Schaff (*Principle of Protest.* p. 80) justly observes: "The more any one enters into the contents of the Bible, the more he learns to say with Luther, that it resembles an herb that by every rubbing becomes only the more odoriferous, a tree that by every shaking throws down only a richer supply of golden apples. Every valuable exegetical work discloses to us new treasures, and our Church (Reformation), having lived upon it already three hundred years, must still with Paul exclaim in amazement, 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God.'"

PROPOSITION 10. *This kingdom should be studied in the light of the Holy Scriptures, and not merely in that of creeds, confessions, formulas of doctrine, etc.*

This legitimately follows from the preceding Proposition, and reminds us, (1) that to learn what the kingdom is, recourse must be had to the original source of information, and (2) that, however much the Scriptural idea of the kingdom may differ from that given, honestly and conscientiously, by men, the former must be received in preference to the latter.

Cornelius Agrippa (*On the Vanity of Sciences*, ch. 100) quaintly says: "Wherefore it behoveth us to trie by the Worde of God all the disciplines and opinions of sciences, as gold is tried by the touchestone, and in all things to flee thither as to a most stiffe rocke, and out of that alone to seeke for the truth of all thinges, and to judge of all doctrine, of the opinions and expositions of all men, and that we reade not by the doctrines, by the gloses, by the expositions, or by other sayings of men, although they be most holy and beste learned, them I meane which speake either without or against the authoritee of God's Worde. . . . So great is the majestie, so great is the power of this Scripture, that it alloweth no strounge exposition, no gloses of men nor Angels: neither suffereth it selfe to be bowed to mens wittes as if it were of waxe, nor after the manier of meps fables suffereth it selfe to be transformed or changed into divers senses as it were some Poetical Proteus, but sufficiente of it selfe, doth expounde and interprete it selfe, and judging all men of none is judged. For the authoritee thereof is greater (as Augustine saith) then all the insight of mans wit: for it hath one constant, plaine, and holy meaninge, in which alone the truth doth consiste, and in which it fighteth and vanquisheth. But other Moral, Mystical, Cosmological, Typical, Anagogical, Tropological, and Allegorical meaninges which are without this, with which many do depainte it with sundrie and straunge coloures, can rightly, and truly teache us some things, and perswade also to the edification of the people, but they cannot prove any thing, or repugne, or reprove to establishe the authoritee of the Worde of God. For let one bringe in controversie of these senses, let him also cite what substancial authour soever he liste thereupon, let him alleage an interpretoure, let him cite a glosse, let him alledge the exposition of all the holy Fathers, all these thinges doth not so binde us, but that we maye saye the contrarie. But of the letter of the Scripture: of the draught and order thereof, bondes are made, which no man can breake, no man can escape: but that dashinge and dissolvinge all the force of argumentes, dothe enforce him to saye and confesse, that it is the finger of God, that man never spake in this manner, that He speaketh not as the Scribes and Pharisees do, but as one that hathe power."

Harper's Weekly, Nov. 3, 1877, says that Dr. Bellows at the "Ministerial Institute" held by the Unitarians, Oct. 8 and 9, at Springfield, said: "The weakness of so-called Liberalism is its boast that it will have no dogmatic system, and that faith requires none. Any man who truly formulates the truth and principles which are now floating in a sentimental mist, will be a re-creator of the religious life of the age."

Creeds must more or less exist. The *Luth. Observer*, Aug. 31, 1877, after pointing out how the Unitarian Church thirty years ago raised the cry, "Down with the creeds and confessions," and the experience of the past, points to the utterance of the "Christian Register," a leading Unitarian paper, as follows: "Let it be said, in all clearness and resoluteness: Those who will not formulate, will not convey religious truth in essential statements—finalities for the time—are the real impeders of progress, are the genuine obstructionists of the onward march of a stalwart and intelligent liberalism. Let it be pointed out that these cries and deliverances as to more liberty, no doctrinal teaching, etc., are from chaotic minds desiring, in their blindness, to spread more chaos, and, blind ones as they are, to lead others into the blind-catching ditches."

Obs. 1. This Proposition in its definite statement is the more needed, since at the present day multitudes find themselves so fettered by an undue reverence for *human authority*, as presented in and through the church, that it is scarcely possible to get them to consider any subject in its true scriptural aspect. We have no sympathy with the men who would, if they were able, destroy the memorials of the church's views and struggles. The creeds, confessions, formulas of doctrine, systems of divinity, theological writings of the past, however some may be one-sided, prolix, etc., are precious heirlooms, giving us in a dogmatical or systematic form the opinions of noble men, in different epochs, entertained respecting the truth. They, too, subserved a great and glorious purpose in holding up Christ and the essentials in Him, in opposing gross error, and in resisting the torrent of unbelief. Admitting that the necessities of our spiritual nature, the thirst after truth, the deep feeling caused by the realities of Revelation, the impressive ideas evolved and suggested by contact with the truth, the earnest desire to extend and defend the same, have caused fallible men to erect these writings as bulwarks and barriers ;—while receiving them with gratitude, and acknowledging our indebtedness to them, yet we *cannot*, for a moment, give them the authority of God's Word. They, too, *the workmanship of man*, must bow to the supremacy of Holy Writ, as, in nearly every instance, the framers thereof intended and declared by appeals to the Bible, indicating it to be the sole, paramount rule of faith.

A few examples must suffice. Thus, in the epilogue of the Augsburg Confession it is distinctly announced that no "dogma" "contrary to the Holy Scriptures" can be admitted. The Confession is based upon the Reformation principle : "There is for articles of faith no other foundation than the Word of God." The Form of Concord, p. 152, says : "But all human writings and symbols are not authorities like the Holy Scriptures ; but they are only a testimony and explanation of our faith, showing the manner in which at any time the Holy Scriptures were understood and explained by those who *then* lived, in respect to articles that had been controverted in the Church of God, and also the grounds on which doctrines, that were opposed to the Holy Scriptures, had been rejected and condemned." This is characteristic of the leading Protestant Confessions (Comp. Fisher's *His. Ref.*, p. 462 ; Schaff's *Principle of Prot.*, p. 70 ; Schmucker's *Luth. Symbols*, chs. 1 and 2 ; Standard *Ch. Histories*) over against the ultra position of the Romish Church that tradition is an equal source of knowledge and the product of the Holy Spirit. Hagenbach (*His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, s. 240) remarks : "That the same importance should afterward be assigned to the symbolical writings of the Protestant churches, which was formerly ascribed to tradition, was not the intention of their original authors ;" and he refers (s. 244) e.g. to Luther's protestation "against any prominence being given to his name and all appeal to his authority," and that it was against "the spirit of the Confession of Faith to impose it as a yoke upon the conscience." Melanchthon himself (Niemeyer's *Life of*, p. 14) said : "In Articles of Faith, some change must be made, *from time to time*, and they must be adapted to the occasions." Hence the idea of making them equal to Scripture, or unalterably authoritative, never entered his mind. Van Oosterzee (*Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 20) pertinently says of the Symbolical books : "They were never intended to confine within bonds the spirit of investigation, still less to fill the hated part of 'a paper pope.' " The austere John Knox (Stanley's *Lec. on His. Ch. of Scotland*, p. 113) made the following profession : "We protest, that if any one will note in this our Confession any article or sentence impugning God's Holy Word, that it would please him of his goodness, and for Christian charity's sake, to admonish us of the same in writing ; and we, upon our honor and fidelity, do promise unto him satisfaction from the mouth of God (that is, from His Holy Scriptures), or else reformation of that which he shall prove to be amiss." Comp. Wycliffe (Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 501, and Dr. Vaughen's "*Monograph*"), the Fathers, and others, as presented in Goode's *Div. Rule of Faith and Practice* (3 vols., London, 1853), the Waldenses according to the Centuriators of Magdeburg (so Jones's *Ch. His.*, p. 249) ; Dr. Schaff in *Com. Review*, 1876, *on Creeds* ; Prof. Blaike on the proper limits of Creeds in "*The Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, 1873" (an Epitome of same in Evang. Review, 1873) ; Dr. McIlvaine's *Christ and Paul* in Bib.

Sacra, 1878; Dr. Hagenbach's *Ency. of Theol.;* Zwingle's views in Hess's and Christoffel's *Lives of;* and numerous others. Lord Bacon (quoted "Lit. of Apologetics," *North Brit. Review*, 1851, p. 184) remarks: "that the Church has no power over the Scriptures, to teach or command anything contrary to the written Word, but is as the ark wherein the tables of the first Testament were kept and preserved; that is to say, the Church hath only the custody and delivery over of the Scriptures committed unto the same; together with the interpretation of them, but such only as is conceived from themselves." Milton (*Treatise of Civil Power in Eccl. Cases*) says: "It is the general consent of all sound Protestant writers that neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible Church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scriptures only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself. . . . With the name of Protestant hath ever been received this doctrine, which prefers the Scriptures before the Church, and acknowledges none but the Scripture *sole interpreter* of itself to the conscience." The Westminster Conf., ch. 31, 3, says: "All Synods or Councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; *therefore* they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." The "Standards" of the Presbyterian Church make the only infallible rule to be the Word of God (as in Conf., ch. 1 : 2, 8, 10, Form of Gov. ch. 1 : 3, 7, etc., Book of Dis. ch. 1 : 3, 4). Out of numerous citations of a Confessional nature, another illustration of the general spirit manifested, is given as follows: *The Dec. of Faith* of the Congreg. Churches, A.D. 1658, declares: "The Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other than the Holy Scripture delivered by the Spirit; into which Scripture, so delivered, our faith is finally resolved." The simple fact is, that only writers and bodies who endeavor either through a hierarchical or a mystical tendency, to elevate the Church beyond its just proportions, take the opposite view. Pre-Millenarians, as a class, adopt the opinion expressed in this work, and the Convention held in Dr. Tyng's Church (New York, 1878) declared: "We affirm our belief in the supreme and absolute authority of the written Word of God on all questions of doctrine and duty." It is strange that believers in the Word should occupy any other position, when it is expressly asserted in it, that we are to be judged at the last day, not by any earthly creeds, or decisions of councils, or opinions of men, but by this Word of God. Hence, while not discarding the careful study of human Confessions, it is of vast more importance to 'search the Scriptures.'" Compare Spener's views as given by Krauth in *Pictures from the Life of Philip Jacob Spener* (p. 140), Sprecher's *Groundwork of Theol.* (e.g. pp. 30, 100, etc.), Art. in *Princeton Review* (July, 1860) on *The Bible its own Witness and Interpreter*, the *Address to* the Reader prefixed to King James' Version (with quotations from Tertullian, Justin, Basil, etc., on the Sufficiency of Scripture), Wycliffe's *Truth and Meaning of Scripture*, Whately's *Errors of Romanism*.

Obs. 2. Creeds, etc., valuable as they are in many respects, can only, at best, give their testimony as witnesses to the truth; and they can only *testify to as much of it* as the framers themselves have seen and experienced. Professing to give evidence in favor of the Bible, or to state what the Bible teaches, that evidence or statement is only proper, consistent, and available in so far as it *coincides* with the Holy Scriptures. Knowledge, therefore, of the satisfactory character of the confessional statements, is only attainable by bringing them to the crucial test, the Word of God. It is a bad indication when, in any period, men will so exalt their confessions that they force the Scriptures to a secondary importance, illustrated in one era, when, as Tulloch (*Leaders of the Refor.*, p. 87) remarks: "Scripture as a witness, disappeared behind the Augsburg Confession."

The reader will be reminded of Luther's reply to Henry VIII: "As to myself, to the words of the Fathers, of men, of angels, of devils, I oppose, not old customs, nor the multitude of men, but the Word of Eternal Majesty, that Gospel which my adversaries themselves are compelled to recognize. There I take my stand," etc. "I heed very little the words of men, whatever their sanctity may have been, and as little do I heed tradition or custom, fallacious custom. The Word of God *is superior* to all else. If I have the Divine Majesty on my side, what care I even though a thousand Augustines, a

thousand Cyprians, a thousand churchfuls of Henrys, rise up against me. God cannot err or deceive ; Augustine and Cyprian, in common with the rest of the elect, may err, and have erred," etc. So also against "the Celestial Prophets" : "The spirit of the new prophet flies very high indeed ; it is an audacious spirit that would have eaten up the Holy Ghost, feathers and all. Bible ! sneer these fellows, Bibel ! Bubal ! Babel ! And not only do they reject the Bible thus contemptuously, but they say that they would reject God too, if He were not to visit them as He did the prophets," etc. (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, Michelet's *Life of Luther*, etc.) Luther thus manifested against all sides the supremacy of the Bible (comp., Introd. to West's "*Analysis of Bible*"), and opposed (Michelet, p. 337) "the papists' cry, 'The Church, the Church, against and above the Bible.'" In his letter to Jerome Dungersheim on the importance and authority of the fathers of the church (Michelet's *Ap.*, p. 419), alluding to several of the fathers, the Council of Nice, he asserts that "whilst I respect the various authorities, I ascend the stream till I reach the great fountain whence they all take their rise." Zwingle repeatedly uttered similar sentiments expressive of the authority of Scripture, and when in the Conference with Melanchthon at Marburg, he referred to the Council of Nice and the Athanasian creed, he stated (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, vol. 4, p. 85) : "We have never rejected the councils, *when* they are based on the authority of the Word of God." All the Reformers, without exception, entertained similar views, and received the statements of previous creeds, councils, fathers, etc., *only* as they thought them correspondent with the Word. How this was afterward perverted and the Reformer's writings elevated to the authority of Scripture, or creeds exalted, as if inspired, to an infallibility, is illustrated in the fierce controversies (Dorner's *His. Prot. Theol.*, vol. 2, p. 211, etc.) waged during the history of "Pietism." How soon was the spirit of Luther lost, as evidenced in his reply (drawn from Augustine to Jerome) to Prierias (D'Aubigne's *His.*, vol. 1, p. 282) : "I have learned to render to the inspired Scriptures alone the homage of a firm belief, that they have never erred ; as to others, I do not believe in the things they teach simply because it is they who teach them," or his more decided utterance in the "Smalcald Articles" (afterward used and perverted to bind men's consciences !) : "We ought not to form articles of faith out of the words or works of the Fathers ; otherwise their diet, their kinds of dress, their houses, etc., would have to be made articles of faith, as men have sported with the relics of saints. But we have another rule, namely, that the Word of God forms articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel (Gal. 1 : 8)." Such a complete subordination of Creeds to Scripture is self-evident—(1) from the authors of such declaring that they derived them from Scripture as then understood by them ; (2) from distinguishing between the infallibility of Scripture and the fallibility of human productions ; (3) from their speaking of Confessions as only witnessing for, or testifying from, the Scriptures ; (4) from their subjecting the testimony of creeds to the test of the Bible ; (5) from their urging others who should subscribe the formulated faith to the study of the Bible as the best teacher ; (6) from the revisions, changes, enlargements, etc., made ; (7) from many of them depreciating a confessional standard in order that they might exalt Scripture. Let us conclude with the apt appeal (illustrating both this subject and Prop. 4) of Melanchthon in his "Apology" to the Parisian University : "Here is, as I think, the sum of the controversy. And now I ask you, my masters, has the Scripture been given in such a form that *its undoubted meaning* may be gathered without exposition of Councils, Fathers, and Schools, or not ? If you deny that the meaning of Scripture is certain by itself, without glosses, I see not *why* the Scripture was given at all, if the Holy Spirit was unwilling to define with certainty what he would have us to believe. Why do the apostles invite us at all to the study of the Scripture, if its meaning is uncertain ? Wherefore do the fathers desire us to believe them no farther than they fortify their statements by the testimonies of Scripture ? Why, too, did the ancient councils decree nothing without Scripture, and in this way we distinguish between true and false councils, that the former agree with plain Scripture, the latter are contrary to Scripture ? . . . Since the Word of God must be the rock on which the soul reposes, what, I pray, shall the soul apprehend from it, if it be not certain what is the mind of the Spirit of God ?"

Obs. 3. The Bible, then, is our only infallible rule of faith and practice, as many of the Confessions of Faith distinctly declare. This is also recognized in Catechisms, or elementary books of instruction, all of which profess to be based *directly* on the Word. Every man feels that a doctrinal position is only strongly fortified by Scripture testimony ; that the injunc-

tion, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," 1 Pet. 4 : 11, is to be observed in teaching divine things; that it is proper and necessary to appeal "to the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8 : 20). This feeling is aroused by the conviction that we (Eph. 2 : 20) "are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone."* Upon these, what they have declared and done, must our doctrines be erected, and to them appeal must be made in their support. It is desirable to know how others understood the doctrines of the Bible, how they derived them, what proof sustains them, etc., and it is proper to acknowledge our indebtedness to all such for information and knowledge imparted, but when these human compositions are to become the leading medium through which to view and interpret Scripture, and that Holy Writ must only be accepted as understood and explained by fallible man, without any appeal therefrom on the ground that they are given in the consciousness of the church as a legitimate spiritual outgrowth through pious and enlightened believers, we must decline such a darkening of authority, such a substitution for the Popish system.

It is amazing how the contrary is asserted in various quarters, overlooking how the best of men, with the purest of intentions, may, under the influence of prior education, ecclesiastical bias, an adopted principle of interpretation, etc., misinterpret Scripture. It is gratifying, therefore, to see that men of the greatest ability and eminence, without desiring to destroy the landmarks of the past or to dishonor the noble legacies left by the church, insist upon it as honorable to the expressions and expositions of faith that they should not be subscribed to without a declaration attached to them of the superior authority of the Word itself. Thus e.g. Dr. Schmucker (*Luth. Symbols*, p. 59) quotes Kœllner as saying that the body of able theologians, "champions for the doctrines of the church," have "departed from the rigid doctrinal system of the symbols," instancing "such as Doederlein, Morus, Michaelis, Reinhard, Knapp, Storr, Schott, Schwartz, Augusti, Marheinecke, Hahn, Olshausen, Tholuck, and Hengstenberg." Kœllner then adds: "In like manner has the public pledge to the symbols been greatly relaxed, and is nowhere unconditional; but infidelity to the principles of Protestantism, and guarding it, the obligation is always expressed with the explicit reservation of the supreme authority of the Scriptures, as is evident from an inspection of the pledges prescribed in the different Protestant countries." A mass of evidence and a host of names might be appended, as seen, e.g. in Schmucker's "*The Lutheran Church in America*" (especially noticing Dr. Endress' testimony and quotations from Melanchthon and Luther, p. 205, etc.), Stuckenberg's *His. Augsb. Confession*, Müller's *Pref. to Symbol Books*, Walch's *Introd. to Symb. Books*, Buddeus in *Isagoge*, recent utterances of *Löhe*, the *Theol. Faculty* of Dorpat, *Guerickce*, *Dietrich*, etc. Compare also Dorner's *His. of Prot.*, 1, 12; Leibnitz's *Theodicy Pref.*; Neander's *Church His.*, 1, 420; Newman's *Arians*, 1, 2, and ch. 2, 1; Waterland's *Works*, 3, 254; Burnet's *His. Ref.*, vol. 2, p. 268, as well as the writings of Fuller, Sherlock, Hodge, Kurtz, Auberlen, etc.

Mackay (*Prog. of Intellect.*, 1, 17) says: "Forms (i.e. creeds, etc.) are in their nature transitory; for being destitute of flexibility and power of self-accommodation to altered

---

* We give Barnes' (Com. loci) comment: We learn "that the traditions of men have no authority in the church, and constitute no part of the foundation; that nothing is to be regarded as a fundamental part of the Christian system, or as binding on the conscience, which cannot be found in the 'prophets and apostles;' that is, as it means here, in the Holy Scriptures. No decrees of councils; no ordinances of synods; no 'standard' of doctrines; no creed or confession, is to be urged as authority in forming the opinions of men. They may be valuable for some purposes, but not for this; they may be referred to as interesting parts of history, but not to form the faith of Christians; they may be used in the church *to express* its belief, not *to form* it. What is based on the authority of apostles and prophets is true, and always true, and only true; what may be found elsewhere may be valuable and true, or not, but, at any rate, is not to be used to control the faith of men."

circumstances, they become in time unconformable to realities, and stand only as idle landmarks of the past, or like deserted channels requiring to be filled up." This is altogether too disparaging, for, truth being eternal, true doctrine being ever the same, those creeds and confessions that most purely embrace it, as e.g. Apostles' Creed, are far from being transitory. This will only apply to lengthy Confessions, embracing numerous details, etc. Dr. Wiliams (*Rational Godliness*, p. 69), although liberal in thinking, expresses himself more reasonably and justly when he says : " No greater subject can in our own day employ any man's noblest energies, than preservation or renewal of the truth of God, not fettered overmuch by the human accidents of our ancestors in the faith, yet with reverential tenderness even for these." The truth is, that an extreme position is to be avoided on this point. The history of the church indicates that Confessions have subserved high purposes ; it is *the abuse and perversion* of them that has done mischief. To oppose creeds and denounce them as " schismatical" is plainly contradicted by fact. Those who so persistently decry formulas of faith on this ground, are as much divided and in as great disagreement as the bodies who receive and adhere to Confessions. Thus e.g. Unitarians embrace Arians, Humanitarians, Rationalists, Liberalists, etc.; or the Universalists, Quakers, Christians, Campbellites, Christadelphians, and others, who mutually reject each other, are divided among themselves in view, and only agree in the denunciation of creeds. Yet all these, without exception, have a written, dogmatical form of faith– not called a creed, but still virtually such—penned by some prominent leader or leaders, which is followed, slavishly, by the mass. It is proper for the church in certain stages, for the sake of uniformity, of restraining error, of bringing forth truth, etc., to define its position in brief formulas, couched as much as possible in Scripture language, but to leave all such open to improvement or change if truth demands it. There is something anti-scriptural in the position of Romanism, Symbolic Lutheranism, Anglican High Churchism, Ultra Calvinism, Reformed Confessionalism—in brief, in all attempts to bring in the work of man as *an authoritative* interpreter of Scripture. However well intentioned the design, it is a virtual lowering of Scripture to a human level, and an abridgment of true Christian liberty. Thus e.g. the spirit of inquiry would be completely fettered if the direction of Dr. Goulbourn (*The Holy Cath. Church*, 1874) were followed : " The Prayer-Book is for us the authorized guide into the teaching of the Bible," assuring us that " there would be an end of controversy, and a good prospect of quiet growth in grace if we could acquiesce in the Bible *as interpreted by* the Prayer-Book." Alas ! a multitude of Symbolical books desire and claim this position, and their respective adherents invite us with similar hopes. Bigotry and unchristian zeal are found in both extremes—viz., in an overdue reverence for, and exaltation of, Confessions, and in the total rejection of creeds as if unworthy, in so far as based on Scripture, of our acceptance. Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.* vol. 1, p. 223) justly says : " One may esteem it a personal happiness if one can with an honest theological conscience stand on the ground of the Confession ; but the honor of sound Orthodoxy, as measured by the standard of the Church is—regarded from a Christian standpoint—by no means the highest. It may well be that one feels himself, on the ground of Scripture itself, and by virtue of the Protestant principle, *bound in conscience* to differ on a certain point from the doctrine of the Church. Heterodoxy, in such a case, is not to be regarded at once as heresy. The rectification of the traditional creed, which is in this way tested by the Word, may even lead to its further development, provided that it is tested *only* by means of Holy Scripture. Precisely he truly holds to his Confession of Faith, in the Evang. Protestant sense of the term, who recognizes in the Confession not *the absolutely perfect form* of his religious conviction, but that which may be constituted an ever more perfect form of it ; and who seeks to attain to this higher perfection by an ever closer attachment, and *an ever deeper subjection of himself, to God's Word* in Holy Scripture. There yet lie treasures in the gold mine, which await only the well-directed spade of the digger," etc. Thus also Martensen (*Ch. Dog.* s. 242) remarks in the same strain, after stating that tradition is an important ally in the interpretation of Scripture : " But though she (church) thus makes use of the guidance of tradition in order to the understanding of Scripture, this by no means violates her principle, that tradition must in turn be tested, purified, and more perfectly developed by Holy Scripture. It is true even of the Apostles' Creed, that being a work in its present form clearly apostolic, it cannot possess the same critical authority as Holy Scripture," etc.

Obs. 4. Having thus determined to occupy the only position consistent with that of a biblical student, viz.: that while duly reverencing the symbolical books and theological efforts of the past, yet they should not be-

come the infallible directories of the conscience and the restrainers of a true Christian freedom to search into and receive what God has revealed, even if opposed to them; it is time to notice what bearing this has upon the subject of the kingdom. The doctrine of the kingdom, although prominently in the Bible, is not specially treated in the earlier Confessions, as e.g. the Apostles', Niceno-Constantinopolitan, and Athanasian. General expressions, without entering into details, are employed, which *both* Millenarians and Anti-Millenarians could subscribe. The doctrine as upheld by us is contained in very few Confessions, is ignored by others, and is misapprehended and opposed in others. The result is, that many persons are prejudiced or biassed by a confessional standard, and are thus poorly prepared for a dispassionate investigation. Preparatively it may be said, that when a doctrine like ours has been almost universally held by the Christian Church for several centuries, and that church points out that it is contained in the grammatical sense of the Word; that it is a doctrine plainly revealed, often repeated, incorporated with covenant and promise, and the subject of enlarged remark and prediction, it should certainly commend itself *as eminently* worthy of calm consideration and careful comparison with Scripture testimony. It is strange that but few Confessions make the kingdom a distinctive article of faith, and from this, no doubt, results in a measure the great variety and latitude of meanings given to it. The reasons why our doctrine has not received a confessional prominency, will be presented under following propositions.

While all our Introductory Treatises to the Bible caution us to avoid approaching the Scriptures, in order to ascertain its sense, under the bias of a previously constructed system of doctrine, yet it is a rule *almost constantly* violated, as is too painfully evident in commentaries, expositions, and theological treatises. So much is this the case, that very few indeed escape entirely from its influence, manifested in anticipating the meaning, inferring it, etc., in accord with a belief conscientiously and sincerely entertained. Man, with the purest of motives, is still addicted to infirmity, and his weakness is presented in more than one confessional utterance. Taylor (*Ep. Ded. Liberty of Prophesying*) has observed: "Such is the iniquity" (we would soften this by substituting misguided zeal) "of men, that they suck in opinions as wild apes do the wind, without distinguishing the wholesome from the corrupted air, and then live upon it at a venture; and when all their confidence is built upon zeal and mistake, yet therefore because they are zealous and mistaken, they are impatient of contradiction." Confessional exclusiveness is the most intolerant, and at the same time the most destructive to true progress. It virtually closes the Bible to advancement in knowledge, being the self-constituted measurer of it. We, therefore, appropriate Martensen's (*Ch. Dog.*, p. 44) language: "We maintain, further, that no reformation can ever be effected in spirit and in truth, unless the principle is accepted, that nothing shall pass for truth which cannot stand the final test of the Word of God and the mind of man, freely investigating, in the liberty wherewith Christ makes us free." The inroads of infidelity and the respondent defence, the destructive criticism of both Scripture and Ecclesiastical matters and the corresponding vindication, have made it requisite that the largest liberty, compatible with the supremacy of Holy Writ, should be allowed in investigation, in order that truth, and truth alone, may be upheld and consistently defended.

Briefly, it may be proper to consider the main reasons assigned for exalting Confessions or traditions to an equality with Scripture. Those under the plea of the continued inspiration, the special enlightenment of the Spirit, the constant impartation of Revelations, have been previously noticed. Those of the Romish Church are (1) that the church is older than the Scriptures, and that they proceed from her. The Divine Record, however, teaches us that the Church itself sprang from God's Word, and that she is only the custodian of that Word, bound to disseminate it without additions, etc. (2) That it is only through tradition that we receive the Scriptures themselves. But this is no reason why tradition as a medium should be exalted to an equality with Scripture, for the former does not make the latter, and the latter only recognizes and forwards that which is bestowed. (3) Rejecting tradition, the door is opened to endless and conflicting in-

terpretations. To this it can be said that tradition, as attested by the facts of history, only increases the evil. The abuse of liberty, the violation of Scripture, the principle of interpretation adopted, etc., are not so controlled by tradition but, as seen in the Romish Church itself, the most divergent opinions obtain. (4) The most plausible objection is, that Scripture itself is reproduced by the authority, and under the Christian consciousness of, the Church. To this it is sufficient to reply: that in so far as there is an actual reproduction of Scripture the church's utterances ought to be received, but a comparison must first be instituted with Holy Writ in order to decide that it is really and truly such. In the controversy between the Papists and the Reformers, the grand characteristic was noticed that the former appealed to the Church and the latter to the Scriptures. Illustrative of this are the anecdotes given by Michelet and D'Aubigne (*Life of Luther Ap.*, p. 395 and 421, Hazlett's ed., and *His. of Ref.*, vol. 4, p. 198): "At the Diet of Augsburg, Duke William of Bavaria, who was strongly opposed to the Evang. doctrine, asked Dr. Eck, 'Cannot we overthrow these opinions by the Holy Scriptures?' 'No,' said Eck, 'only by the Fathers.' Whereupon the Bishop of Mayence observed, 'Truly, our divines are making a pretty defence for us. The Lutherans show us their opinions in the Scripture, chapter and verse; we are fain to go elsewhere.'" The advice of the Pope's court fool to the Cardinals—who were consulting how the Protestants could be suppressed notwithstanding their appeal to Scripture, especially to the writings of Paul—that the Pope, by virtue of his authority, should take Paul out of the number of the apostles, etc., so that his dicta "shall be no more held for apostolical." It is well, in this day, to recall and impress the true Protestant principle of authority, for the time is coming when, amidst the bitter and overwhelming persecution of the church, *sole reliance* upon the Word will be sorely needed.

It is a sad fact, that cannot be denied, that millions of professed Christians are bound in the cast-iron fetters of creeds; not merely the Greek Church (see e.g. Dr. Thompson's statements in *the Chris. Union* of Jan. 17, 1877, of Russian "intolerance and persecution, against which religious deputations protested in vain"), or the Romish Church (see e.g. recent Encyclicals, etc.), but a large portion of Protestant bodies. The old proverb of some Jews, "the Bible is water; the Mishna is wine," is not dead; for we have plenty of men with the same spirit, who practically, when a Biblical question comes up for decision, evidence that "The Bible is water, the Mishna is wine"—seeing that the question is decided by human writings and not by the Bible. While some entertain proper views, feelings, and practice, yet of others it may be said, that they retain the mind which made Cromwell exclaim despairingly: "Every sect saith, Give me liberty; but give it to him, and to his power he will not yield it to anybody else." Some are so confessional that they will reject a doctrine if not found in their creed, and virtually the instructions of the Bible are changed, so that they seem to read "Search the Confessions" (not the Scriptures)—"Earnestly desiring the sincere milk of the Confession (not Word) that ye may grow thereby," etc. It is true in theory as the Ch. Intelligencer (Aug. 4, 1877, in reply to an attack upon Creeds in Scribner's *Monthly*, Aug. 1877) declares, that "all Protestant bodies proclaim and hold their creeds as entirely subordinate to the Word of God," but practically many do more than this—viz., constituting the creed the standard or rule of faith. This has been noticed by numerous writers in the Church; this called forth the noble protest of Macleod against the same in his speech made to the Assembly of 1872 (comp. remarks of representatives on Confession in the Presbyterian Alliance in Edinburgh, 1877). Outside of the church many also notice it, as e.g. Spencer in his *Study of Sociology on the Theological Bias*, Froude in his *Plea for the Free Discussion of Theological Difficulties* (where the sentence occurs: "It may be that the true teaching of our Lord was overlaid with doctrines; and theology, when insisting on the reception of its huge catena of formulas, may be binding a yoke upon our necks, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear"), and others. The student in this direction will be pleased to notice the ultra position assumed by a Dr. Stahl, and the deserved strictures received in *The North Brit. Review*, Feb. 1856, in Art. "Bunsen's Signs of the Times." A proper medium is thus enforced by Dr. Sprecher (*Groundwork of Theol.*, ch. 2, "Proper Estimate of Creeds"): "Creeds should not, therefore, be neglected or despised, on the one hand, nor should they, on the other, be allowed to have undue weight, or be unconditionally enforced. Only the substance of the faith, the great system of doctrine, and not the individual clauses and details of the creed, should be made unconditionally binding. When they are enforced beyond this, they drive out many of the best men, and hinder many of the most conscientious from coming in, and thus fill the Church, at last, with bigots on the one hand, who will repress all spiritual life and freedom, and on the other hand, with careless men who are as really indifferent to truth as they are to godliness—men who can subscribe to any creed, caring only for the form of religion,

while they deny its power." Hence, from our position, we have admired the farewell *Address* of Pastor Robison to the Pilgrims at Delft Haven, advising them to receive any and every truth that the Bible holds as it may be preached to them by his successors, complaining that others will only receive what the Reformers have taught and nothing more, and thus expresses his faith: "For I am verily persuaded the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of the Holy Word;" and concludes with "an article of Church covenant," as follows: "That you shall be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written Word."

Obs. 5. In this age of destructive criticism, it is proper to additionally define our position. The exceeding multitude of interpretations, with their variegated hues, has led persons to fix some limit, thus attempting to perform what God has not prescribed outside of the Scriptures, for God holds us only responsible *for the plain, naked, grammatical sense of the Word*, and not for recondite, hidden senses that the ingenuity or imagination of man may concoct. One party will take refuge in the infallibility of the Pope, another in the decisions of Councils, and a third in the agreement of these two. One class cleaves to the oft-repeated maxim of Vicentius, and will allow no interpretation saving that given by the Church in "a unanimous consent of the Fathers," which consent (retained in Romish profession of faith, see e.g. "The Path to Paradise," authorized by Archb. Hughes, New York, 1856, p. 34), on inspection, is found to be a foregone conclusion. Another declares that the only security is found in private judgment, by which they mean the casting aside as a hindrance the interpretation of the past, and a studying of the Word for ourselves utterly independent of outside help. The fruits of this last attitude have been manifested in those who have professed it, either by a many-sided or a one-sided interpretation, just as it happened to be suggested by the temperament, education, bias, intentions, etc., of the interpreter. Experience seems to teach us that safety lies in our avoiding all these extremes. While the Bible is the chief object of study, and its truths authoritative; while private judgment is inalienable and should be exercised; while it is reasonable to anticipate that others beside ourselves should see and believe in the truth, it is folly, on the one hand, to look, owing to human imperfection, for a general consent to the truth (especially after the intimations of the Word itself that it will not exist), and, on the other hand, to give ourselves such license and *self-importance* as not to avail ourselves of the labors, faith, experience, etc., of our fellow-believers. This we can do, without yielding the supremacy of the Word, or sacrificing our freedom in Christ. In our argument for the kingdom, tradition shall also be brought to view, enforcing the same.

We may be accused of laying too great stress on the Apostolic Fathers and Primitive Church in our argument. Tradition is indeed of secondary importance, but still it is valuable as confirmatory evidence. For if a doctrine—important and directly appertaining to the Plan of Redemption—is produced which has never been entertained in any other age of the church, it would be, to say the very least, a very suspicious one. The Fathers are not to be received as "arbiters of our faith," but yet the testimony of the earliest, before so many errors arose, is valuable simply because of their having been in immediate contact with the apostles, elders, and their disciples, and thus would be likely to know something, even if imperfectly expressed, of the doctrines received and the belief entertained. A recent writer (Killen, *The Old Cath. Church*, p. 98) says: "It has often been asserted that those Fathers who lived nearest the times of the apostles must, therefore, be the best expositors of Scripture. It might with equal propriety be affirmed, that the most ancient philosophers are the most enlightened interpreters of the works of creation." While the latter clause utterly fails as an argument—being irrelevant for the

simple reason that those philosophers did not immediately follow an inspired and harmonious teaching of philosophy, and hence the cases are not analogous—it would be unwise and imprudent to assert the former, as presented by Dr. Killen, viz. : that they are "the best expositors." They too are to be measured by Scripture ; they were fallible, and human weakness exhibits itself in their writings ; but notwithstanding this we hold that following *so closely after* perfectly reliable teachers, to whom they constantly appeal, it is *reasonable* to expect that the truth concerning so significant and prominent doctrine as that of the kingdom would also appear. Admitting fully their infirmities, and liability to error, that their words are to be carefully weighed in the Scripture balance, it is right to suppose, in virtue of their nearness to the Christ and apostles, that so important a subject as that of the Messianic Kingdom should enter largely into their doctrinal expositions. It could not be otherwise. The tradition, therefore, which really possesses most weight in deciding questions pertaining to the Kingdom, is that of the first and second centuries. The reason is apparent : if Holy Writ is the real authority in matters of doctrine, then it follows, in view of the standing of the apostles, that it is important for us to direct our attention to the first churches who were favored with their instruction, conversed with them, enjoyed their supervision, to ascertain how they understood the apostles, how they explained the Kingdom, and what views they entertained —and if there is *a correspondence* between the Bible and themselves, we justly claim that their utterances thus far are worthy of credence. This matter is not to be discarded because it happens, as we shall show hereafter, that the Primitive teaching corresponded with and is confirmatory of our doctrinal position. The reader must, if acquainted with early history, know that at the introduction of Christianity the great, leading subject with the Jews was that of the Messianic Kingdom. This could not be ignored or set aside. Hence, before we proceed to their examination it is just to anticipate, from their proximity to inspired men, that they heard and embraced the doctrine of the Kingdom as given by the witnesses appointed by Jesus. The desire to have our views confirmed by the faith of the Primitive Church is so common with theologians that every one seems solicitous to confirm, if possible, his doctrine by theirs, thus indicating *the desirableness* of such subsidiary proof. After the third century tradition, owing to the varied and contradictory opinions introduced, is not so reliable or significant. Knapp (*Theol.*, Introd. s. 7) remarks : "Augustine established the maxim, that tradition could not be relied upon in the ever-increasing distance from the age of the apostles, except when it was universal and perfectly consistent with itself. And long before him, Irenæus (Ag. Her. 4. 36) had remarked, that no tradition should be received as apostolical unless founded in the Holy Scriptures and conformable to them." With the evidences of the fallibility of the Fathers, something to be expected, we are not concerned, but notwithstanding their sudden emergence from heathenism, former habits of thought, etc., it is the most reasonable to look for some truth mingled with it, and that which is the most worthy of our acceptance is that truth in which there was a general union of belief, and which strictly conforms to Bible teaching. It is but a low device to decry any Father, unless palpably in error, as weak-minded, etc., because he happens to disagree from us ; and it is equally absurd to elevate any one as so superior in attainments that his statements are to be received without the direct endorsement of Scripture. We use the Fathers, as e.g. Œcolampadius (D'Anbigne's *His. Refor.*, vol. 4, p. 98): "If we quote the Fathers, it is only to free our doctrine from the reproach of novelty, and not to support our cause by their authority." (Comp. an Art. on *Patristic Theology and its Apologists* in the North Brit. Review, May, 1858.)

It is well to notice a mistake into which some excellent writers have fallen. Overlooking the fact that the opinions of even great and good men are only doctrinally valuable in so far as they are based on Scripture, they pick out the weaknesses and failings and errors of eminent Christians and parade them as if *the Scriptures* were responsible for such views. Thus, e.g., even Leckey in his *His. of Rationalism* refers to Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Baxter, etc., and thus indirectly attempts to weaken Christianity by contrasts. The weakness of believers is only too apparent, and is frankly acknowledged *by themselves ;* their strength, Scripturally derived, is, however, not to be overlooked. Again, a large and respectable class, not only in the Romish Church, but in the Puseyite, Ritualistic movement, and in others, have much to affirm of the reproduction of Scripture in the church, and that we are bound to receive, as "the life blood," the faith of the church. But not one of these advocates of tradition that we have read, is prepared to receive *the general tradition of the early church* respecting the Kingdom. Tradition is all well enough so long as it does not run counter to their own views ; and as the latter agree with *a later period* in the history of the church, they are utterly unwilling to ascend the stream of tradition and receive it as it comes from the Primitive church. How they

reconcile this with their own avowed reverence for tradition, it is impossible to see. Even that early portion received, is itself often interpreted differently from the understanding of it by the early church. Thus, e.g., take the Apostles' Creed as given to us by Irenæus, held by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, and the coming of Jesus to judge and the resurrection were explained (as will hereafter be shown) very differently from the opinions now fastened by many to the creed. If tradition is receivable at all, if it possesses any weight in argument, the stream should be ascended to its fountain head. Again, some writers defend the doctrines of Christianity too much from an outside position, that is, in a philosophical manner. Cheerfully admitting that philosophically many things can be alleged in favor of Christianity, and that its truths can be enforced, yet distinctive Christian doctrine must always find *its chief and true support* in the Word which is the foundation of Christianity. Philosophy being the love of wisdom, and manifesting itself in the search after wisdom, cannot be discarded (hence in using the term in this work the historical sense implying the various systems that have successively arisen, is alone meant) without positive injury, yet it should ever be borne in mind that philosophy is not itself wisdom or its judge, but only its useful servant, its attractive handmaiden. The highest philosophy takes this position, and therefore it is that our greatest philosophers have been most humble men, feeling and acknowledging that wisdom has been imperfectly apprehended by them. In Scripture doctrine we need something *more conclusive* than the mere deductions, however valuable or suggestive, of reason. We require facts announced by Revelation, related to man, and interwoven, recognizable, with past and present history. Taking up the works, theological, of many eminent writers in this country and Europe, it will be found that, although representing different tendencies, there is an endeavor to place the Christian system of faith upon a philosophical basis. The result of this treatment is a great diversity, arising from the philosophical system adopted. A grave mistake is made just so soon as *the Bible method* of presenting doctrine is lost sight of; for, instead of philosophy being the introductory to, and the interpreter of, the Scriptures, there should be, first of all, a historical statement of doctrine as presented in the Word, and then, after God has spoken, philosophy, if so minded, may explain and confirm. A clear perception of the Divine Purpose, historically presented, must precede all our own efforts.

Obs. 6. One of the fruits of the Reformation is the recovery and firm re-establishment of the principle that all have the privilege of judging for themselves in matters of religion. Roscoe (*Life of Leo X.*, p. 235, vol. 2) declares: "The most important point which he (Luther) incessantly labored to establish was the right of private judgment in matters of faith. To the defence of this proposition he was at all times ready to devote his learning, his talents, his repose, his character, and his life; and the great and imperishable merit of this Reformer consists in his having demonstrated it by such arguments as neither the efforts of his adversaries, nor his own subsequent conduct, have been able either to refute or invalidate." Count Bossi (whom Roscoe answers), and others, have endeavored to deny this privilege as opposed to their views of tradition, church authority, etc., but only in reliance upon the declarations of hierarchical teaching outside of the Bible. The Scriptures, while enjoining obedience to the church teaching, does this only in so far as such instruction is in correspondence with itself. God's Word is supreme. A comparison of passages clearly indicates this, as e.g. obedience to the Scriptures is the test of fellowship, 2 Thess. 3 : 14; 2 John 10, etc.; ministers are only to proclaim the truth as given to them, Matt. 18 : 19, 2 Cor. 5 : 19, 20, 1 Tim. 1 : 3, 4, and 6 : 3, 4, etc.; believers themselves are strengthened, etc., by the Word in faith, John 20 : 31; in growth, 2 Tim. 3 : 16, 17, etc.; believers are to exercise and obtain wisdom, etc., Phil. 1 : 9–11, Col. 1 : 9–11, etc.; wicked ministers, etc., shall exist and teach, Matt. 7 : 22, 23, 2 Tim. 3 : 5, etc.; men shall proclaim as binding the commandments of men, Matt. 15 : 9, Acts 20 : 32, Gal. 2 : 4, 5, Col. 2 : 8, etc.; men shall reject the words of Christ and sub-

stitute their own, 1 Tim. 4 : 1–3 and 6 : 3, 2 Pet. 2 : 1, 2, etc. ; hence, the appeal is made to us individually to test or try the doctrine proclaimed, 1 John 4 : 1 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 21, etc., and that we can know the truth by receiving the things of God, 1 Cor. 2 : 12, 13, being urged to it by the fact that some professors, forsaking the Word, have not the knowledge of God, 1 Cor. 15 : 34, and that we shall finally be judged by the Word, John 8 : 48. The entire framework of the Scriptures is erected on the idea of personal responsibility enhanced by the ability to discern the truth for ourselves.

A vast array of Scripture might be presented bearing on this point, but it is needless, since the whole question really depends upon that of the supremacy of Scripture or the supremacy of the church. Let this be decided in favor of Holy Writ, and the right of private judgment follows. It is for this reason that Confessions of Faith ought to be simple, and couched as much as possible in Scripture language. It is a matter of congratulation that this principle is a leading one among Protestants, and is fully recognized and stated in various confessions. But to make these Confessions in turn the interpreters of Scripture, and absolutely binding upon the conscience so as to allow no progress excepting in their direction and under their control, is a palpable violation of the principle itself ; it is inconsistent both with Scripture and the Confessional spirit. Protestantism, which is a Protest to such a fettering of the believer, never could have arisen if the shackles upon freedom of investigation forged by centuries of traditional belief had not been broken.

A caution is requisite : in advocating, like Luther and a host of others, the right of private judgment, we do not mean unrestricted license, for private judgment is itself controlled by the contents of Scripture plainly, grammatically expressed. It gives us the liberty of going ourselves to the Bible, but it does not allow us the freedom of rejecting anything that is clearly taught in it. It is used only to ascertain by reading, searching, comparison, etc., what is revealed, and when this is known it acquiesces in the same. It has not the liberty, being merely a servant of God's and held accountable to Him, of inferring and deducing from the Word what it pleases ; it must itself be led by *a consistent interpretation* of Scripture, based on sound rules. Such a caution is the more necessary, since the principle is seized by many and grossly perverted from its true meaning and intent. It is made the medium through which a flood of destructive criticism and misleading doctrine is conveyed to cover the plain truth. Some even abuse it to mean "that a man has a right to be in the wrong," just as if man's accountability to the great Lawgiver was abrogated, and as if the Scriptures could not be properly apprehended. Many, arraying themselves in its silken folds, place themselves on the Judge's bench and undertake to decide what the Supreme Being ought, and what He ought not, to have revealed. The principle is pushed from its legitimate position to a half-way accommodation, and to an unbelieving extreme. Whilst the right is a necessary, inalienable one, making us *personally responsible* for the reception or rejection of the truth, we must render an account for its proper use or abuse. The same is true of those who deny it to others, so that Luther once remarked : "The Papists must bear with us, and we with them. If they will not follow us, we have no right to force them. Wherever they can, they will hang, burn, behead, and strangle us. I shall be persecuted as long as I live, and most likely be killed. But it must come to this at last : *every man* must be allowed to believe according to his conscience, and answer for his belief to his Maker." The spirit of Tetzel, Wimpina, or Prierius (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, vol. 1, pp. 269, 279), that would take such a judgment away and give it to a Pope only, or that of those who make it synonymous with liberty to judge of the propriety of God's commands, etc. (and not whether they are to be found in Holy Scripture in order to be received), are alike opposed to the simple attitude represented by the child Samuel : "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." The Evang. Alliance adopted as one of its important and fundamental principles : "The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures." Indeed, so widespread and essential is this that even such an exclusive Church as the Greek (so Pinkerton's *Russia*, p. 41, taken from Philaret's statement —the Metropolitan of Moscow) affirms the Bible as sufficient for a rule of faith, and the right of private judgment, in interpreting the same.

Obs. 7. It is also a perversion to make (as in *Essays and Reviews*) conscience the supreme Judge to decide upon the meaning, merits, authority,

etc., of Scripture, and that the latter must bend to the decisions of the former. The person who exercises private judgment ought to come to Revelation, realizing (as conscience itself teaches) that his moral obligations *are not dependent* upon his conscience, but upon the relation that he sustains to God and man; and that, after ascertaining by the use of his judgment what the truths of God really are, conscience may aid in showing their adaptation in the response given to them, help in impressing them and in urging obedience to them. Moral law exists independently of the conscience, and is made for conscience to respond to; the former is unchangeable and binding alike upon all; the latter may refuse to perform its function in impressing that law, as is evidenced in the power of choice influencing the action of conscience. Hence the right of private judgment does not, as some fancy, release a man from moral obligation, or lessen the authority of the Bible, or place him as a judge over the things of the Spirit, or give him power to substitute his own thoughts and vagaries *in place of what is written.* It increases, instead of diminishing, our responsibility, by placing us under greater obligations to pursue the truth *in the way* God Himself has indicated. Those who are to "try the spirits whether they be of God," who "need not that any man teach you," are those who have "searched the Scriptures," acknowledging its claims and bowing their judgments to its divine superiority. God appeals to every man to come personally to His Revelation, to read, study, and meditate upon it, and this appeal is based on its sacred origin, its adaptedness to the condition of all, the possibility of its superhuman element being appreciated by all, and that its truth can be found by all, and will commend itself to every one.

It is important to notice this, since efforts are made in various directions to exalt conscience above Scripture. Two illustrations, out of a multitude, are here presented. The Spiritualists in Convention (Boston, May, 1864) adopted the following: "Resolved, That individual conscience, under the quickening and illumining influences of angel intelligence, is the only reliable guide of faith and life." It is significant that this resolution followed another commending "the works of Colenso, Renan, and other theological agitators." This specimen only proves the correctness of Scripture, that the conscience of men is not so all-powerful but that it can be made subservient to passion, self-interest, and abuse; that its corrective and restraining power can be materially lessened by turning away from the truth, refusing to allow its moral influence to be exerted, and desiring the substitution of things not demanding so high a standard of self-denial, morality, and piety. The Bible assures us what experience corroborates, that conscience cannot only be overridden but become so seared that it will no longer respond to the truth as originally designed (1 Tim. 4 : 1, 2; Tit. 1 : 5). The conscience, even of a believer, if not properly exercised may prove to be a "weak" one, 1 Cor. 8 : 12, and 10 : 28, 29. Leckey (*His. Rationalism*, p. 181), speaking of "Protestant Rationalism," says: "Its central conception is the elevation of conscience into a position of supreme authority as the religious organ, a verifying faculty discriminating between truth and error." We are not told, however, how this holds good in the conscience of a Hindoo, Mohammedan, Roman Catholic, Protestant, etc., which receives error instead of truth; or how it happens that a Rationalistic conscience diverges so widely in ideality, materialism, spiritualism, nihilism, etc.; or how even any unbelieving conscience is not united in the view what constitutes the "supreme authority," etc. If there were some semblance of unity, and an array of facts, to substantiate such an opinion, *then* it might deserve consideration, but finding the guidance of conscience leading to the utmost diversity in the Rationalistic ranks, it may be dismissed with the single remark: that whilst conscience has, as the Bible teaches, a discriminating power, yet this may be perverted and abused until man possesses "*an evil conscience.*" Conscience is appealed to (Rom. 1 and 2) in the Scriptures as something needing aid (Rom. 9 : 1 and 14 : 15), as developed by the truth (John 18 : 37; Heb. 9 : 14), and, therefore, is only presented to us as that faculty, or arrangement of our mental and moral constitution, which intuitively responds to revelation when brought

into contact with it, but which can be repressed or overcome by the will, passion, self-interest, etc. In the nature of the case, it only becomes *a witness* of the truth and not its judge, thus corroborating the fact that both Creation and Revelation proceed from the same God. We reproduce two admirable statements: Dr. Schenkel (quoted by Frothingham in *The Soul of Protestantism*) says: "The contents of religion are in God Himself; and since man is conscious of God only as God reveals Himself, for man the contents of religion are in the written revelation. Most gloriously and completely has God manifested Himself in the person of Christ; and the Holy Scriptures give the history of that manifestation. The Holy Scripture, as the word or revelation of God, contains the divine substance. Conscience is free; but true freedom consists in obedience to the truth. Caprice is no freedom. That only is genuinely free which is bound to God. Hence the Protestant position, while appealing to conscience, at the same time insists *that conscience is bound to God's Word*, and can attain outside of that to nothing. It is therefore the special characteristic of Protestantism to be the religion of the Bible." Thus this liberal theologian endorses what Chillingworth (*The Relig. of Protestantism*) said long ago: "The Bible, I say, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe beside it and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as matter of opinion. I, for my part, after a long and, as I readily believe and hope, impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any true test for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe to it with hand and heart, as knowing that no demonstration can be stronger than this: God hath said so, and therefore it must be true. In other things I will take no man's liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian. I will love no man the less for differing in opinion from me. I am fully assured that God does not, and that, therefore, men ought not to require any more of any man than this: to believe that the Scriptures are God's Word, to endeavor to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it."

Obs. 8. The exaltation of reason to the supreme authority is characteristic of numerous works. Eulogies on the excellence of reason as the sole and final arbiter abound; and such might be deserving, and reason be elevated above Revelation, provided it had, apart from the Scriptures, given to us that which alone can satisfy the moral and religious sense of man, viz.: a religion equal in merit to that contained in the Bible, or one better adapted to the wants and necessities of humanity. If such persons as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, and a host of others, could have produced a more noble portrayal of the nature and attributes of God, a more perfect character than Christ, and a more glorious salvation than that presented in the Word, *then* there might be some force and propriety in urging the claims of reason to its arrogated position. Until this is done, it is the wisest course to receive *the manifest superiority* of the Bible over all mere human productions; a superiority attested not only by a multiplicity of fact and experience (Comp. Prop. 182), but by comparative ignorant and unlettered men giving us a complete Plan of Redemption, which, while constantly dealing with the loftiest subjects that can be entertained by mind, preserves an unbroken unity amid detail. In the study of Scripture and in its reception it is well to keep in mind what Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. p. 159), after Pascal, says: "Two extremes must be avoided; the exclusion of reason, and the admission of nothing but reason."

Some additional remarks are proper, seeing that so much is said respecting the superiority of Reason. The Bible constantly appeals to man's reason; Revelation is made to Reason, and is designed to be apprehended by it. Not a step can be taken without its aid, and therefore it is folly to ignore its importance and value. But whilst acknowledging the same, it is foolishness to elevate it into an infallible guide and director, yea into a Judge of Scripture itself. (1) Reason is imperfect, needing culture, training, dis-

cipline, constant exercise, etc.; it is subject to growth, retrogression, variations, etc.; it is limited in its ability to fathom things, much being utterly unknown to it. Hence the impropriety of making it a supreme tribunal. Let any one take a glance at the different and successive forms of Philosophy that Reason has constructed, and these features of imperfection, variation, inability, are painfully exhibited. The boasted rule of Reason is manifested in a bewildering diversity, scarcely two of them agreeing in the fundamentals. The ruins of the past, and the numerous claimants for the present afford us the best answer to such a claim. (2) The Bible represents Reason as swayed and controlled by wicked impulses, as yielding to the influence of passion, self-interest, and evil, and as needing correction and wholesome restraint. Experience, sad and boundless, corroborates this statement. Men of the highest intellect, whose works are the admiration of the world, have been the slaves of degrading vice, and have prostituted their minds to represent it in attractive forms. Reason subject to the degrading authority of passion; which even has undertaken in an alluring manner to prove that there is no distinction between vice and virtue, which has overriden conscience and the nobler feelings of man in its efforts to secure the ascendency of unbelief—is no infallible standard. (3) The Bible again represents Reason as needing Revelation. Holy Writ is based upon this necessity. Many facts indicate this truth. Thus, e.g., outside of the Scriptures what light has Reason thrown into the dark grave, the nature and attributes of God, the deliverance of man and creation from an all-pervading and constantly experienced evil, etc. How these problems are met—problems pertaining to God, man, and the world—let the discordant and antagonistic theories, from materialism through Pantheism, Idealism, etc., down to the baldest Nihilism, testify. When the greatest philosophers are contradictory and cannot agree, when one system after another follows, surely there is need of help. When the most gifted minds are utterly unable to fathom the things of Nature, how a grain of sand is held together, why crystallizing is invariable, how instinct is perpetuated, how mind and body mutually affect each other, with a multitude of questions unanswered, or if answered only under some glittering generality, surely in the higher region of morals and religion, it is most reasonable to anticipate, just as we find it, *less ability* to explain, *less power* to penetrate the deep things relating to God and man. (4) The Bible represents Reason as often unreliable, even in believers, unless controlled by the higher Reason pervading Revelation. That is, when left to itself, it may lead us to error and folly. Unbelievers themselves point out this peculiarity, so unhappily displayed in too many instances in the church, forgetting that the Bible expressly warns us that such exhibitions of weakness in reason are to be expected. But, if this is so with believers, how does it stand with unbelievers? Let the multitude of philosophers reply; let the multiplicity of systems of error testify. The truthfulness of God's Word is abundantly confirmed *both* in the church and outside of it. (5) The Bible cautions us against the pride of Reason, its self-exaltation, and urges us to humility. How this has been exemplified, *both* in the church and out of it, forms one of the most humiliating features of imperfect humanity. Overbearance, intolerance, abuse of opponents, lack of charity, and even persecution, have been some of its fruits. It has never lacked in bold presumption. (6) The Bible assures us that if Revelation is received as God has designed, Reason itself will most fully acquiesce in its superiority. The declaration of the Saviour, "*If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine,*" has been tested by such a host of gifted minds, that it is unnecessary to press the matter. In the case of apostates, etc., 1 John 2 : 4, is verified, whilst all others have not even entertained the essential preliminaries to a proper apprehension of Scripture. (7) Reason, with its loftiest efforts, can only give us the Possible, the Probable; and this is unsatisfactory to man because it presents no Plan of Deliverance adapted to the common and universal wants of humanity, it develops no practical relief; Revelation bestows the Real, and this is manifested both in its *perfect adaptability* to man's necessities and in the *blessed earnests* of experience. The former only finds its corroboration—if truth—in the latter. (8) God warns us that as we shall approach the ending of this dispensation, Reason shall so pervert a due veneration and knowledge of God, shall so array itself against the Revealed Will, that it shall succeed in mustering the nations and kings of the earth against the Truth. Hence the efforts to exalt reason, the advance that such a theory has made in practically alienating a multitude from the Scriptures, is *only* in the line of previously given prediction. It is something to be expected, and therefore its extensive existence should give us the stronger faith in Scripture, which so accurately foretells it. (9) Reason ought not to complain if there are things beyond its comprehension, things impossible for it to explain, in the Word, for this is precisely what ought to be anticipated in a Supernatural Revelation. Besides this, it does not reject Nature because of its inability to apprehend it fully. Its proper attitude, therefore, is that of a learner,

receiving truth from all sources, even if unable to understand "how and wherefore" such and such things exist, take place, etc. (10) The acknowledgments of men of Reason indicate its utter unfitness to be the final and supreme arbiter. Passing by the desponding, hopeless, despairing admissions by those sunken to Nihilism, it is sufficient to select a single example, illustrative of many others. Thus e.g. Hume (quoted by Christlieb, *Mod. Doubt.*, p. 127) pointedly and significantly says: "The ultimate fruit of all philosophy is the observation of human ignorance and weakness.* On the other hand, men of undoubted mental power, distinguished for the use of reason subservient to religion (as Bacon, etc.), have informed us that the portions of philosophy really valuable are those which recognize and enforce truths already given to us in Revelation. (11) Finally, Reason has never succeeded in improving the lessons inculcated by Scripture. It can suggest no virtue, no duty, no obligations, nothing promotive of individual, social, and national happiness, nothing essential to the welfare of man, that is *not already* presented and enforced by the most powerful of motives in God's Word.

Dr. Crosby (*On Preaching*, before the Pan-Presbyterian Council, 1877) correctly affirms that "men's affections, not their intellects, are the hindrances to God's truth, and accordingly if the contest can be brought into the intellectual field, and so relieve the heart from the pressure of spiritual truth, men are satisfied." The Bible, as he forcibly urges, appeals to the heart, to our moral nature, more than it does to reason, without, however, discarding the latter. It has often been noticed that men in error, both in doctrine and practice, love controversy—something that may engage reason and stifle the demands of the heart. Such are inclined to eulogize "Practical Reason," "Moral Reason," and "The Transcendent Sphere of Reason." An insidious and half-true method —eloquently expressed (as e.g. by Coleridge in "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit")— is to allow a partial inspiration to the Scriptures and a high degree of ordinary grace to the rest, so that they rather present themselves as the supply of the deepest wants of man than as an authoritative and infallible standard. But how the soul can rest upon a supply, lacking those essentials, we are not informed. Comp. the necessity of reason, etc., as given by Row in the *Bampton Lects.* 1877, "Ch. Evidences," p. 19, etc.; Butler's *Analogy*, P. II., ch. 3, etc.

Obs. 9. In this study of Scripture, reason and faith must be joined together in order to make it effective. The two cannot be separated without serious injury; this is God's own arrangement, and, to insure success, it must be followed. They are inseparable, for there can be no faith without reason first perceiving the truth and its adaptability to man, so that faith may then appropriate it. Reason may refuse faith, can exist without it, but faith cannot live without reason. Christlieb, in view of this intimate and mutual relationship, well says that faith is "the highest form of reason," seeing that it establishes and confirms reason by giving us a more certain knowledge of the supernatural in its appropriating effects of the truth upon ourselves. One part of faith sees the truth, the other, the crowning part which constitutes it faith, accepts and applies it, thus giving *a practical*, and not a mere theoretical knowledge of the same. The head and the heart are combined in this work, thus affording a realizing, abiding acquaintance with the truth. Faith *must* have knowledge, for we must first *know* the things that we are to believe, and hence it is also represented as "*seeing*" (John 6 : 40, Heb. 11 : 27). Cremer (*Bremen Lectures*, Lec. 2) remarks: "All faith rests upon knowledge, and when it is not produced by deduction or logical demonstration, it must ground itself upon spiritual perception and contact. Knowledge and faith are distin-

* One unbeliever in reply to another, in the Religio-Philosophical Journal, March 13, 1875, makes the following remark: "It is futile to talk of reason as an infallible standard of religious truth, until mankind become so perfect in knowledge as never to err in the premises from which they reason. *Until then* the dictates of reason will be simply every man's opinion, as it is now."

guished from each other like cognition and recognition ; so faith is an exercise of obedience, of recognition, and hence of trust, of surrender," etc. Evangelical faith includes more than mere knowledge, viz.: the hearty self-appropriation of such knowledge, leading necessarily, as the truth received demands it, to an obedience of the same. Such faith is sustained by three things : (1) by the sense of truth, *i.e.* by reason, the ability to discern and know it; (2) by the sense of right, *i.e.* by conscience, the power of testifying to the truth and enjoining responsibility of its acceptance ; (3) and by the practical experience wrought by faith, *i.e.* in the agreement of faith with our mental and moral constitution and the results that it produces.

Faith is indeed "the gift of God," Christ is "the author of faith," the Spirit produces faith, etc., but only in the higher Evangelical, Biblical sense in those who voluntarily receive the truth as given by the Father, Son, and Spirit. No man is forced into faith, as appears from the Scriptures being designed for faith (John 20 : 31), the ministry being a means of faith (Rom. 10 : 14–17), the Gospel itself being called faith (Gal. 1 : 23), the promises given to faith (John 5 : 24), and the want of faith is reproved (Mark 16 : 14), warned against (Heb. 3 : 12), threatened (John 3 : 18, 36), and described as voluntary (John 5 : 44, 46, 47). Enlightened by the truth as given by the Father in His Son and through the Spirit, that faith, which God commends and that rejoices the heart, is possible ; without accepting the aid thus tendered, it cannot be produced. Hence no man, unless he has experienced the power of this faith, is able to judge correctly of its merits and its true relationship to knowledge. To make man passive in the reception of faith, is to ignore the Scriptures to the contrary and also experience ; to make man himself the chief and sole instrumentality in believing, is to overlook the truth given to excite and sustain it ; to make faith the barrier to knowledge, is to forget that faith's foundation is the knowledge of the truth ; and to make faith fatal to progress, is to trample under foot the declarations of Holy Writ and the realization of believers that faith only opens the way to increased knowledge. Indeed, it is a matter of doubt whether in any of the spheres and pursuits of life there can be knowledge without the addition of some faith, and whether any great achievement can be accomplished without suitable faith. Zöckler (*Bremen Lectures*, Sec. 1, p. 16) refers in such a connection to the faith of Columbus, Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, etc., and remarks : "True faith and actual knowledge, so far from being contradictory, always demand and supplement each other. For faith, as the immediate apprehension of the truth by the divinely illuminated reason, is related to knowledge, regarded as the acquired apprehension of the same truth by the reason struggling toward such knowledge, as the necessary condition, the starting point and support of all its operations. All faith is undeveloped knowledge, and all knowledge is faith unfolded and applied to the different realms of reason and experience." All Evangelical writers, however they may differ in details, unite in the common opinion that faith is not to be separated from knowledge, seeing that the Bible, in unison with experience, includes in believing a previous knowledge of certain facts, as e.g. the Coming of Christ, His work of grace in man's behalf, etc. They also unite in the view that the certainty of this knowledge, derived from reason, is made evident by faith in its vital force of acceptance, because through the latter we experience its *actuality* in the effects—as promised—produced upon us personally. Thus, to illustrate : a medicine is presented to us in whose nature and efficacy we may believe on the testimony of others ; here is knowledge and faith in its lowest form. But let this medicine be taken, and its efficacy be established by personal use, then previous knowledge and faith of a theoretical cast gives place to a practical knowledge and faith, derived from personal acceptance and experience, that elevates the former into real facts connected with our own personality, which, like existence, thinking, feeling, etc., it is impossible any longer to doubt. This is the secret of the believer's strength, so that all the arguments of unbelief *can never shake* the simple faith of the unlearned but sincere Christian. He knows, and he believes, the attestation of self-consciousness.

Undoubtedly, taking Scripture as a guide, unbelief itself will finally accept of this union of reason or knowledge and faith. The controversy thus far has clearly established this fact. Delitzsch, Fabri, Christlieb, and many others have shown that (as Fabri states it, quoted by Christlieb in *Mod. Doubt*), "As its ultimate basis, even the most radical unbelief has one and the same principle of knowledge with Christianity and every other positive religion—the principle of belief in given matter of fact, on the ground of the original and direct testimony of the human mind." Unbelief, however much it may

decry faith, lives *largely* upon it, calls loudly for others to exercise it, and denounces those who refuse to entertain it. Unbelief has sufficient intelligence to perceive that, while demanding faith, it is utterly inconsistent to run a crusade against faith on the grounds heretofore alleged. The result will be a change. Knowing that faith influences the masses, that it is the most potent of powers, it will, as the Bible predicts, so shape its future course that a connection will be allowed to exist between Revelation and Reason, between Faith and Reason, as evidenced in the coming worship of Antichrist—*the worship of Deified Man.* For this worship of the last times, we are assured, is to rely largely upon pretended revelations and lying wonders to aid Reason and inspire Faith. Denying the faith and reason that God requires, their punishment will come through *their own* deluded, self-exalted reason and faith.

Finally, all Christians, too, are agreed that faith in its appropriating form, is such a trust in God, that it receives His Word and relies upon it, bringing under subjection free will, so that it chooses the moral, the religious, the obedience required in preference to pleasure, sin, and selfishness. To attain such faith demands self-abnegation, and this is *the stone of stumbling* to multitudes. Hence faith is not the power of choice, though it leads to it; faith is not conscience, though it quickens it; faith is not reason, though it is led by it; faith is not the mere knowledge of the truth, though it receives; faith is not goodness, though provocative of it;—it is that act which brings reason, the will, conscience, knowledge, goodness, all into *humble submission* to the Infinite, and *relies* upon the provision made by God for man. It is *appropriating trust.* Such faith brings forth its own evidences of the Divine Truth, in its sustaining reason (where it only finds mysteries), in satisfying the moral nature of man (e.g. the dictates of conscience), in bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit (i.e. in experiencing the sanctifying nature of the truth received), in its adaptability to all his circumstances (in strengthening, comforting, etc.), in transmuting evil into good (making it disciplinary, provocative of good to others, etc.), and in quickening the whole man into newness of life (implanting supreme love to God and love to man). It is *a powerful* instrumentality; it is transforming, corrective, and elevating. It is the purest and strongest where it is joined to the least error; but even with error it is all powerful when based on the essentials of Christianity. The Bible takes it for granted that strong faith—faith testifying in the most satisfactory manner to self-consciousness—may be allied with a lack of knowledge respecting things not absolutely necessary to salvation. A few simple truths respecting God, the Redeemer, the relation that man sustains to God and his fellow-men, the moral obligation and responsibility of man—truths to which the moral nature of man is respondent—are all sufficient to create this faith. It is a faith that all the learning in the world cannot alone produce, seeing that its vital power lies not in the head, but in the heart. It is a faith common to the intelligent and the illiterate, and cannot be circumscribed or produced through mere knowledge. Therefore it is that unbelief and bigotry so gravely misjudge the weakness, error, etc., of believers—just as if faith was dependent upon uniformity in all things, thus totally mistaking its foundation and intent. Faith indeed increases by knowledge, knowledge derived from the Word and experience, but only as truth is appropriated and obeyed. This feature of obedience to the truth known, the evidence of appropriating faith, *often, often* gives the unlearned man a power and charm that the greatest philosopher, neglecting it, cannot attain. Alas! that men so persistently overlook this plain fact.

Attention has already been called (Prop. 9) to the misapprehension that faith is not connected with doctrine, that as M. Colani (in the Prot. Synod of France, 1872) said: "You place Christianity in certain beliefs; we place it in the heart." The Bible, the experience of Christians, unite the two; the denial of one or the other leads to an extreme, for the simplest act of Christianity, as, e.g., prayer, cannot be performed without some distinctive belief in doctrine—the doctrine respecting God and the power of Christ. It is true that faith itself may be hampered by the excesses of Confessional zeal and dogma, curtailing access to God's truth or veiling it by tradition, but this is not the fault of doctrine *per se*, but of doctrine imperfectly or erroneously presented. Hence the importance of presenting doctrine, in a Confessional standard, as much as possible in Scripture language, and of making even such subordinate to Scripture. One reason for the persistent attack against doctrine, is owing to its vital connection with Christianity, with enlightened faith; for as Kurtz (*Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 130) has well remarked: "The Doctrine of the Gospel is *the life blood* of the Church, the pulsations of which throb through her entire organization." How faith is wrought by the Spirit through the truth given by Him, has been sufficiently noticed under Prop. 9. Faith being largely a heart work, it is impossible for the sensual, haughty, self-confident, worldly man to exercise it, because it demands as its concomitant, in order to receive the things revealed by the Spirit,

obedience, which pride, love for sin, etc., rejects. Even an Aristotle appreciated the relation existing between the indulgence of evil and the rejection of truth, when he says (quoted by Bloomfield, see Barnes, 1 Cor. 2 : 14): "For wickedness perverts the judgment, and makes men err with respect to practical principles; so that no one can be wise and judicious who is not good."

A few words may be added respecting the charge that faith—Evang. faith—is destructive to Science. We are unjustly charged by Scientists and others with disparaging learning and philosophy under the Scriptural phrases "the wisdom of this world," "oppositions of Science falsely so called," "to the Greeks foolishness," etc., just as if reason was not to be employed (when constantly appealed to in Scripture), as if true science (implied by "falsely so called") could not exist, and as if true philosophy (by which we understand the love for, and search after, wisdom) was not commended by God. This charge is so sweeping that it defeats itself; for, however individual men or organizations may have acted in this matter under bigotry and mistaken zeal, neither Revelation, nor a believer who receives *all* that God enjoins, is responsible for the same. The learning, worldly wisdom, and Science that the Bible condemns, is *only* that perverted form that caters to depravity, making men despisers of virtue and holiness, and leading them to deny their obligations and responsibility to God. Simple consistency requires of us that, the moment we accept of the Word of God as a divine Revelation, Holy Writ be allowed a precedency (accorded by reason and faith) without interfering with or destroying the existence and relationship of truth wherever elsewhere found. This precedency, indeed, leads to caution, to comparison, and to the rejection of positive error, but it does not depreciate learning, scientific knowledge, etc., as evidenced in believers having been among the most learned, wise, and scientific. It is not too much to say, that the foundation of this objection lies in the estimate formed of the relative value of Revealed Truth and Scientific Truth. Believers, of course, finding the former dealing with *the higher interests* of man (his moral, religious, and eternal), place it highest in the scale of truth; the unbeliever, rejecting the former, elevates nature or the facts of humanity in that scale. Some Scientists, having no such preponderating plea as the believers, despise learning and philosophy (e.g., Art. "*Nat. Religion*," Macmillan's Mag., 1875, repub. Pop. Science Monthly May, 1875) outside of their peculiar sphere of study. Scientists have too often been as bigoted and one-sided as overzealous believers. The truth is, that both parties, belief and unbelief, are opposed to that form and manifestation of learning and philosophy which is hostile and antagonistic to their respective views; and the correctness of such opposition is to be determined by the nature of the things believed. Hence the relative value of Revelation and of mere Science must first be determined before the question is decided one way or the other. The fact also that some truth is essential and other truth non-essential to personal happiness and salvation, ought to be considered in such a discussion. This does not discourage investigations in all domains of truth, but welcomes them with the hope and faith, inspired by Revelation, that all truth, higher or lower, essential or non-essential, will in the end be found in fraternal relationship—supplementing each other.*

---

* The student who desires to read on this subject is referred to Christlieb's "Modern Doubt," Birk's "Bible and Mod. Thought," Ulrici's "God and Nature," Rogers' "Reason and Faith," Candlish's "Reason and Revelation," etc. Dr. McCosh, Delitzsch, Fabri, and many other writers present the most valuable thoughts on these points, extending and ably defending what nearly every work on the Evidences of Christianity also notices. The reader will pardon such digression in view of their practical, fundamental importance. The fine statement of faith and reason, p. 463, etc., *Debt and Grace*, by Hudson, ought not to be overlooked.

PROPOSITION 11. *The mysteries of the kingdom were given to the apostles.*

This is plainly asserted by Jesus Himself (Mark 4 : 11, Matt. 13 : 11), "*Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God*," "*it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven*," which the apostles, including Paul, claimed to have been imparted, Eph. 1 : 9, and 3 : 3, etc. The entire tenor of the New Test. impresses us, that their superior qualifications as teachers arises from their acquaintance with the doctrine of the kingdom, resulting from the personal instructions received from Christ, and the subsequent special guidance of the Spirit.

Obs. 1. We are not concerned, in this stage of the argument, to know how much truth respecting the kingdom they obtained from Jesus, and how much, afterward, from the specially delegated Spirit; this will forcibly appear as we proceed. It may, however, be properly stated here, that there might be mysteries pertaining to the kingdom, while the kingdom itself—what it denoted—may be fully known. The reader will carefully notice, that in the early period of their discipleship, the mysteries relating to the kingdom were already given to them. It is incredible, utterly impossible, that the kingdom itself—*what it meant*—should, therefore, have been a mystery to them. The express language of Jesus forbids it. Hence, that large class of eminent writers, which teach that during the life of Jesus the apostles *misapprehended* the kingdom, are mistaken, and it is the most reasonable, and the most consistent with Christ's words, to conclude that the apostles, even then, had more than the mere "husk," or the unrecognized "germ."

Neander, and a host of writers, say, by way of apologizing in behalf of the apostles (because they did not hold the modernized view of the Kingdom), that they only held "the shell," or "husk." But Jesus declares expressly, Math. 13 : 16 : "*But your eyes see, and your ears understand.*" Comp. Mark 4 : 11, etc. Such knowledge is proper for preachers of the Kingdom.

Obs. 2. The word "mystery" ordinarily denotes something secret, hidden, or beyond our comprehension, and is frequently employed in Scripture to denote truth formerly concealed but now revealed. The name "mystery" is retained in view of its having been previously hidden. Mysteries when disclosed may be perfectly intelligible, and when not divulged, but simply pointed out, may exist without our reason being able to understand their nature, meaning, etc. That the latter is not opposed to reason, although above reason, is apparent from the ten thousand unsolved mysteries of nature. (Comp. Elliot's "*Christian Errors, Infidel Arguments*," Horne, vol. 1, p. 158, etc.) Then, too, as in the most simple

things, there may be something inexplicable, so in the doctrines of Revelation—plainly stated and easily comprehended—there may be great depths unsounded. To this Luther referred, when he said that he could not fully comprehend even the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, etc.

Obs. 3. While some mystery, some unexplained or unrevealed things pertaining to the kingdom, may have existed in the days of the apostles and now remain such, not given by Jesus or the Spirit, yet the assurance is abundantly ours, that *the kingdom itself*, its nature, our relation to it, all things necessary for a correct understanding of its meaning, was made known. This is evident, e.g. from its having been predicted, taught to the disciples and preached by them to the people; the apostles and their immediate followers professing themselves called to proclaim it so that men might be induced to enter, receive, and inherit it. All this, in the nature of the case, presupposes *a correct understanding* of it. The kingdom is the great prize, reward, etc., held up before them, and it is most reasonable and conformable to fact to believe that they would have such an adequate knowledge of *its real import* as to be able to tell us what it denotes. Admitting mystery even now attached to things relating to the kingdom, we can know these so far as declared, for while "the secret things belong unto the Lord our God; those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever" (Deut. 29 : 29).

Obs. 4. Carefully looking over the entire records of discipleship and apostleship, nothing is to be found to indicate that those mysteries given to them related to the kingdom so far as *its meaning or signification* is concerned. The contrary indeed is largely inferred, and upon this unproven inference a massive superstructure is built. (This will be noticed hereafter.) The reader can soon verify our position by a reference to passages which either directly or indirectly refer to mysteries (*i.e.* things of which they were ignorant, that had been hidden, etc.), and he will see that they allude to the death of Christ, or to the intimate and unending union of the divine and human in His Person, or to the ascension and exaltation of the man Christ Jesus to heaven, or to the blending in the Scriptures of two Advents, the First and Second seperated by an unknown interval of time, or to the rejection of the Jews and the call of the Gentiles, or to the period of the Times of the Gentiles and their subsequent overthrow, or to the future restoration of the Jews and their blessing to the Gentiles, or to the redemption of the race progressing when, under Christ's dominion, both Jews and Gentiles are exalted in the favor of God, etc., but never is *the kingdom* introduced as a mystery, *i.e.* as something unknown. The reason for this will appear, when we come to the disciples' preaching the kingdom. In the mean time, the very outskirts of the subject already force the conclusion that those mysteries refer not *to the nature* of the kingdom, but *to the manner* of its establishment, *the means* employed, *the preparation* for it, *the time* for its manifestation, and such related subjects.

Obs. 5. The mysteries of the kingdom were not all given at once; they were gradually revealed, and some of them were postponed and others are still withheld; this again leads us to the decided opinion that the kingdom, to which they stand related, was well known to the disciples and apostles.

Take away the mysteries, such as the necessity of Christ's death, the call of the Gentiles, etc., made more fully known after the resurrection of Jesus, and what is left of mystery communicated to them? Surely it is *not* the kingdom; for the least dispassionate reflection will lead us soon to see that they could not have been ignorant of *the main, leading* subject with which the others stand connected. To suppose, as many do, that they were, would be contradictory to the revelation of the mysteries, their gradual bestowal, and the indefinite postponement of some. For, if Jesus preached *the kingdom* to them and proclaimed its mysteries, He certainly must have said something directly respecting the kingdom, either confirmatory or contradictory to the opinion already formed concerning it, so that they could form a correct idea of it. Before the kingdom could be appreciated, with its mysterious preparatory stages, etc., the kingdom itself must be understood, for that was *the subject matter* distinctly announced and illustrated.

Obs. 6. The mysteries, therefore, imply: (1) a previous acquaintance with *the doctrine of the kingdom*, and (2) that the mysteries imparted bestow a fuller knowledge of the subject in view of the additions made. In teaching science, art, etc., the primary fact is either first taught, or it is taken for granted that it is well known. So Jesus, in teaching the mysteries of the kingdom, must base the same on a knowledge previously attained of the kingdom. If the apostles were to be "stewards of the mysteries of God" under the teaching of Jesus, it was necessary for them, being constituted such, to know *first of all* what the kingdom itself was; otherwise it was impossible for them to comprehend the accessories belonging to it. Multitudes now believe that the mysteries were first proclaimed, and *afterward* the kingdom was made plain; some go a step beyond this and tell us that the mysteries and kingdom were both so profound and hid under a veil that *the apostles themselves* had a very imperfect notion respecting the kingdom. In following propositions, such will be largely quoted. We do not, cannot believe that such a mode of teaching, reversing all ideas of propriety, was adopted by *the most perfect Teacher*, and which is flatly contradicted by the disciples themselves *preaching the kingdom*, thus implying knowledge concerning its nature, and by the belief of the churches planted by them, thus evincing a unity in that preaching.

PROPOSITION 12. *There is some mystery yet connected with the things of the kingdom.*

This is seen, e.g. in Rev. 10 : 7, where it is declared that under the last period of time in this age, "*the mystery of God should be finished*," which commentators generally apply to the fulfilment of the Divine Purpose in the setting up of the kingdom in a manner that shall be universally acknowledged, in vindicating through its establishment the Divine plan, etc. It indicates that some things hitherto kept concealed or partially known, should now be revealed or openly manifested. Whatever meaning is attached to the passage, it leaves the impression that not everything pertaining to the kingdom is yet fully known.

Obs. 1. Men who have given the subject much thought, have the idea that the mystery here stated mainly refers to the period, not definitely known, for the outward manifestation of the kingdom, but it may, for aught we know, include much more. While the mystery does not allude to the nature of the kingdom (for this, as will be shown hereafter, is explained), it suggests the comparative unknown time for its glorious establishment, the events connected with it of which only broken hints are given, the occurrence of things not revealed, and the manner in which things revealed shall be accomplished.

The chief mystery seems to be this : *how* in the person of Jesus, and those associated with Him in regal power, there will be a consolidation, or a most intimate blending of the purest Theocracy with the restored throne and Kingdom of David. This union is stated, and the inestimable blessings and honor flowing from it are described, but just *how* it will be performed, *what* changes and evolutions result from its organization, *what* extraordinary dignity and glory will be imparted to the engrafted, providentially reared, and elevated Davidic Kingdom in its manifested Divine relationship, we cannot fully tell, having, for the present, to rest satisfied with general descriptions. Glimpses are vouchsafed, promises are given, intimations of things inexpressibly great, which indicate that, however done and whatever the results, it will be a most desirable exhibition of power and rule, a most wonderful revealment of mercy, judgment, and love, a most unparalleled outgrowth of Redemption in a visible, indisputable form. The design of previous dispensations, the orderings of Providence, the probation of saints, the longsuffering and patience of God, the permission of evil—in brief, all that has preceded, will find their *solution* in the incoming Kingdom.

Obs. 2. The word "mystery," according to Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 372), "in the quite uniform usage of Scripture, denotes something which lies beyond the ken of the natural apprehension, and is revealed only to such as have the mind and spirit of God. So it is used frequently by the Apostle Paul, Rom. 16 : 25, 1 Cor. 2 : 7, 10, etc." Whilst the Scriptures and a devout mind are requisite to grasp the truth thus revealed, it still remains true that some things that are mysterious remain ; for some

things are only hinted at, others stated without explanation, others again so allied with the Supernatural, so far beyond present experience that we are utterly unable to tell how, or in what manner and time, they will be accomplished. Hence down to the end of this age there is still some mystery attached *to things* pertaining to the kingdom. The question of Nicodemus, "*How* can these things be?" may be often repeated, without the spirit of unbelief, in the way of inquiry.

Comp., e.g., Bh. Sanderson's *Works*, vol. 1, p. 233, on the text, "The mystery of godliness," etc., Kirk's *Lec. on Parables*, on word "Mystery," the Baird Lecture for 1874, by Dr. Crawford, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, etc. It may be added, that Rev. Hall in his *Review* of Gregory's Letters, sustaining the latter's "Fourth Letter on Mysteries in Religion," adverts to the sophism, ascribed to Dr. Foster—"that where mystery begins, religion ends," and then forcibly says: "The fact is, that religion and mystery both begin and end together—a portion of what is inscrutable to our faculties being intimately and inseparably blended with its most vital and operative truths. A religion without mysteries is a temple without God." The least reflection will indicate the truthfulness of such a position, seeing that Religion deals so largely with the Supernatural and the future destiny of man. As the doctrine of the Kingdom embraces these as vital points, mystery is necessarily connected with it. Thus, e.g., mystery will attach itself to revealed things (as the resurrection), the relation that one thing sustains to another (as in the Oneness of the Father and Son), the statement of a fact (as the translation), the transcendent nature of the subject treated (as the glorification), the limited extent of disclosure (as in the Antichrist and doom), the inadequacy of language to convey a proper conception of certain things (as in the Person of the King, and His rule, and the blessings resulting), the seeming inconsistency from our being incapable (owing to finiteness) to place ourselves in the largeness of the Spirit in its infinite conceptions (as in time, dispensational orderings, etc.).

Obs. 3. A multitude of writers attest to the existence of mysteries, their necessity, their value, and usefulness; and correctly affirm, that without them *a decided proof* of the Divine origin of the Bible would be lacking, a sublime display of Divine perfection would be wanting, and that the scope for faith, hope, reverence, humility, etc., would be seriously narrowed. This is especially true of the kingdom, in view of the Theocratic King and His glorified co-rulers, and the realization of Redemption through their power and rule. If there is mystery connected with the operations of nature, contained even in the growth of the smallest plant and in the structure of a grain of sand, *most certainly* they will be found in a subject so vast and comprehensive (Props. 1 and 2) as that of "the Gospel of the Kingdom." Bogue (*Essay on Div. Author of the N. Test.*, p. 249) has well said, when comparing the mysteries of nature with those of Revelation: "Without mysteries, the Gospel would not be like the works of God." Bish. Butler (*Anal.*, 1. c. 1), speaking of mysteries necessarily connected with Religion, calls them "clouds on the mercy seat," capable of only an imperfect explanation, owing to our limited capacities and experience. Eaton (*Permanence of Christianity*) asserts: "Mysteries are the properties of all genuine religions, in regard to which the believer walks by faith and not by sight."

Comp. Campbell's *Prel. Diss. to Gospels*, vol. 1, p. 383, Burr's *Pater Mundi*, sec. 6, South's *Sermons*, ser. 6, vol. 3, Bh. Newton's *Works*, vol. 4, Diss. 35, Mansel's "*Limits of Relig. Thought Examined*," in Bampton Lects., 1858, as well as the writings of Hall, Stillingfleet, Claude, McCosh, etc., and works specially devoted to presenting the Evidences of Christianity. It may be remarked that a few writers (as, e.g., Knapp, *Ch. Theol.*, p. 36) say that the Scriptures, although containing mysteries, must not "necessarily contain" them, and that their existence is "a question of fact." But this is taking a low

estimate of the subjects which a Revelation—to be adequate—must contain (pertaining to the Infinite), and it also ignores that their very existence in the Word indicates that in God's wisdom they were requisite for His purposes. Comp. Rogers' *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, p. 403, commencing: "A Revelation without mystery is not even conceivable. A revelation, if it deserves the name, must make known some new truths," etc.

Obs. 4. The doctrine of the Kingdom thus containing mysteries, confirms the position taken, that to its proper understanding, we must apply to the Scriptures, and seek within its limits for the things appertaining to it, Props. 9, and 10.

Obs. 5. It is difficult to satisfy the cavils of unbelief on this point, seeing that the most opposite objections are urged against mysteries. The manner in which they are presented, indicate that they come more from the heart (i.e. are desired) than from the head (i.e. intelligently based).

Some object to the Scriptures because they contain mysteries. This has been shown (as, e.g., Vinet, *Miscel. Art.*, "The Mysteries of Christianity," and many others) to be both unjust and unreasonable; and it has been conclusively proven (Eaton, *Perm. of Chris.*, Horne's *Introd.*, etc.) that "mysteries are not contradictions to reason or to fact." Those who discard them take the same ground occupied by Toland, the English Deist, who in his work "*Christianity not Mysterious*," charges the mysteries to the craft and ambition of priests and philosophers. So also Annet, in *Judging for Ourselves*, pronounces "mysteries a fraud." This is a one-sided statement, violating all analogy and the reasoning and facts of common life. It is scarcely worthy of the attention that it has received. Toland, Annet, and others like them, if mysteries were lacking, would quickly and eagerly have built a really forcible argument upon such an absence, by pressing into their service the abundant analogies found in nature. But then we have the objection in another form, brought from the opposite extreme, viz.: that there is no mystery in the Bible, and consequently it cannot be accepted. After admitting that there is mystery, and hence the Scriptures cannot be received, because it is unreasonable, the work of men, etc., the information is gravely imparted, that there is none, and that, in consequence, the Word is unreliable. This feature is mainly based on the idea that we cannot believe in a mystery, and is founded thus: "A proposition to be believed, must be expressed in intelligible terms, and that if the terms are intelligible, the thing signified cannot be mysterious." This is a Thesis that very well answers their purpose to apply to Holy Writ, but which they *do not* refer to nature, to themselves, or to a Supreme Cause. It is palpably absurd. The key-note of a prevailing opinion, that all things relating to Christianity are so readily understood that a child can comprehend them, is found in this direction. This unscriptural view first originated in unbelief, was seized by philosophy (see Locke, Mansel on *Free Thinking*), and urged as an objection to Christianity, without distinguishing between essentials to Salvation and Knowledge in general. Hence two objections are to be met: (1) That there is mystery; (2) that there is none. Extremes are to be avoided; thus, e.g., the adage used by some, "that that only is truth which we can fully understand" (for this limits our knowledge), and the other "omnia exeunt in mysterium" (which would make all knowledge end in mystery).

Obs. 6. It is a strange fact, that unbelievers of the past and present, who reject the mysteries of the Bible, call upon us to accept of the incomprehensible, the mysterious, the hypothetical in their several theories. Thus e.g. their readers are invited to believe in some unexplained "living principle," or "substance," or "forces," or "chance," or "laws;" they are urged to receive as the highest wisdom a mysterious "self-creative world matter," "origin of things by self-development," "self-developing man," "hypotheses of science," etc. Mystery, the inexplicable, the unexplained, the impenetrable, gives them no trouble, and is not opposed to reason or facts, but when found in the Bible, is to be rejected as incompatible with reason and fact.

It is to be remarked, that such men as Spencer, Tyndall, etc., recognize an "insoluble mystery," "the Unknowable," "the inscrutable," something beyond the power of man fully to grasp—something which is, "in all probability," the Great Cause of all the manifestations seen and experienced. This acknowledgment even of "a mystery" by such talented men, does not suit a wing of the Rationalistic Progress party. The latter party takes the former to task (as, e.g., in Abbott's *Index*) for thus erecting "a quasi-God," a something that must be received "on faith," alleging that Science virtually "cuts her own throat" by the confession or concession that "the manifestation of anything under heaven is 'inscrutable' to her." They contend, over against Tyndall, etc., that "mystery" is to be abolished, that "the knowable" is to be the grand solvent of progress, and that such concessions, pronounced to be "empty gibberish" and "meaningless jargon," are to be utterly discarded. Surely the wise man, in such an exposition of arrogance, has food for reflection over the vanity and pride of the creature.

As an example how men will flatly contradict themselves on this point, when not directly arguing against the Bible or Christianity, the reader is referred to Strauss (*The Old Faith and the New*, p. 306), who, when speaking of the forms of government, advocating adhesion to the monarchy, remarks: "There is something enigmatic—nay, seemingly absurd—in a monarchy. But just in this consists the mystery of its superiority. Every mystery appears absurd; and yet nothing profound, either in life, in the arts, or in the State, *is devoid of mystery*." A Reviewer, in the *Edinburgh Review*, justly says, that Strauss never thought of this in his *Life of Jesus*—for then, it seems, the reverse of this was truth with him. Figuier, in his *World before the Deluge*, is not opposed to "mystery," for he closes the same by "suggesting, without hoping to solve, this formidable problem," viz.: whether after the four preceding Kingdoms (as in the Primary epoch the vegetable, in the Secondary and Tertiary epochs the vegetable and animal, and in the Quaternary epoch the human kingdom) another and "new kingdom" is to appear. He pronounces this "an impenetrable mystery," and adds: "It is a great mystery, which, according to the fine expression of Pliny, 'lies hid in the majesty of nature'; or, to speak more in the spirit of Christian Philosophy, it is known only to the Almighty Creator of the Universe." Alas! that men are unwilling to receive "the mystery" as revealed by this Creator.

Obs. 7. Some writers (as e.g. Reuss, *His. Ch. Theol. of Apos. Age*, p. 149) connect the mystery with a change of the nature of the Kingdom, so that a new meaning is to be attached to it; it includes, at least, such new characteristics added, such modifications or alterations, that it is completely transformed. Admitting additions and changes to it as predicted, yet it remains *unproven* that there is a change in its nature or meaning. This already appears, but will be more conclusively shown by the preaching of Jesus and His disciples, etc. The Church-Kingdom theory suggested such an opinion *by way of apology* for its lacking the characteristics of the Kingdom as given in the grammatical sense of the prophets. The mysteries, however, were those respecting the gathering out of the elect who should inherit the Kingdom, the death of the King, the postponement of the Kingdom, the continued desolation of the Davidic house until the Times of the Gentiles were fulfilled, the ultimate re-establishment of the Kingdom after the rise, progress, and conflict with the Antichrist, etc., and they do not refer to a change of the nature of the Kingdom. It is, and ever remains *the unchangeable Theocratic Kingdom*, manifested in a covenanted line and through a covenanted nation. If such a change was intended or made in the most important of matters, there certainly would be something *direct* on the subject, and it would not be left *to mere inference* to deduce it.

PROPOSITION 13. *Some things pertaining to the kingdom, intentionally revealed somewhat obscurely.*

Admitting the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and that, as many writers have noticed, some indistinctness, a degree of obscurity, relating to time, explanations, etc., is manifested in the things of the kingdom, these facts are indicative of design in the same.

Obs. 1. In answer to the question, frequently asked, why the revelations respecting the Messiah's Kingdom were at first so obscure, were so gradually unfolded, and that some things, to be fully understood, require additional light, it has been said, that God makes long and secret preparations for important events; that He adapts His revelations to the necessities and circumstances of particular times, etc. Reflection will teach us an additional reason, viz.: that the depravity of man, exhibited in the pursuit of selfishness, would, hitherto, have rejected a plainer revelation, or else would have made it the basis of a continuous cruel persecution. If everything relating to the Kingdom would have been clearly revealed, in a systematic order, we are confident that such would have been *the hatred of earthly kingdoms* toward it, that no believer in it would have been safe, and, in consequence, the work of gathering out the elect would have been seriously impeded. The existence of Gentile domination, especially the hostile and jealous Roman power, prevented (as we shall show in the proper place) a plainer statement of various particulars, lest it should *unnecessarily* excite unremitting persecution. This Kingdom will be better understood as the Primitive view is revived; its nature and the things pertaining to it will be better comprehended as the Scriptures are compared; and *the result* will be, as prophecy teaches us (e.g. Rev. 19, etc.), that *the kings and mighty of the earth* will be arrayed against its re-establishment. God, foreseeing this antagonism as directed by "the god of this world," does not unnecessarily excite it by *a premature* disclosure of all things, but gives us the truth in detached portions, some of it veiled under prophecy, others under symbolical language, etc., so that His preparations, patiently conducted, may go on to a successful completion, and the Kingdom be suddenly—unexpectedly to many—manifested. The history of the world in its rejection of the truth, is evidence to justify such a conclusion.

Obs. 2. Again, another reason for the same may be found in human freedom. Omnipotence inspired by mercy has given continued moral freedom, and it will do nothing, even by way of revelation, to exert an undue force upon the will. Preiswerk (quoted by Auberlen *Danl. and Rev.*, p. 84) says: "The Lord has always represented the events He announced by the prophets in such a manner, that they were *sufficiently clear* for him who approached with reverence and careful thought, and yet *sufficiently*

dark and veiled not to limit the freedom of human action. For if the unchangeable decrees of the Eternal were presented to our eyes in unveiled features, *what* would become of the responsibility of man, of the free movements of human life, *what* of courage, and hope, and joy?" Hence it is, e.g. that prophecies which particularly describe the time of the re-establishment of the Kingdom are given somewhat obscurely, as in Daniel and the Apocalypse. This, and other reasons, will become more apparent, when considering certain things pertaining to the Kingdom, especially the postponement, the ordering of the future Kingdom, the restoration of the Jews, the Antichrist, etc.

Obs. 3. The blending of the two Advents, the rejection of Jesus by the Jews, the call of the Gentiles, etc., these indicate the feature alluded to so far as the past is concerned. As to the future, among a variety, time may be selected, the time of the Kingdom's manifestation, as an illustration. The *exact* period when it will be set up, is not known to us, although approximately revealed. It is only fully known to God, and *an indefiniteness* is purposely thrown around it to keep us in the posture of constant expectation and watching. Chronology has purposely its chasms, the general signs of the Advent of the King are those nearly always prevalent, although at the time of fulfilment more intensive, and prophecy, in its guarded language and in its accomplishment, is so conducted that almost at any time may be witnessed the ushering in of the glorious Kingdom.

Obs. 4. The restoration of the Jews being intimately connected with the Kingdom, an essential accessory to its re-establishment, a degree of obscurity is thrown around the subject (as e.g. to the exact manner of occurrence, the time, etc.), in order that it may prove "*a snare*" and "*a net*" for the nations, who, at the consummation, shall be arrayed against it and the saints and God, saying, "*Come and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance*" (Ps. 83 : 4).

Obs. 5. Care, however, must be taken to avoid the extreme of concluding some things to be obscure which the Spirit intended to be plainly understood. This is illustrated by the predictions referring to the humiliation, sufferings, and death of Jesus, which, although *plainly* given, were not comprehended by even the disciples until fulfilled. When the grammatical sense is observed to teach a thing clearly and unequivocally, that meaning *must be retained*, as the history of the past proclaims. Brookes (*El. of Proph. Inter.*, p. 113) presents some admirable cautions on this point, which are the more needed, since multitudes make that obscure, mystical, or spiritual, that is to be comprehended in its literal import, as the analogy of Scripture and Faith proves.

The student will add the reason assigned under the previous Proposition, viz.: that a revelation, as a matter of self-confirmation, must contain some mystery. We must quote the admirable language of Row (*Bampton Lectures*, 1877, "Christian Evidences," Lec. 1, p. 5): "Can we wonder that the Christian revelation should contain truths, of which the fulness, like the great works of creation and providence, can only be fully recognized after the lapse of time, and as the result of careful investigation? That great reasoner, Bh. Butler, clearly perceived that it is only in conformity with the analogy of

nature, that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind as the Bible, if it contains a Revelation from God, should contain truths as yet undiscovered ; and that events, as they come to pass, should open and ascertain the meaning of Scripture ; and that such discoveries should be made ' in the same way as all other knowledge is ascertained, by particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations, scattered up and down in it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world.' "

PROPOSITION 14. *Some things pertaining to the kingdom not so easily comprehended as many suppose.*

This is already seen by the greatness of the subject (Props. 1 and 2), by the differences of opinion (Prop. 3) entertained, the connection it sustains to the supernatural (Props. 6 and 7) and to mysteries (Props. 11, 12, and 13).

Obs. 1. Taking the word "mystery" to denote, as theologians state, something revealed that was before unknown, Revelation itself must be carefully scanned and compared to appreciate these. At the same time, whilst a fact is disclosed, or an ordering is divulged, yet the reason *why* it will, or *the manner* in which it may, be accomplished is either not explained or merely hinted at, thus leaving large room for attentive study and reflection. Besides this, many things—the great burden—relating to the Kingdom are still in the shape of unfulfilled prophecy and promise, requiring *discrimination* to distinguish what belongs to different dispensations, to the two Advents, to the past, present, and future, so that we may form a correct estimate of the preparatory stages and of the Kingdom itself. The Apocalypse, with its varied and discordant interpretations, alone proves our proposition.

Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 105) correctly observes: "Now, indeed, we see from the nature of the case, that even a revealed mystery may have its dark sides; the sun come forth from behind the clouds nevertheless still dazzles our eyes. But Holy Scripture nowhere teaches that mystery as such lies, and must necessarily lie, entirely beyond the reach of all human ken; the contrary is evident from 1 Cor. 13 : 2; Eph. 3 : 4. Mystery, too, though never wholly penetrated, may still be known, but only by means of Revelation." This corroborates our position, viz.: that the things of the Kingdom can only be found within the limits of Scripture, and can only be understood to the extent that God has been pleased to reveal and explain them.

Obs. 2. Some persons confidently tell us that "*the Gospel of the Kingdom*" is readily understood by all men, forgetting how *variously* it is interpreted and preached. This assertion is contradicted by the remark of Jesus, that the revelations concerning the Kingdom were *only given* to believers and not to those without (Mark 4 : 11, etc.), and by the declaration (John 3 : 13), that the things relating to it must be received exclusively on the testimony of Him who declared them. All men are not believers, and even multitudes, who profess to believe, do not receive this testimony, (as e.g. witness the rejection of much of His Word, and of His last revelation as given in the Apocalypse). Even among believers, the apostle distinguishes between the weak and the strong (Heb. 5 : 12), between the unlearned and the understanding (2 Pet. 3 : 16), and many exhortations are based on a growth of knowledge and the avoidance of ignorance. We are exhorted that there "are some things hard to be understood" (2 Pet. 3 : 16), some things exceeding the measure of the wisest, some things be-

yond our experience, some things so grand in conception and associated with the Infinite, that they can only be apprehended by faith. No one, therefore, excepting a believer, who receives the word *as spoken*, the testimony *as delivered*, can duly appreciate the whole Gospel—good news—pertaining to it. Those who make the above assertion, are led to it by mistaking repentance, faith, obedience, etc., the adjuncts or preparatives *of* the Kingdom, *for* the Kingdom itself. We must discriminate *between the means* employed by which the Kingdom can be obtained—which is also Gospel or glad tidings—and *the Kingdom itself*—which proclaimed is the Gospel in its fullest sense.

Obs. 3. There is no systematic statement of the doctrine of the Kingdom in the Bible. It is given in brief covenants, in separate prophecies, in detached portions, in fragments, in hints, in promises, in concise outlines, and to bring all these together in their regular order much labor is requisite. Without *diligent comparison*, no progress can be made. A devout recognition of much that is now regarded trivial, or of little practical value, is demanded. Unless there is a deep conviction that the Bible is a Divine Record, and that, in consequence, everything that it contains should be duly weighed and placed in its connection with the Divine Purpose, it is impossible to harmonize the Word: some discordant elements will inevitably appear to prevent unity.

This is illustrated by supposing that we had lived just previous to, and during, the First Advent. Had we then taken up the Old Test. to search after the Messiah, and passed by the lesser, even minute, particulars, and the detached, isolated hints, referring to the birth, life, betrayal, scourging, crucifixion, etc., and confined ourselves to the moral enlarged Messianic descrpitions (as, e.g., those representing His glory), we, too, like the Jews, would have failed to comprehend the matter as it was to be realized. So now, unless there is *a careful collation* of all passages that legitimately refer to the Kingdom, error may, more or less, be advanced. If, as claimed, the Scriptures are the Word of God, then every word—conceding that the truth is given through the language and style most familiar to the writer—is of importance. Being engaged in examining witnesses for the truth, in weighing testimony, *to do justice* both to the writers and ourselves—yea, to God Himself—this cannot be omitted with safety. This caution becomes the more imperative, since it is pointedly predicted, that many shall, by a neglect of the truth, reject the things pertaining to the Kingdom, and have no faith even in the coming of the King.

Obs. 4. Avoiding, on the one hand, the opinion of the Romish Church that the Scriptures are so unintelligible, so obscure that they need the interpretation of the Church, of Councils, of the Fathers, or of the Pope; and, on the other hand, the view of some Protestant divines, and others, that all things are clear and intelligible to him who is in the Spirit—it is best to preserve the due medium, that whilst many things are plainly stated, yet others, for the reasons given, can only be ascertained by laborious research, or, as some old writers have quaintly observed, by "digging for hid treasures." The Kingdom, forming the subject-matter of a large portion of the Bible, cannot be correctly apprehended in its totality without the student passing over all that the different sacred writers have to say concerning it.

Obs. 5. "The Gospel *of the Kingdom*," as intimated, includes "the mystery of God," i.e. the final, closing act as presented Rev. 10 : 7, embracing the ultimate realization of the previously ordained provisionary in-

stitutions. This is seen in the language employed, for the word in our version "declared" is used to denote the declaration of good tidings, glad news, so that some (as e.g. Editor of *Proph. Times*, vol. 10, p. 190) render the phrase: "The mystery of God is (to be) fulfilled, even as he preached glad tidings to his servants the prophets." However translated, the Gospel undoubtedly comprehends the grand consummation, the perfected Redemption realized only in the Kingdom.

PROPOSITION 15. *The doctrine of the kingdom can become better understood and appreciated.*

This follows from the previous Propositions. For, while it is a doctrine exclusively found in Scripture, and which cannot be modified or changed to suit the theories of men without doing violence to the Word, yet, as has been shown, it is not so clearly apprehended in all its details, in all its depth and vastness, but that additional light may be thrown upon it—a light, too, borrowed from the same Word.

Obs. 1. Some think that religious truth is stationary, and this is a favorite charge of the enemies of Christianity, upon which is founded the expressions "antiquated," "stale," "worn out," etc. Admitting that any doctrinal matter contained in Holy Writ is final in authority, and that the things of the Spirit are only to be found in their purity in the Revelation given by that Spirit, yet these same truths may become more and more clear and distinctive by careful study, comparison, analogy, induction, deduction, by considering their relationship to history, the constant development of God's purposes, the continued fulfilment of prophecy, the experience of mankind, and the gathering of the elect. It is the universal testimony of believers that a searching of the Scriptures has always *added* to our religious knowledge, and every Christian student must gratefully acknowledge his indebtedness to this feature. The Bible is *a wonderful book* in this respect.

The most reliable writers on the side of Religion declare (e.g., Bh. Butler, *Analogy*, 2, c. 3) that "truths yet undiscerned" are contained in the Scriptures; that (Rogers' *Essays*, vol. 2, p. 335) "fragments of new truth, or more exact adjustments of old truths may be perpetually expected;" that (Eaton, *Perm. of Ch.*, p. 219) "the scheme of Revelation admits of endless advance and indefinite augmentation." Comp. Dorner's *His. Prot. Theol.*, vol. 2, p. 4, Bh. Law's *Theory of Relig.*, p. 145, Dean Stanley's *Sermons on the Bible*, p. 112, Dunn's *Study of the Bible*, and the writings of Birks, Bickersteth, Bh. Newton, Schaff, etc. Works specially designed for the Christian ministry, such as Bridge's *On the Ch. Ministry*, Herbert's *Parson*, Mather's *Student and Parson*, etc., and the Memoirs and Lives of eminent Christians unmistakably indicate how advance in knowledge is increased by renewed and unremitting study of God's Word; which many truthfully compare to a precious mine revealing its treasures by "digging" for them, or to a constant flowing stream whose placid depths and extent can only be appreciated by passing over its course and sounding its clear waters.

Obs. 2. If it is true, in the general, that knowledge can be increased, it certainly must apply to the doctrine of the Kingdom, so largely the subject of prediction and promise; so extensive in its aims, preparations, and end; so complicated in its numerous details, hints, and obscure allusions; so described under literal, figurative, and symbolical language; and so varied in its relationship to God and man, to the Divine Will and human

imperfection. A doctrine which embraces the King, the inheritors, and the subjects, the provisionary dispensations and the final consummation, the loftiest topics and the most precious promises that can enter the mind or encourage the hope of man, is, *in the nature of the case*, susceptible of being better apprehended in proportion as attention and meditation is given to it. Here, if anywhere, there is plenty of room for the deepest study, the most guarded discrimination, the keenest perception, the most patient comparison, and the most childlike faith. Then an increase of knowledge—as the rich experience of many testifies—will also come.

It is a matter of regret, that good men, who insist in their writings upon our deriving doctrine from the study of the Bible, who lament that others give a greater prominency to man's writings and systems than to the Word, while theoretically right, in practice largely ignore this very feature. A doctrine that does not suit the religious system already adopted, no matter how strongly presented, is at once ignored or rejected. This, too, is evidence of human infirmity—a weakness predicted in God's Word.

Obs. 3. Divine Truth, surely, cannot be circumscribed, when even, as Chalmers (*Bridg. Treatise*, p. 1) has said in relation to natural science: "Each science, though definite in its commencement, has its outgoings in the Infinite and the Eternal." We will allow, although subject to perversion, the claims of scientists in reference to the extension of truth in all departments of science, but they must also grant to us that theological truth, having a higher, nobler origin and design, is not to be restrained in its advancement. Nature, and not mere speculation or fancy, is the abundant source from whence true and increased knowledge is drawn for the natural sciences, so also the Bible forms "the inexhaustible storehouse" from whence biblical theology derives its solid foundation and growing superstructure—the latter strengthened by the results manifested in historical connection, etc.

Obs. 4. In the Proposition it is purposely said, "can become better understood," for several reasons: (1) There is no subject like this so covered with human additions, speculations, and prejudice. Hence it is so difficult to approach, divested of all bias and preconceived opinions. The greatest care is necessary, owing to the extent and influence of prevailing views, and no step should be taken without substantial scriptural proof to sustain it. (2) Conclusions respecting the Kingdom should only be drawn after having traced the subject from the earliest point of its introduction down, through the prophets, to the final testimony of Jesus given by John the Revelator. Multitudes, including most eminent men (as will be shown hereafter), take an isolated passage and, without caring for its connection, build an exclusive theory upon it. (3) Covenants, in view of their special importance and fundamental bearing, should have the preference in determining the nature of the Kingdom. This, however, is too much overlooked. (4) Some things are underrated, owing to their simplicity (i.e. "too Jewish"): others are rejected because utterly opposed to human expectations (i.e. "How can these things be?"); and others again are declined as utterly unreasonable, not realizing that faith should apprehend them simply because they are recorded in the truthful Word of God (i.e. with all the laudation of faith, there is very little Abrahamic faith in the world). (5) The difficulties already enumerated in previous Propositions are not sufficiently considered; difficulties, not relating to the na-

ture of the Kingdom, but to the provisions made for it, the time of its manifestation, the events connected with its exhibition, the symbolical portraiture of its realization, the manner of its divine administration (the divine and human being united), and the remarkable and astounding interpositions of the Supernatural introducing and carrying it forward into the eternal ages—all of which ought to be duly considered in order that increased light may be thrown upon the subject. With such a spirit, and such a posture of recognition and appreciation of the matter before us, there is a prospect before the student of a better understanding of the doctrine.

PROPOSITION 16. *This kingdom cannot be properly comprehended without acknowledging an intimate and internal connection existing between the Old and New Testaments.*

The doctrine of the kingdom is first taught by covenant, theocratic ordering, and prophecy in the Old Testament, and it is *taken for granted* in the New Testament as a subject derived from the Old Testament and *well understood;* for the kingdom is preached without any appended explanation.

Obs. 1. This Proposition is the more needed, since some recent works (as e.g. Fairbairn *On Proph.*, p. 164, etc.) have made efforts to depreciate the value of the Old Test. as an instructor, telling us that it is *far inferior* to the New Test., that its light is dim and its utterances indistinct in comparison with the New, etc. This, in view of our so largely relying upon the Old Test., is done with such evident satisfaction that a canon of interpretation is adopted which reads: "Everything which affects the constitution and destiny of the New Test. Church has its clearest determination in the New Test. Scriptures." While we cheerfully admit that on many points (as e.g. the birth, life, sufferings, death, etc., of Jesus, the present ordering during the Times of the Gentiles, etc.) the New Test. gives additional and clearer light, yet such a canon is exceedingly *unjust* to the Old Test., which so largely deals, e.g. in *the consummation* of the Church's glory.

It is gratifying to find that in many recent works, especially in the department of Bib. Theology, the Old Test. is restored to its proper position, thus corroborating the declarations found in various Commentaries, Introductions to the Bible, etc., respecting *the fundamental* station of the Old Test. in Scripture. Such writers as Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Tholuck, Auberlen, Hofmann, Kurtz, Delitzsch, Stanley, Bonar, Baumgarten, etc., have done much in this direction, and even Fairbairn, in other places, enforces this relationship. The old Marcionitic notion (comp. Lardner's *Works*, vol. 9, p. 256–288, giving also the alterations of the New Test. by Marcion) of separating the Old Test. from the New, while not carried to the absurd extent (as, under the plea that the God of the Old Test. was different from that of the New) of ancient times, yet is still felt and expressed in modern times in various ways, especially in a species of exalting the New to a wrongful disparagement of the Old. Thus the Spiritualists, Free Religionists, etc., boldly proclaim (as, e.g., Oliver Porter, in *Religio-Philosoph. Journal* for 1874) that the Old and New Tests. should be separated, and not even bound together in the same book, because of their being hostile, antagonistic to each other; adding, that to join them "is like putting new cloth into old garments, to be rent asunder. A divorce, doubtless, will some time be made." A writer in the *Edinb. Review*, Oct., 1873, reviewing Strauss' work, recommends that "Gentile Christianity" should not make itself responsible for the Old Test., saying: "We are not Jews," etc., and that "the Jewish Scriptures do not belong to us, and that we are in no way responsible for them." Comp. Prof. Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. 2, p. 402, Carpenter *On Mind and Will in Nature*, Contemp. Review, 1872. It is not difficult to see that all such fail to view the Redemptive Purpose as a grand whole, the portrayal of which alike demands the Old and New Tests.

Obs. 2. Our entire argument, as we proceed, is a refutation of this lowering of the Old Test. A few reasons now stated, will indicate the one-sidedness of those who resist the claims of the Old Test. to the same rank and dignity of the New. (1) The Old foretells the New, and the New confirms the Old—both are indispensably necessary. (2) The Covenants out of which, and in which, the New stands, are only contained in the Old. (3) The prophecies and promises descriptive of the New, are found in the Old. (4) Both are the Word of God, and should, therefore, be received on equal footing, and possess equal value. (5) The New, taking a familiar acquaintance of the Old for granted, and proceeding on this supposition, does not supersede the Old. (6) The continued quotation from the Old in the New, the constant references to the covenanted promises of the Old, the general appeal to the predictions of the Old, the example of Jesus and of the apostles in estimating the value of the Old—all this proves its vital importance. (7) The express injunction to search and study the Old Test. Scriptures. (8) The declaration of Jesus that He came to fulfil and not to destroy it, and that every jot and tittle of it was precious. (9) A large portion of the Old, embracing entire chapters and continuous prophecies, has not yet been fulfilled, owing to the postponement of the Kingdom and the designs of mercy, and hence—as will be shown hereafter—the period of the Christian Church is an intercalary one, extending through the Times of the Gentiles, and if we desire to know its destiny, its ultimate condition in the consummation, the Old must be compared with the New. (10) Many things contained in the Old yet to be fulfilled, are only slightly hinted at or taken for granted in the New; others of magnitude and vast importance, are not even mentioned, it being supposed that every believer, *as enjoined*, would find them in the Old and incorporate them. (11) The New only professes to be a continuation of the Divine Plan of Salvation; it is a necessary supplement to the Old, but not a superseding of the Old, excepting only in the ordaining of certain provisionary and typical measures. (12) The destiny of all the elect, both under the Old and New, is the same, showing that the same truth leading to the same end, is virtually contained in both Tests., however one may add to the other. (13) The unity of Divine Purpose can only be ascertained by their combination; without the Old many of the allusions in the New could not be understood, and without the New much that is in the Old could not be properly appreciated. (14) The New, as evidenced by our remarks, is built on the Old as on a foundation, and if separated from the latter, its strength and stability is diminished, if not destroyed. By this removal, as seen in too many works, its light is dimmed and its testimony to the truth is fearfully weakened. Hence no rule or interpretation should be endured which arbitrarily distinguishes between, virtually severs, *the same Word of God*, but we must regard the Scriptures *as one whole, all significant, important, and weighty*, giving only when in combination, in firm union, the steady, brilliant light that we need.

Comp. Dorner's *His. Prot. Theol.*, vol. 2, p. 435, etc., and Oosterzee's, Schmid's, and Reuss' *Bib. Theols. of the New Test.* Dorner has also remarked (p. 404, vol. 2), that a Bib. Theol. of the Old Test. is still lacking, and until this want is skilfully supplied, many will fail to see the vast stores of treasures contained within it, essential to a correct apprehension of many doctrinal points and of the Plan of Salvation. In this respect a lesson can be learned from the early church (Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 87): "They frequently appeal to the connection existing between the Old and New Tests. (e.g., Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, 4, 9, etc.), consequently implying that the two parts of Scripture

belong together." They do more than this, they so employ the Old Test. as to indicate in its covenants and prophecies that it contains stronger proof and clearer light in reference to some things that are yet to be fulfilled than the New Test. While this is so, the extreme (Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, sec. 292, note) must be avoided of preferring the Old to the New as illustrated, so stated by Hagenbach, in the writings of Herder, De Wette, and Umbreit. The truth is, that each gives a strong light that must be combined; that the one illustrates, enforces, and confirms the other.

Obs. 3. The criticism, then, of Ernesti and others, that the Old Test. might indeed have been of some use to the Jews, but certainly was not intended for all mankind, is *sadly defective and demoralizing*, seeing that on the fulfilment of the Old Test. promises depends our completed Salvation, our hope of perfected Redemption, the expectation of the final restitution of all things. The Old Test. is full of anticipated, covenanted, prophesied Salvation; the New is full of the inestimable provision made for the same; *both unite* in showing how and when it will be fully accomplished.

The writer has been pained to find excellent writers express themselves incautiously, when, e.g., referring to the Old Test. as preparative to the New (which is also true), they inform (as Pressense, *The Redeemer*, p. 38) us "that the Old Test. speaks to us of the preparation for Salvation, whilst the New Test. speaks of its realization." This is only a half truth; in point of fact both speak *the same language*; and the Old Test., as comparison abundantly shows, has *more to say* of the final realization than the New. Row (*Bampton Lectures*, 1877, p. 22) presents an injurious limitation, as follows: "So likewise I accept Paley's general positions, that the Christian advocate is only concerned with the Old Test. so far as portions of it have received the direct sanction of our Lord." The other portions he thinks important only in the "elaboration of a true Christian theology." But this is too restrictive, and at once trammels the study of the Christ, the Kingdom, etc. Some recent writers might learn a lesson from even De Wette (quoted by Bähr and requoted by Fairbairn *Typology*, p. 34), who, with all his liberalism, could say: "Christianity sprang out of Judaism. Long before Christ appeared, the world was prepared for His appearance; the entire Old Test. is a great prophecy, a great type of Him who was to come and has come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Test. saw in spirit the Advent of Christ long before He came, and, in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, descried the new doctrine? The typological comparison, also, of the Old Test. with the New, was by no means a mere play of fancy, nor can it be regarded as altogether the result of accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important particulars, runs parallel with the Mosaic. Christianity lay in Judaism as leaves and fruits do in the seed, though certainly it needed the divine sun to bring them forth."

Obs. 4. Unbelievers, wise in perceiving the intimate and abiding connection existing between the Old and New Tests., attack the Old with the correct opinion, that just in proportion as they can show that the Old is "antiquated, unreliable, uncertain" in its utterances, etc., to the same extent will they lessen the authority and force of the New. Knowing full well, as the majority of writers on Inspiration hold, that both are equally inspired and of equal authority, and that both are to be interpreted as *the continuous* Word of God, they believe that if one falls the other must also suffer. This teaches us, therefore, how guarded we should be in lowering the standard of the Old, lest by so doing, in so far the efforts of destructive tendencies are countenanced.

Here, as our argument will develop more fully hereafter, is the fatal defect in the system of the Socinians (Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, sec. 242), who receive only the New Test. as canonical; the Old Test. having only a historical value, useful but not necessary to be read, etc. Its importance and exceeding value as a doctrinal basis, is by them, and others, too much ignored; and the inevitable result is, the utter impossibility of recognizing the Theocratic Personage in Jesus as covenanted. It is well to notice,

that at the very time God is raising up eminent men to defend the necessary intimate relationship of the Old and New Tests., and that both must be conjoined to give us a true conception of the Divine Purpose in Redemption—both being indispensable—prominent persons also arise (even in the pale of, and enjoying the emoluments of the church), who persistently attack the authenticity, credibility, and inspiration of the Old Test., especially of the Pentateuch. The recent efforts of Colenso in this direction are fresh in the reader's mind. The attack, if successful, would invalidate the truth of Christianity itself; for such is the connection existing between Moses and Christ that both stand or fall together. An eminent Jewish Rabbi in the *Jewish Chronicle*, quoted in *The Israelite Indeed* for Oct., 1863, argues, justly, that if the Pentateuch is not in the main the product of Moses, or at least worthy of reception as divine, then it must be an "impudent forgery," and the prophets, Jesus, and the Evangelists, who all received it "in its present shape" as genuine, etc., are all equally guilty of gross deception. The Rabbi presses this, quoting Luke 16 : 31, etc., and shows the inconsistency of Colenso's position (still retaining the New Test. as inspired) by stating that if Jesus was not inspired when He assumed the truth of the Pentateuch and applied it in teaching, "neither can He be regarded as infallible with respect to His application of passages from the prophets of Judah and the Psalms." There is no logical escape from this dilemma; any lowering of the Old Test. inevitably recoils upon the New. Conway, in correspondence with *Cin. Com.*, May 31, 1879, says: "The learned Prof. Sepp, of Munich University, is writing a remarkable series of articles in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in which he advocates the discarding of the Old Test. altogether as the basis of Christianity." "Dr. David Asher, a learned Jew, answers: 'If he (Sepp) should carry his point, he would, indeed, widen the breach between Judaism and Christianity. But the question is, Who would be the greater loser by the process?'" Draper (*His. Conflict*, p. 225) very coolly advises the Christian Church not to burden itself with the Pentateuch, but to relegate it back to the Jews; and if this gratuitous counsel (so sagely proffered) were adopted, he would be the first to show how destructive, in its logical sequence, it would be to Christianity. Others, observing the disintegrating efforts of professed believers which destroy the unity, sarcastically (as Mill) refer to those who believe the Bible to be *one book;* some sneeringly assert that the only union to be found existing is that in the line of "Jewish ideas and prejudices." Rogers (*Superh. Orig. of the Bible*, Ap. p. 441) refers to Alexander's *Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Tests.*, Lord Hatherley's *Continuity of the Bible*, and to a work entitled *Divine Footprints in the Bible*, as enforcing this intimate connection, and then adds: "Many in our day, as well as some in former times, would endeavor to extricate Christianity from certain difficulties by cutting the ligaments between it and Judaism. They would displace it from what they regard its precarious foundations in the Old Test. I am profoundly convinced that this cannot be done without leaving both in ruins." He then quotes Herder (Pref. to *Spirit of Heb. Poetry*), who, notwithstanding his free spirit of criticism, writes: "Der Grund der Theologie ist die Bibel, und der Grund des N. T. ist das alte. Unmöglich verstehen wir jenes recht, wenn wir dieses nicht verstehen; denn Christenthum ist aus dem Judenthum hervorgegangen, der Genius der Sprache ist in beiderlei Büchern derselbe," etc.

Obs. 5. Martensen, a most estimable writer, gives the keynote to a prevailing treatment of the Old Test. He, whilst recognizing the importance and value of the Old, makes it too subsidiary to the New, opening a wide gap for varied interpretation, in declaring, that "the contents (of the Old) cannot be received by the Christian mind as present truths without being *regenerated* by the new Spirit of Christianity, and in various respects *reconstructed.*" Alas! to *this specious* "regeneration" and to *this subtle* "spirit of reconstruction," which is only another mode of expressing a spiritualizing and accommodating interpretation, we are indebted for an ignoring of the plain oath-bound covenants of God the covenanted and predicted Messianic Kingdom.

This position, *so unjust* to the Old Test., is based on the idea that the Old Test. is superseded by the New, and that the interpretation of the Old, as once held by the Jews, is antagonistic to the New, and that, consequently, the literal, grammatical sense must give place to another, additional one grafted upon the Old. This whole theory is *a violation* of the laws of language, of the Revelation of God's Purposes as given to ancient

believers and trusted in by them, and it places the Israelites, before the Advent, in the posture of an ignorant, self-deceived people who trusted in a grammatical sense which is a lie—in plainly expressed covenants and promises which, as understood by them, they never comprehended. In brief, it makes God teaching what they *could not* understand, prophesying what they *could not* apprehend, and developing a faith and hope that *can never* be realized. Besides this, the reader will observe that Martensen's notion takes it for granted that the New Test. is well understood. This idea forms one of the rules that Waldegrave presents in his *Lectures on New Test. Millenarianism;* but unfortunately for its successful application, those who employ it—owing to the various engrafted senses—are not agreed among themselves respecting large portions of the New Test., because of their adopted system of interpretation. Briefly, no student can afford to occupy such an exclusive position; the true scholarly method, commended by common sense and due respect for God's whole Word, is to interpret both by *the same laws of language*, and to observe, on any given subject, which part, the Old or the New, advances the most revelation or information, receiving the same as of *equal* authority.

Obs. 6. The Kingdom being a leading subject of many portions of the Old Test., a subject specially mentioned in covenant and prophecy, it is utterly impossible to understand it properly without passing over the same. This is realized the more, if it is considered that the doctrine *originates* in the Old Test.; that the New Test. in its opening takes a knowledge of the Old *for granted;* that in view of such a previous obtained information important details given in the Old are either slightly presented or omitted in the New; and that, aside from the Apocalypse, the most glowing and extended descriptions pertaining to the Kingdom, as God's predictions relating to it receive an ample verification, are still found in the Old. It is not uncharitable to suspect, that one reason why so many meanings and contradictory definitions are given to the Kingdom, arises from the neglect—conscious or unconscious, designed or undesigned—of the Old Test. Scriptures, or, from an artful, misleading, but well-intended exaltation of the New over the Old, as if some great and vital difference existed between them instead of their being *inseparably one.*

Many have the mistaken notion that the instruction of the Old Test. is *solely* elementary, being supplemented by that of the New Test. This is taught in many of our Systematic Theologies (e.g., Knapp, etc.); but this is evidently *an error*, seeing that much of the Old Test. remains yet to be fulfilled; that Peter (2 Pet. 1 : 19) tells believers to take heed of the sure word of prophecy as *to a light* until the day of Christ appears; that Paul (2 Tim. 3 : 14-17) exhorts a minister to apply himself to the Old Test. Scriptures, not to obtain elementary knowledge but to perfect himself; that Christians are directed by the apostles to find the hope of Salvation, the promises of completed Redemption in the Scriptures previously given; and that constant reference is made to the Old Test. as the storehouse of promised deliverance given in covenant and prophecy. It is true that some things in the Old Test. are elementary, such as typical and provisionary institutions, but to make all fall into the same category is doing *the grossest violence* to its contents and the example of the first believers. It appears that the main passage of Scripture, which led to such an unjust inference and discrimination, is the one in Matt. 11 : 11. How this verse is to be understood will appear hereafter, as we shall examine it in detail, on account of the varied use to which it is put. It is to be regretted that able advocates of Christianity fall into this notion. Thus, e.g., Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 17) says, that "the writings of the New Test. must be placed before those of the Old," and approvingly quotes J. Müller: "It is to the writings of the New Test. that the dogmatic proof must return to found its dogmas securely on Christ Himself." This is simply, as already shown, a one-sided discrimination. Now whilst the New Test. is exceedingly precious, cannot be neglected without vital defect, gives us the desired proof in and through Jesus Christ how the Old Test. and New Test. promises can be fulfilled, and teaches us in the plainest manner how to attain Salvation through Jesus, etc., yet much, very much doctrinally expressed in the New finds *its true basis* back in the Old. This the apostles, the Evangelists, yea, Jesus, teach us when appealing to the Old as ful-

filled, e.g., in the Person, character, life, sufferings, etc., of Jesus. The Messiahship of the promised David's Son is delineated in the Old Test., and in deciding the doctrinal question of the Messiahship of Jesus, the question must be answered, whether the Christ of the New Test. *corresponds in all respects with the Christ covenanted and promised in the Old.* This simple illustration shows that we are not at liberty to exalt the one portion above the other, but that *both* are indispensable and mutually confirm each other. Admitting fully that the New contains in a large measure *the sufficient provisionary* for Salvation, yet the grand theme of *both* is Salvation, and the Old, in view of its unfulfilled portions, etc., is far more than a "preliminary training." If the rule given by Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 169) be admitted, it will, if logically applied, give the preference to the Old instead of the New. The rule is: "A part of Scripture has so much the higher value in proportion as it is of greater importance for *our knowledge of the Kingdom of God.*" For, as will be shown, the covenants and prophecies (which the New Test. takes so largely for granted as well known) relating to the Kingdom, and *fundamental* to its comprehension, are in the Old Test.—yea, our chief knowledge is derived therefrom, and, therefore, the Old cannot be inferior to the New. Oosterzee and Müller forget *where* the dogmatical ground was in the quite early church, *before* the New Test. was written, or formed into a canon.

PROPOSITION 17. *Without study of the prophecies, no adequate idea can be obtained of the kingdom.*

The doctrine of the kingdom is a revelation from God, and "*God spake by the Prophets,*" for "*the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*" (Luke 1 : 70, 2 Pet. 1 : 21, 2 Tim. 3 : 16, etc.). The descriptions of it come to us mainly through prediction, embracing a Divine Purpose pertaining to the future beyond the power of human sagacity and knowledge to discern and portray.

Fairbairn (*On Proph.*) has the correct idea, when, as the Amer. editor remarks, "We find as the result that prophecy is a sublime portraiture of the Kingdom of God." How faithfully he followed the prophetic portraiture is another question.

Obs. 1. Hence arises the necessity, if accurate knowledge of the Kingdom is desired, of receiving what God, through the prophets, has revealed concerning it. Jesus was the subject of prophecy, and we know that He truly came because in Him the prophecies pertaining to His First Advent were strictly fulfilled. Jesus and the apostles constantly appeal to this: that the Scriptures testified concerning Him, and that their testimony was true, being verified. Precisely so with this Kingdom; for it is *the great theme* of the prophets, and we can only know that it has really come *when* the predictions relating to it are realized.

Prophecy has been compared (Wilson's *Three Sermons*, p. 6, quoted by Stanley) "to a golden thread" stretching to the end of the web. But in our estimation it is more than this: it is the warp, the golden chain into which time fills and weaves its threads, the latter interlinked and supported by the former. It contains the substance of Revelation and History. Strike out of the Scriptures Prophecy, fulfilled and unfulfilled, and *the very essence* of them the most precious portion—is also removed. The early Fathers, when they designated the Prophets "Theologians," were evidently impressed by the profound relationship that their utterances sustained to our knowledge of divine things. The church, if it desires *an increase* of knowledge, must return to this Scriptural attitude. Some writers in their haste and eagerness to oppose the study of Prophecy (because we lay much stress on it), tell us that its doctrinal aspect is of little account, and dare to assert, that "the folly of basing a tenet upon unfulfilled prophecy has grown to be an axiom in theology." Such an axiom was unknown to ancient worthies before and immediately after the First Advent, and is discarded by a sound theology since the establishment of the Christian Church, seeing that quite a number of doctrines are dependent upon unfulfilled prophecy, as, e.g., the Second Advent, the Antichrist, the restoration of the Jews, the Millennial age, the consummation, the judgment day, the resurrection, the realization of eternal life in the final restitution, the New Heavens and New Earth, the New Jerusalem, etc. The promises of the New Test. relating to the future are based on unfulfilled predictions of the Old, are repetitions of the same, and thus renewed predictions. Surely if angelic beings take a deep interest in the divine predictions—if the redeemed are represented as rejoicing in their bestowal and realization, we, who need their light, ought to receive the bright assurances with gratitude and joy.

Obs. 2. Prophecy takes higher ground than that of merely being a prediction of the future, or a witness to the truth, or a message of hope.

Whilst all this, it is above all *a Revelation of God's Will and Purpose;* and, therefore, while the preceding flow from it, a still grander result is attained when combining and linking together the predictions of God. Then we find, from first to last, that they publish a predetermined counsel of God, *a great Redemptive Process,* all centering in the predestined King and Kingdom.

Negative criticism endeavors here and there to break this connected chain; unavailingly, however, seeing that "all the prophets witness," and their united testimony, separated by centuries and ages, form an unbroken unity. God has given us numerous prophecies, some in detached portions, others in brief fragments, which require special attention to systematize, but when once brought together and compared evince a most blessed design, a most glorious Plan, such as man and creation *needs* to secure permanent, everlasting happiness. Together they form "a sure word," something "whereunto ye do well that ye take heed," being eminently worthy of the most careful investigation. Together they give "a light" (comp. Barnes' admirable remarks on 2 Pet. 1:19), which is the only safe guide until the greater illumination of the coming day. It is a matter of amazement that so many professed Theologies either ignore or slightly touch this God-given "light." Within the limits and design of this work it is impossible to give the rules for interpreting Prophecy; and, indeed, they are not needed, seeing that we have various works on the subject. The principle of Interpretation adopted (Prop. 4) by us sufficiently explains our position, showing that the ordinary rules for interpreting literal, figurative, symbolic, and typical language are to be observed. The reader will find these presented in Bickersteth's *Guide,* Brooke's *El. of Proph. Inter.,* Lord's *Lit. and Theol. Journal,* and *Introd. to the Apoc.,* Horne's *Introd.,* Winthrop's *Premium Essay on Proph. Symbols,* Stuart's *El. of Interp.,* etc. Davison's *Dis. on Proph.* fixes a "Criterion of Prophecy," and ably shows its application to Jesus at the First Advent, to the Church, Jewish Nation, etc.

In reference to the definitions, a few words are in place. Horne (*Intro.,* vol. 1, p. 119) says: "Prophecy is a miracle of knowledge, a declaration, or description, or representation of something future, beyond the power of human sagacity to discern or to calculate, and it is the highest evidence that can be given of supernatural communion with the Deity, and of the truth of a revelation from God." M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* defines it: "God's communication to the Church, to be her light and comfort in time of trouble and perplexity," and adds the following, from Vitringa: "A prediction of some contingent circumstance or event in the future, received by immediate or direct revelation"; Dr. Pye Smith: "A declaration made by a creature under the inspiration and commission of the omniscient God relating to an event or series of events which have not taken place at the time the prophecy is uttered, and which could not have been certainly foreknown by any science or wisdom of man;" other writers: "Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass." It refers also to Dean Magee as dissenting "from this popular but erroneous view," and making the prophet to be "the religious teacher of his age, whose aim is the religious education of those whom he addresses." This is a fair specimen of numerous similar definitions, and there is an element of truth in all of them. But, after all, they only give a partial view, for while neither ignoring the predictive character, nor its evidential nature, nor the moral element (the religious instruction of the age in which delivered and of successive ages), it is self-evident that prophecy is largely intended *to reveal the Divine Purpose relating to the Plan of Redemption.* To illustrate our meaning by a single prophecy: take Deut. 32, and we have not merely a prediction of a series of events and valuable religious instruction, but we have a divine explanation of the manner in which ultimately—after a terrible trial, etc.—covenanted promises are to be realized. Hence prophecy is *an essential part* of the system of revelation, revealing, incorporating, and systematizing truths, which could in no other way be obtained. Therefore in Theology proper, in order to comprehend God's purpose in Redemption and present a systematic statement of the Plan of Salvation, it should be brought forth *prominently,* and subjected to careful study. The lack of this presents us with serious defects in the various systems of Theology, especially in the part pertaining to Eschatology.

Williamson (*Letters to a Millenarian,* p. 177) informs us that the restoration of the Kingdom and Christ's future reign (i.e., its proper conception) is not dependent on "the meaning of certain predictions of the prophets, *for I am no student of the prophets,* but on the question, Who are the lawful heirs of the bequests made to the seed of Abraham?

This seems to be a question totally distinct from the question, What are the contents of the will? and should surely be definitely settled *before* we look at the contents of the will; for before I know whether I am an heir, the contents of the will are of little consequence to me." This author, an amiable writer, and free from the usual reproaches against us, in striving to wrest from us our vantage ground on prophecy, makes a confession that vitiates his own labor. If no student of the prophets, *how* can he even undertake the expounding of his prior question, seeing that the prophets enter largely in *both* questions, respecting the will (to use his figure) and the heirship—they being the expounders of the Divine Purpose concerning both. This lack is seen throughout his "*Letters*," reversing a logical consideration of the whole subject. He overlooks two essential points: (1) That before we are heirs, we are invited by prophets and apostles to consider and study this "Will," in order that we may be induced to become heirs through the acceptance of the Christ, and (2) that the contents of the will are of primary importance, because unless we *first* "look at the contents" it is impossible to determine the heirship. It certainly needs no discussion, that the contents of the will precede the heirship, and that, therefore, the first question to be decided is that referring to the will itself. When it is found that a will is really made, and that we are noticed in it, being assured of an heirship under certain conditions imposed by the testator, a deepened interest arises to make ourselves acquainted with all the details, and worthy of its provisions, and this will correspondingly—inevitably—make us students of prophecy. (In ref. to his view of the heirship, see Prop. 64.)

Obs. 3. Conceding that Prophecy has thus a higher province than that of merely foretelling future events, yet every believer in the Word ought to insist, that such a foretelling is a most important, *essential feature and proof* of the Prophet's mission. That spirit of compromising with Rationalism, by which, under the shallow pretence that the Prophets had nobler duties to perform than that of predicting, the predictions themselves are lowered or set aside, is to be avoided as derogatory to the prophetical office.

As we shall largely use their predictive authority in our argument, placing it in the front rank where the Bible and the early Fathers set it, some additional remarks may be needed. Infidels, next to miracles, have most violently assaulted prophecy (also a miracle). Seeing how largely the Word of God is dependent upon it, how believers have appealed to it as evidence of its credibility and inspiration, how the very life of Christianity is bound up with it, they directed their attack with the cry that it was either disparaging to God, or a tender to fatalism, or incredible to reason, or mere foolishness, or the natural suggestions, shrewd foresight and guesses of man; some predictions were given after the events, others were never fulfilled, some were so obscure that they are utterly unreliable, others were interpolations of a succeeding age to subserve political or religious purposes, etc. With such men it is, of course, vain to reason, for the case is *prejudged;* and any move to get rid of, or weaken, its testimony, is deemed honorable. To appeal to prophecies fulfilled, such as related to Babylon, Tyre, Nineveh, Jerusalem, etc. (showing also that the writers lived long before the events transpired), is to exhibit our ignorance; to show that prophecies are now fulfilling in the dispersion of the Jews, in the continued down-treading of Jerusalem under Gentile feet, in Mohammedanism and the Turkish Empire, in Gentile domination, in the Papacy, in the condition of the church and the world, etc., is to manifest our credulity; to indicate the relationship that individual prophecy sustains to the whole, and to point to the future as the period when those, claimed by them as unfulfilled, shall be realized, is to display an unreasonable faith. So be it then, if men desire to elevate themselves to the judgment seat, deeming themselves perfectly adequate to decide what is proper and what improper for the Almighty to perform; what is worthy and what unworthy of credence in His Word. The opposite reasons, influencing them in their rejection, are aptly delineated by Isaiah (ch. 29:11, 12): "The vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed; and the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I am not learned." It is impossible to conciliate such a class, for the objections come more from the heart than from the mind, rather from indisposition, lack of moral sympathy than from careful study, and every effort in the way of concession to their demands, is only hailed as an evidence of weakness.

There has been a tendency, especially in German Theology, arising from the contest between Rationalism and Orthodoxy, to settle down in the conviction that Christianity cannot be demonstrated by historical proofs, as many authors and apologists have attempted; and that as Twesten (quoted by Dorner, *His. Prot.*, vol. 2, p. 428) remarks: "It is not possible to prove, independent of Christian faith, that there is a Divine Revelation, and that this is deposited in Holy Scripture, nor can such proof be the foundation of faith," etc. While freely admitting the higher and more satisfactory testimony of Evangelical faith, which produces a personal, practical knowledge of the truth and thus impresses its divine origin, yet such a statement is far too sweeping, removing the responsibility laid upon all men to receive God's Revelation, rejecting the evidence afforded by the experience of men that many have been led by the reading and study of the Word to acknowledge, without and before such faith, that God's Word is truth; and discarding the labors of Apologists and others whose works, as the conversion of many testifies, have not been in vain. Indeed, the very men who insist upon such a theory constantly violate their own rule by appealing to historical proofs, or by bringing an array of evidence obtained through the fulfilment of prophecy to substantiate revelation against unbelief. In their writings there is a constant appeal to reason in behalf of the positions taken by them. It is one thing to lay down a one-sided rule, but it is quite another to apply it. The Bible speaks of two kinds of evidence; one, the most gratifying, comes from faith, but this, in many aspects, must be sustained by the other; the other is derived from historical evidence, including the fulfilment of prophecy, the dealings of God, the works performed, etc. God Himself appeals to the latter evidence as desirable, as introductory to the other, and also as condemnatory if not received. The first preaching of the apostles is based on it; Stephen's address is full of it; Christ refers the Jews to it; the Jews themselves received the Old Test. in view of it; the New Test. is a record of its value; believers have been first led to faith by it; even the devils themselves are under its influence, and unbelief has often, in the dying hour, confessed its claims. We cannot do without such an attestation to existing Revelation, for even the way of Evangelical faith (which simply appropriates to self what the other brings) is prepared by due reference to historical facts, as, e.g., the fall, the sinfulness of man, the foretelling and coming of the Messiah, etc., so that every Christian writer, whatever his theory in the study, will practically, more or less, endeavor to secure the approval of reason by the use of such testimony, a process favored by our mental and moral constitution.

It is, therefore, with deep regret that we see eminent and devoted men, for the sake of gaining the good-will of unbelievers, forsake a principle of prophetic interpretation and application, that God Himself has laid down, viz.: the strict grammatical interpretation of prophecy and a literal fulfilment of the same. Thus, e.g., Dr. Dorner (*His. Prot. Theol.*, p. 445) in view of Rationalism in some quarters declaring "that a transference of Old Test. occurrences, images, and Messianic features to the person of Jesus of Nazareth, is the source of the Gospel," asserts: "the more literal the fulfilment of Old Test. sayings found in the New, the more difficult will it be to dispel the suspicion that the former is the source of the latter." * To rid ourselves of so unjust a "suspicion," it is requisite to accommodate ourselves to unbelief, and yield up everything that may be too "Jewish." This theory is opposed (1) to the facts in the case; for (*a*) if this literal fulfilment were missing, the unbelievers would be *the first* to take advantage of it; (*b*) it can be proven that the prophecies preceded, and hence the fulfilment the more obvious; (*c*) it can be shown, as an essential element in the Divine Plan, that both the prediction and the literal fulfilment are a necessity to constitute Jesus the Messiah; (*d*) it can be pointed out, that the fulfilment, in most cases, is one adverse to the anticipations of Jewish opinion based on Jewish Scriptures, and yet necessary in the Divine Purpose; (*e*) it can be boldly assumed, that without such a correspondence we can have no assurance that the Christ came; (*f*) it can be affirmed, that such concessions do *no good* to the class for whom they are intended, but that they rather confirm them in unbelief. Then, again, the theory is opposed (2) to the criterion established by God; for (*a*) the plainest and most triumphant exhibition of veracity and union with the Divine is a literal fulfilment of prediction, and hence the failure of such is the test of a false prophet;

---

* This is quoted from the Eng. Transl., which may do Dr. Dorner injustice; for my friend Dr. Sprecher, ex-Pres. of Wit. College, informs me that in comparing it with the original, he found it in various places imperfect, and in several instances stating the reverse of the original.

(*b*) a literal fulfilment is adapted to all classes of minds, for which the Bible is designed ; (*c*) the literal fulfilment manifests the Divine Will, and is a part of the Divine Purpose, and as such is appealed to in order to indicate it ; (*d*) Jesus and the apostles represent it as a decided proof and reality of the Divine, thus flatly controverting the far-fetched "suspicions" of early and later opposers of Christianity ; (*e*) if it were desirable to avoid such an objection, the Bible, the product of Divine wisdom, knowing how to reach men's minds and hearts, would not lay stress upon it ; (*f*) it is not a literal fulfilment that leads to such "suspicions," but the heart desires them to silence the sense of responsibility ; (*g*) it forms, then, a substantial reason—for if missing the chain would be broken —in behalf of Christianity ; adapted to all minds ; preserving the unity of the Record ; attesting to the Divine Plan ; giving a proper insight into Redemption ; revealing the future history of the race and the ultimate triumph of truth and holiness over error and evil ; and practically illustrating the power of an all-pervading Providence in the most forcible manner. Let it be repeated : it is *impossible* to satisfy the demands of opposing parties. Objection is made that there is *too literal* a fulfilment, which is adduced as evidence of collusion, etc. Frazer (*Key to the Prophecies*) informs us of some infidels, who object to Revelation because there is *no accurate*, literal fulfilment of its own predictions. So Renan also objects, and claims that Jesus was disappointed in His fond anticipations. The Jews also objected to Christ that all the prophecies pertaining to the Messiah were not literally fulfilled at the First Advent. Here, then, are two objections, the exact opposite of each other : the one rejecting Scripture because of a too literal fulfilment, the other doing the same on the ground that a sufficiently literal aspect is wanting. This should teach us to accept of God's wisdom in the matter, receiving His testimony as superior to man's, and not weaken its force in *the vain attempt* of conciliating unbelievers.

It is comparatively easy to endure the reproaches of unbelievers, but not so readily those of excellent men, believers, who, by their sweeping statements, are justly chargeable with moulding the minds of multitudes to a rejection of a true, consistent interpretation of Scripture, preparing the masses of the church to have *no faith* when the Saviour comes. Unable to reconcile with their views of Scripture and of the future, a literal fulfilment of prophecy, such Prophecy must submit its grammatical sense to another that is more accommodating. But this is not all : the most ultra positions are taken to sustain such a departure. Thus, e.g., Pressensé (*The Redeemer*, p. 100) asserts : "Literal interpretation of prophecy is, therefore, nonsense," etc., declaring that all prophecy is in its "form essentially symbolical," and adduces the Psalms relating to Christ as first applicable to David (?), then to Solomon (?), and finally to Christ. Yet he is inconsistent with himself, for in other places and works he repeatedly presents this same "nonsense," i.e., literal fulfilment of prophecy, as evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus. Adopt his rule, and it plunges us at once into the most varied and contradictory interpretation, and makes it impossible to meet the arguments of infidels against prophecy without a pitiful retreat into mystical subterfuges and the plainest violation of the laws of language. Alas ! otherwise able works abound in this species of damaging statement, and set themselves in direct antagonism to Jesus (John 14 : 29) : "*And now I have told you before it come too pass, that when it come to pass, ye might believe.*"

Obs. 4. The prophecies referring to the Kingdom of God, as now interpreted by the large majority of Christians, afford the strongest leverage employed by unbelievers against Christianity. Unfortunately, unbelief is often logically correct. Thus e.g. it eagerly points to the predictions pertaining to David's Son, showing that, if language has any *legitimate* meaning, and words are *adequate* to express an idea, they *unmistakably* predict the restoration of David's throne and kingdom, etc., and then triumphantly declare that it was not realized (so Strauss, Baur, Renan, Parker, etc.). They mock the expectation of the Jews, of Simeon, the preaching of John, Jesus, and the disciples, the anticipations of the early Church, and hastily conclude, sustained by *the present faith* of the Church (excepting only a few), that *they will never be fulfilled ;* and that, therefore, the prophecies, the foundation upon which the superstructure rests, are false, and of human concoction. The manner of meeting such objections is *humiliating* to the Word and Reason ; for it discards *the plain grammati-*

cal sense as unreliable, and, to save the credit of the Word, insists upon interpreting all such prophecies by adding to them, under the claim of spiritual, a sense which *is not contained in the language*, but suits the religious system adopted. Unbelief is not slow in seizing *the advantage* thus given, gleefully pointing out how this introduced change makes the ancient faith an ignorant one, the early Church occupying a false position, and the Bible a book to which man adds any sense, under the plea of spiritual, that may be deemed necessary for its defence.

Some unbelievers even go to the length of denouncing the Saviour and the apostles as being "deceivers," "Indian jugglers," etc., who endeavored, without success, to appropriate the predictions to themselves. Others inform us that the prophecies inflamed the imagination of Jesus, and that under their influence His ministry started, but that He discarded much as unable to be realized in the condition of things then existing. This is a favorite topic of Renan's, the result of his own unreliable imaginings. Parker and his followers, of course, tell us that there are "prophecies which have not been, and never will be fulfilled," referring especially to those relating to the Kingdom promised to David's Son. The Liberalist, M. Grotz, and others, advise us to keep prophecy in the background as a very minor question, and not worthy of serious consideration—i.e. it is only worthy the contempt of the enlightened. Even Schleiermacher (*Sys. of Doctrines*) objects to nearly all the prophecies, especially the more prominent, as proceeding from a material spirit of the people, and hence places the Old Test. containing them far below the New. As we proceed, there will be found abundant and painful evidence of this spirit and lack of faith in the Word of God, extending from the most virulent of unbelievers down to semi-unbelievers and even believers. It is a lamentable fact that prophecies, *en masse*, which have no relation to the church as organized at present, are appropriated and applied to the church as now existing, *that cannot and do not thus apply*, and that this has necessarily caused unbelief in many who detect, easily, the utter discrepancy. We only now say, that there must be *a sad defect* somewhere in human systems, which causes prophecies to promise, plainly too, one thing and yet mean quite another; this, we affirm, is an imperfection existing, *not* in the language of the prophets, but *only* in the interpretation of them, and in the limiting of their fulfilment to the past and present, as if God was unable to carry out His purposes in the future. A renewed study, a thorough examination of them, and a return to *the grammatical sense*, will alone enable us to close the wide gap left open for opposers to enter.

The student will observe also that the evidence in behalf of the predictive nature of prophecy is not dependent—as in alleged human—upon single or isolated predictions, but brings to its support *a grand series* of predictions, one hinging upon the other. In this work we shall frequently avail ourselves of this connected succession. The destructive theories respecting prophecy (e.g. in Davidson's *Introduction*, with which comp. the "*Reply*" in *The Princeton Review*, Jan., 1864), which bring it down to something like human sagacity, are fully met by the simple fact of this divine order, and their forming integral parts of a divine system, imparting to us a knowledge of the Divine Purpose. The fulfilment of prediction is evidence of the truth (Archb. Sumner's *Essay on Proph.*, etc.), and in the preparatory measures relating to the Kingdom, confirms the office of prophecy (Kurtz's *Sac. His.*, p. 32).

Obs. 5. Multitudes are found, who deliberately and persistently refuse to study the Prophecies. To such, at least in part, applies the language of Bengel (*Gnomon*, Apoc. c. 1 : 1), who, after directing attention to the fact that Revelation is given "to shew unto his servants," etc., says: "He who does not permit the things which must come to pass to be shewn to him, is wanting *in the duty* of a servant." There is propriety and force in the remark, which those who object to our making these things *a special* subject of study, would do well to ponder. A servant cannot, without injury to himself, neglect a large portion of Scripture, which God, with a merciful object in view, kindly presents to him. He will rather imitate the Prophets themselves, who "*inquired and searched diligently*"—not a mere cursory examination, but a profound and extended

inquiry—into the revelations made to them (1 Pet. 1 : 10, 11). God's *wisdom and power* (Isa. 43 : 9, 13) is found in prophecy; to many, however, it is foolishness. *Blessedness* is attached to it (Apoc. 1 : 3, comp. Bengel, Barnes, etc.), but to many it is evil and drudgery.

Instead of a careful investigation, some refuse to receive it; others quote isolated passages to support some doctrine or opinion, without the least idea of the context or real prophetical meaning. Popes, e.g., have applied prophetic announcements pertaining to the Messiah to themselves; Papists and Protestants have appropriated what exclusively belongs to the Jewish nation; sects and individuals have presumptuously claimed as belonging to themselves what really is predicted of "the age to come." Prophecy has been made a plastic mortar to daub over the crudest and most mystical conceptions. Rejection or misconception has triumphed, and thus it will continue down to the harvest itself. Pious and able men, such as Bh. Newton, Meade, Bengel, etc., are ridiculed for having studied and written on the subject. Voltaire's sneer at Sir I. Newton, that he wrote on the Apocalypse to console mankind for his superiority in other matters, has been reproduced in another form by Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 138): "Newton thought his crazy exposition of the Apoc. as certain as his system of the world." (Which clearly shows that Renan never read Newton's book, which claims no such certainty, but represents itself as a humble attempt to approximately elucidate, if possible, a difficult subject, containing both modesty and valuable suggestions. The remark reveals the animus of Renan.) Valuable information and suggestions imparted by such a class of writers is studiously ignored, and mistakes, to which the best of men are liable, are joyfully paraded as evidence of the sad results of prophetical study. How true it is that to the mass of mankind and to many believers, it is a matter of *the utmost indifference* whether Jesus opened the seals of the book or not, whether He gave a farewell testimony or not, whether He enjoined special attention to it or not, whether John was deeply affected, even to tears, or not. John wept because the things fastened by the seals could not be revealed, and he rejoiced when Christ opened them; but now, although those things are plainly recorded, it is deemed foolishness to be in sympathy with John, or to search into them with an interest becoming the subject. Let a man enter this field of investigation with sobriety, honesty, and humility, and epithets the most derogatory are heaped upon him indicative of "folly," "weak-mindedness," visionary," "fanatical," etc., so that it requires some degree of courage to face the obloquy, to endure the loss of sympathy, to suffer the reproaches of withdrawn confidence, and to receive the imputations of mental and moral weakness. Rashness, however, consists not only in attempting to interpret in a trifling way, without due comparison, reflection, moderation, etc., but is *equally* to be found in neglecting or despising prophetical truth; indeed, the latter exceeds the former in one respect since it lacks even *the respect* shown to prophecy by the most injudicious of interpreters. Alas! how comparatively few have, at present, the spirit of Daniel (2 : 19-23), who manifested his reverence and gratitude for and interest in the prophecies given. Indeed, such as ancient believers received with faith and praise, are now regarded either with unbelief, or indifference, or scorn and reproach, and "*the testimony of Jesus (which) is the spirit of prophecy*" (Rev. 19 : 10) is not only rejected, pronounced unworthy of special study, but rebukes are heaped upon those who devote time and labor to its elucidation and enforcement. It is true of prophecy, as of all God's works: "*The works of the Lord are great* (vast in magnitude), *sought out* (investigated) *of all them that have pleasure therein*" (Ps. 111 : 2).

Obs. 6. It is the united testimony of all who have devoted much time to the study of prophecy, that it is *exceedingly profitable* in many respects; and they exhort others, in view of personal benefit derived therefrom, to devote special attention to the same. This testimony is the more worthy of consideration, since it comes from the most talented, scholarly, devoted men that the Church has produced, and fully accords with the promises of the Word. Fully acknowledging the correctness of Stanley (*His. of Jewish Church*), Payne Smith (*Mess. Inter. of Isa.*, Introd.), Fairbairn (*On Proph.*), and others, that the teaching of the Future or simple prediction was only one part of the Prophetic office or duty, we firmly hold that, viewed correctly, this is far from being "subordinate." Reflection shows

that its distinguishing peculiarity consists in this: under the form of Prophecy, the Divine Purpose, not merely in particular cases, but as *a grand whole*, is developed. Therefore it is, that he who studies and compares Prophecy (teaching respecting the future), keeping in view that it is far more than mere prediction (in the sense of foretelling to convince men of the truth, etc.), that it is designed to teach *a system of truth* (one part adjusting itself to another in the thus revealed Plan), will obtain *a deeper and more satisfactory* insight into Redemption, as carried on and finally realized. We cannot call that "subordinate" which materially aids—is essential—to such knowledge.

It may be well, in the briefest terms, to enumerate the reasons why the study of Prophecy is important. (1) It evinces due respect for "all" Scripture. (2) It shows that we believe that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." (3) That it is "a sure word." (4) It affords the satisfaction of performing a duty. (5) It is fruitful in bringing forth treasure. (6) It increases faith, hope, and love. (7) It exalts our conceptions of the attributes of God, His knowledge and power. (8) It reveals the results of depravity. (9) It teaches forbearance and patience under the trials to which the church and believer are subject. (10) It gives the Second Advent its due prominency. (11) It enforces the motives, hopes, etc., grounded on the Second Advent. (11) It enlightens us respecting the mission of the First Advent, and shows how it is preparatory. (12) It imparts accurate information concerning the Kingdom of God, its nature and re-establishment. (13) It explains the intercalary period, the Times of the Gentiles. (14) It teaches us more clearly upon what the engrafting of the Gentiles depends. (15) It presents us with the career of the church and anti-Christian powers. (16) It gives us distinctive knowledge of God's Redemptive Purpose. (17) It secures the blessedness of obedience to the truth, if received, hereafter. (18) It increases the range of prayer, and stimulates to its employment. (19) It is a preservative from sin. (20) It leads to separation from the world, but to labor for its warning and welfare. (21) It preserves us from the rebuke given to the non-discerning Pharisees. (22) It alone will prepare believers for the terrible trials of the still future great tribulation. (23) Being received by faith and appropriated, we may, according to Promise, escape from the sad scenes to be ushered in (this will be explained under the Translation). (24) Its tendency is to produce love toward the brethren, sinking the present into the future. (25) Its revelations may, when presented to others, warn, instruct, and guide to the knowledge, service, and obedience of God. (26) It prominently holds forth the Theocratic relationship of Jesus. (27) It specifically instructs us concerning the Jewish nation, the true people of God, and the enemies of Christ. (28) The design of the present dispensation, its introductory character, etc., are delineated by it. (29) It enforces and confirms the covenants. (30) It tells us when we are to be rewarded, when we shall inherit. (31) It makes the promises of God consistent and more precious. (32) It materially aids to explain Scripture. (33) It shows us how Redemption is complete—a recovery from all the effects of the fall. (34) It gives us a clearer idea of the resurrection, translation, judgment day, etc. (35) It enables us to understand and appreciate the reign of the saints. (36) It indicates the ending of Gentile domination and the supremacy of the Theocratic ordering. (37) It presents us with a more enlarged view of the future agency and power of the Holy Spirit. (38) It vindicates the glory of God in the Salvation portrayed in its sublime language. (39) It makes the Bible a harmonious whole. (40) It prevents us from predicting falsely. (41) It helps us to meet the objections urged by infidels, Jews, etc. (42) It serves to explain, more satisfactorily, the world's history. (43) It honors, exalts the mighty King, giving us the most enlarged views of His majesty and power. Considering the value of such study, it is inexcusable to neglect it. The remarks of Dr. Schmucker (*Proph. Illus. of the Ch. Relig.*, p. 44, on Apoc. 1 : 3) are but too applicable: "Oh! the guilty backwardness of many in our days, to read and study this invaluable treasure of the Christian, for fear of incurring the ridicule of infidels, or the piteous smile of the wise men of the world. Some in our days neglect this kind of study even from hypocrisy. They assume a superior air of sanctity, as if their minds were employed in matters of far greater moment than this, and therefore pray to be excused. Should a mortal presume to know better, what he ought to read than God? However the study of the prophecies should not be our first care; for what will all this knowledge avail, if we die in our sins at last. Our first duty is to seek the Kingdom of God and His right-

eousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. We must be experimentally acquainted with the ways of God in Christ Jesus, to derive real benefit from knowledge of this kind. He whose eternal interest is truly settled will study the prophecies to the advantage of his soul's concerns, when the unconverted speculation only satisfies vain curiosity." This rebuke and caution is well deserved; for neglect, on the one hand is criminal, whilst, on the other, without an appropriating of Christ, the sum of all prophecy, by the elementary principles of repentance and faith, its study only increases our condemnation. (Comp. Commentators, generally, on Apoc. 1 : 3.) In view of the general neglect of prophecy, even by ministers eminent for ability, it is to be feared that Daniel's prayer is applicable (Dan. 9 : 6): "*Neither have we hearkened unto Thy servants, the prophets,* which spake in Thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land." For if Daniel could include this in a confession of sin and unworthiness, how much more pertinent is it, when regarding *the additions* made to prophecy since Daniel's time, some even given under the direct auspices of Jesus Himself and called His "*testimony*"? Jesus (Matt. 24 : 15) refers to Daniel's prophecy, saying, "*Whoso readeth, let him understand,*" and both He and the apostles allude to unfulfilled prophecy, calling attention to it, and assuming that it was imparted to secure knowledge of God's ways. Indeed, we have intimations that in the private and unrecorded instructions much stress was laid on the study of prophecy (e.g. as to Jesus, Luke 24 : 25-27; as to the apostles, 2 Thess. 2 : 5). Comp. "On the Importance of Prophecy," Brookes's *Maranatha*, Seiss's *Last Times*, and kindred works.

Obs. 7. The nature, characteristics, etc., of the Kingdom, should not be determined by one, two, or even more, predictions, unless very specific, but by a comparison of all, or at least a large number of, the predictions relating to it. One or more, taken separately, may give us but slight evidence, whilst the whole, or a large proportion, will present such abundant proof that the correctness of view will be fortified against assault. The neglect of this caution has been fruitful in mistake; a passage or two is selected and a plausible theory is erected upon it, which, however, cannot bear the test of accumulated light. Inferential or one-sided testimony must give place to the direct and abounding.

Bh. Horsley (*Sermons*, vol. 2, p. 13), showing that the prophecies were parts of a system which pointed to the establishment of the Messiah's Kingdom, takes 2 Pet. 1 : 20 to express: "Not any prophecy of Scripture is of self-interpretation" (i.e. isolated from others), but must be interpreted in its unity with others or the whole (so also Faber, etc.). However the passage is rendered, the rule of comparison is essential to preserve from error. Horne (*Introd.*) adopts this as the first rule for ascertaining the sense of prophetic writers. (Many authors indorse Horsley's rendering, whilst others make it to denote "that what they communicated was not of their own disclosure;" "that the prophecy cannot be understood until compared with the event," etc. (Barnes' Com. loci.). Fairbairn (*On Proph.* Ap. G. p. 496) interprets it to mean: "No Scripture comes of one's own solution;" and he refers it not, as others, "how the meaning of prophecy is made out, or interpreted, but how prophecy itself came into existence, whence it drew its origin," etc. The Roman Cath. application of the passage is refuted by Barnes and others. Bh. Van Mildert says: "That the sense of no prophecy is to be determined by an abstract consideration of the passage itself; but by taking it in conjunction with other portions of Scripture relating to the subject." Comp. Bloomfield, loci, who quotes Van Mildert, but agrees with Horsley, who, in addition, includes more than mere comparison, viz.: that in virtue of its divine origin, it sustains a necessary relation to a system of truth and must find its true interpretation in that relationship, and in the history (fulfilment of the world).* In reference to the double fulfilment of prophecy,

---

* The *Crit. Eng. Test.* renders "private interpretation" by "merely human interpretation." The editor of the *Luth. Observer* (Dec. 8th, 1876) translates: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of its own origin (starting, revelation, disclosure). For," etc. The *Latin Vulgate* in the Dublin translation is made to say: "Understanding this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation."

while we would not entirely reject it, yet great caution is required in its application, being convinced that in many instances it is faulty and erroneously applied. Our argument makes it unnecessary to be employed by us, and therefore we refer the reader to works that adopt it, as Bh. Newton's *Diss. on Proph.*, vol. 1, p. 70; and vol. 2, p. 92; Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 390; Bacon's *Adv. of Learning*, B. 2; Bickersteth's *Guide*; Brookes's *El Proph. Inter.*, etc.

It may be added that the very cautions given respecting the study of prophecy, indicate that no man can make himself conversant with the same without considerable labor and time. The Bible implies this in the manner in which it is given, and clearly teaches us that God exercises the talent and wisdom of His people in the searching of His Word; and that in condescending to such revelations He leaves us to investigate in order that the wise only may understand. The labor necessarily bestowed causes the laborer to appreciate the treasures dug out, and, at the same time, prevents those who are the special subjects of prophetic judgments—owing to sin—to see and understand the impending doom. The range of prophecy, dealing with the deepest and most vital theological questions, with the highest and noblest things pertaining to man and his destiny, demands, to insure successful prosecution, a cultivated mind as well as a heart of faith. In its relationship to history it calls for an acquaintance with ancient and modern, sacred and profane history. For, as Bh. Newton remarks: "Prophecy is history anticipated and contracted; history is prophecy accomplished and dilated." Von Döllinger (*Essay on Proph. Spirit*) calls the historian "a prophet looking behind." In addition to this, its relationship to, as an essential part of, a great redemptive system, calls for a comprehensive view of the numerous details, fitting them into their several designed places, and bringing forth the unity of design exhibited. While all men can derive benefit from its study, yet few men are really qualified to perform the amount of labor required to bring together prophecy connectedly and systematically. And among the few, nearly all, possessing the requisite talent and ability, are so occupied with other labors that they cannot bestow the time that the subject demands.

Obs. 8. In almost every work written against the doctrine of the Kingdom as held by us, great stress is laid on the obscurity of prophetic announcements arising from their figurative or symbolic language. Some even go so far as to say, that prophecy can only be understood after its fulfilment. Admitting a degree of obscurity in some details, in the order of some events, in the manner in which some things are to be fulfilled, etc., it is sufficient to reply, that the objection only has force when applied to our method of interpretation, but is forgotten and overridden when the substitution of a spiritualistic interpretation is attempted.

This requires some additional remarks. It has already been shown under several Propositions that there is mystery attached to some things, that a degree of obscurity is intentionally given, that laborious study and diligent comparison is required, etc., but have also stated (which will hereafter clearly appear) that this mystery and obscurity does not refer to the nature of the Kingdom, but to events connected therewith, the exact order to be observed, the time of accomplishment, the brevity of expression, the figurative language used, etc. Bh. Newton, who gave much thought and attention to the subject, justly says (*On Proph.*, vol. 2, p. 91): "Though some parts are obscure enough to exercise the church, yet others are sufficiently clear to illuminate it; and the obscure parts, the more they are fulfilled, the better they can be understood. In this respect, as the world groweth older, it groweth wiser." The present and past fulfilment

---

Fuller (*Calv. and Socin. Sys. Comp.*, Let. 12) explains: "It is not to be considered as the private opinion of a fallible man, as the case is with other productions." Some few make "private interpretation" to mean "that we cannot interpret prophecy, unless we are enlightened by the Holy Spirit," and hence plead in behalf of themselves a special illumination which fits them for expositors. Fausset (*Com.* loci) has, "private (the mere individual writer's uninspired) interpretation," i.e. they were not the words of themselves to be interpreted by themselves, but the words of the Holy Spirit. Alford (*Com.*) explains: "springs not out of human interpretations," i.e. is not the result of "a man knowing what he means when he utters it," etc.

of prophecy gives us a clue to its language and the expressions peculiar to itself, and thus constantly enlarges the facilities for comprehending the same. Without diligent study of the more obscure allusions, it would be impossible to predicate a fulfilment of them when accomplished, unless proper comparison were instituted. It was, probably, in view of this, that Sir I. Newton, *Obs. Apoc.*, ch. 1, p. 253) said: "Amongst the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note who has not made some discovery worth knowing."

The objection grounded on alleged obscurity is urged to evince that we can know but little concerning it, and that, therefore, our explanations are worthless. For the present, it is only necessary to reply: (1) How comes it, then, that if they are necessarily so obscure that nothing certain can be gained respecting the Kingdom and its manifestation, they themselves *so confidently* appeal to and interpret them concerning the same? Thus e.g. every one of them brings forward a favorite theory of the Kingdom and Millennium, and to sustain his position largely quotes the figurative and even the symbolical prophecies, and these, when thus applied by themselves, are *no longer* obscure; nay, more, are become so decidedly clear that they are used in preaching, prayer, and singing. Singular change! In sermons, prayers, and hymns, when confidently used by themselves, prophecy is easily apprehended, but *when* Millenarians refer to it and endeavor to show its relationship to the future, *then*, all at once, it is considered too dark and incomprehensible! Alas! men of ability resort to so pitiful a subterfuge, and actually influence the ignorant by it. (2) They themselves, being the judges, decide after all that if desirous to become acquainted with what God has revealed concerning the Kingdom and its glory, we must turn to the prophecies abounding in figure. Hence censure in this direction is scarcely compatible with their own course, they themselves affirming that "vagueness" gives place, by comparison and study, to certainty. (3) That when not directly writing against us, they overlook this obscurity, making all the concessions that are needed. (Comp. e.g. Barnes, *Com.* on 2 Pet. 1 : 20, 21; Rev. 1 : 1; *The Presbyterian Quarterly Review* for 1853, quoted by Lord in *Theol. and Lit. Journal* for 1853, p. 258; Stuart's *Com.* on Apoc. ch. 1 : 1-5; in brief, compare their expositions of such passages and all others urging us to the study of prophecy.) (4) That really there exists but little difference—if any—between us so far as *the grammatical and rhetorical meaning* is concerned; and the same is true even in many cases of the symbols employed; we both are agreed how the tropical language is to be interpreted, viz.: by the ordinary rules governing all language. The difference between us lies in the fact that *after* the plain, unobscure sense is presented, then, in opposition to us who hold to the sense thus conveyed, another ungrammatical and unrhetorical operation must be performed, viz.: this sense thus obtained must have engrafted upon it (as e.g. David's throne and kingdom) a different and very spiritual or mystical meaning; must be tortured by the Origenistic process until it evolves something that suits the taste or option of the interpreter; must, in brief, be explained by a mode that has *never* been applied to any other written document in existence, and which is utterly *unknown* to the laws of language. Here is where the obscurity obtains—certainly not on the side which limits itself by regular, well-known law, but on that which passes beyond those ascertained rules, and allows in addition a sense which is unconfined and unlimited in variety at the discretion of spiritualistic assumption, making the plainest of passages inflated, involved, and transcendental. The writer does not exaggerate on so important a point, for the proof of its being unconfined and unlimited consists in this: that no work, addicted to spiritualizing, is in existence (within the knowledge of the author) that gives *the laws* regulating the obtaining and applying of such *an added sense*, thus leaving it unconfined at the pleasure of the expositor; the unlimited variety can be readily seen in e.g. the meanings attached to the Kingdom, in various commentaries, in Swedenborg's works, in the writings of the mystics, etc., numerous examples of which will be quoted as we proceed.

In reference to the old and oft-refuted objection, making a total obscurity—"that prophecy is so arranged that it is not to be understood until its fulfilment"—this too is already answered by the course of our opponents, who against this alleged axiom profess *themselves* able to express a confident opinion as to fulfilment. Some professed Christians almost seem to have adopted, with reference to unfulfilled prophecy, the inscription ("nil scire tutissima fides") over the gateway of the famous mansion of Claas van Olden Barneveld, expressive of the faith that to know nothing is the safest belief. Let those who urge such objections answer questions like the following: What propriety and force is there in Amos 4 : 7, 8, Hos. 14 : 9, Dan. 12 : 4, Apoc. 1 : 3, and kindred passages? Where is the Scripture that contains such a rule for our guidance? Why are we so expressly exhorted to read and study it, and why is the non-discerning and neglect of

it so rebuked, if we can know nothing about it until fulfilled? How can prophecy be a light, if it is dark? What encouragement, profit, hope, etc., is to be derived from it previous to fulfilment? Why do some of these very men rashly attempt to elucidate prophecy, as in commentaries, sermons, books on prophecy, etc.? Why confidently declare that we are certainly wrong, if they know nothing about it; for might we not even happily guess at the true meaning? Why, in contending with unbelievers, quote prophecy against them, if it has no more weight than this? Why refer to it in encouraging the faith and hope of the church? The reader must not censure because so much space is occupied with such objections, for the writer has been often pained to find good and learned men urge them against us, and then turn around and, in the same book, plead the usefulness and benefit of prophecy in throwing light upon the, what would be otherwise a dark, future. Some are like Sir Thom. Browne (*Christian Morals*, s. 13), who said: "Study prophecies when they are become histories, and past hovering in their causes;" but they do not assign as a reason one given by him: "The greatest part of time being already wrapt up in things behind us, it's now somewhat late to bait after things before us; for futurity still shortens, and time present sucks in time to come." . . . "If the expected Elias should appear, he might say much of what is past, not much of what's to come." On the other hand, Moody (*How to Study the Bible*) remarks: "If God did not wish us to understand the Revelation, He would not have given it us at all. A good many say that it is so dark and mysterious common readers cannot understand it. Let us only keep digging away at it, and it will unfold itself by and by. Some one says it is the only book in the whole Bible that tells about the devil being chained; and as the devil knows that, he goes up and down Christendom, and says: 'It is no use, you reading the Revelation; you cannot understand the book; it's too hard for you.' The fact is, he doesn't want you to understand about his own defeat."

Another and favorite mode of discrediting prophecy as employed by Millenarians must, in justice to ourselves, be briefly noticed. It is charged that its study has led to foolish interpretations and rash expositions. This, alas, is true, and one of the results of human infirmity. But the abuse, the perversion does not discredit a proper use of the truth, for otherwise no truth—for what has escaped—would be left to us. After many years of careful study and reading, embracing the writings of all classes, it is correct to assert as a well-weighed opinion, that if we were to measure the extravagance of Anti- and Post-Millenarians—our opponents—with that of Millenarian writers, the former would greatly exceed in the scale of folly and rashness. Thus e.g. Pres. Edwards (*His. of Redemp.*) employing prophecy to make this earth (to which prophecy offers redemption) the future, eternal hell; Prof. Stuart's Neroic theory; Dr. Berg making the Fifth Kingdom of Daniel the United States; Swedenborg's appropriation of the New Jerusalem prophecies; "the Apoc. Unveiled," making the angel of Rev. 10 the symbol of "the present age of steam-power and the magnetic telegraph," etc., etc.

Obs. 9. Millenarians, in order to secure the belief of others, constantly appeal to a literal fulfilment of prophecy. They indorse the language of Tertullian (*Apol.* ch. 20): "The daily fulfilment of prophecy is, surely, a full proof of revelation. Hence, then, we have a well-founded belief in many things which are yet to come, namely, the confidence arising from our knowledge of the past, because some events, still future, were foretold at the same time with others which are past. The voice of prophecy speaks alike of each; the Scriptures record them equally; the same Spirit taught the prophets both. In the predictions there is no distinction of time; if there be any such distinction, it is made by men; while the gradual course of time makes that present which was future, and that past which was present. How can we, then, be blamed for believing also what is predicted respecting the future, when our confidence is founded upon the fulfilment of prophecies relating to the present and the past" (quoted by Cumming's *Lect. on Dan.*, p. 425, from Chevallier's Trans.). We lay much stress on this feature in the present work.

In view of this fact, something more may be said to impress its value. No one can fail to see that prophecy in the past and present has been minutely fulfilled—i.e. fulfilled

according to *the plain grammatical sense* contained in it. Analogy, *logically applied*, demands, as Tertullian asserts, a confident belief that that portion relating to the future will be fulfilled in *the same* manner. The same God gave both, and the same power will be exerted in fulfilment. The value of prophecy in this direction arises from the fulfilment according with the grammatical sense—the one that the language obviously conveys, for *then only* can it be legitimately employed as an argument against unbelief. Thus e.g. in the prophecies pertaining to Tyre, Babylon, Nineveh, Jerusalem, the Jewish nation, the church, Rome, etc., all writers lay great stress upon history accurately corresponding with the predictions *in their grammatical sense*. No one doubts the propriety and force of this so far as it relates to the past and present, but just so soon as we undertake to insist upon *the same* grammatical sense pertaining to prophecies describing the future, then a multitude arises and derides our system of interpretation as crude, unreasonable, Jewish, etc. The experience of the past and present is set aside, the appeal of Scripture to such a fulfilment is ignored, in order that a favorite system of Eschatology, inconsistent with a continued application of this sound principle, may be saved. Our adherence to such a literal interpretation is pronounced extravagant, enthusiastic, and *even* fanatical, because, forsooth, in every case we may be unable to explain just *how* the things predicted are to be accomplished. Our faith in God taking care that His Word *shall be fulfilled* when the time arrives is decided as childish and unworthy of intelligent piety. Soberness, intelligence, and piety, they inform us, call for a figurative, spiritual, or mystical interpretation of these prophecies. Alas! what exhibition *of faith* in God's Word! Learning, ability, piety, are joined in resisting one of *the plainest and safest rules* of interpretation given in Scripture and corroborated by history, and no sarcasm or ridicule is spared to make our position odious. Let it be so; nothing that we can say or do will *alter* the Word or *retard* its fulfilment. Wisdom will be justified by her children. But may we appeal to such by making a supposition: Suppose that we and our opponents lived just before the First Advent of Jesus, with our respective systems of interpretation. Suppose these systems be applied by us to the prophecies pertaining to the coming Messiah, *what* would be the inevitable result? Our literal system would, of course, bring out the birth, life, sufferings, death, burial, etc., of Jesus as they took place. The other system, spiritualizing on account of supposed difficulties, would necessarily make figurative or symbolic the facts as predicted. The supposition shows how contradictory the one system would be to fulfilment. But to neutralize this supposed case, it will, perhaps, be said, that we are under another dispensation, and that the history of the church indicates that much is also to be spiritually understood to make it harmonize with the Scriptures. As this matter will hereafter be fully answered in our line of argument, it is sufficient now to say that the change of dispensation does not affect *the interpretation* of the Word, no change of the latter being anywhere intimated; and that the reason why so much is spiritualized respecting the church, etc., is simply owing to the sad fact that predictions solely relating to the future, to another dispensation, to the Jewish nation, to the period after the Sec. Advent, men apply to the present time, to this dispensation, to the Gentiles, and to the church, and the result unavoidably is, that an immense amount of spiritualizing and accommodation must take place to cause these things to fit into their system of belief. A system of interpreting prophecy that cannot be *equally* available in any period of history, in any dispensation, is open, at once, to the gravest suspicion of unsoundness. We, at least, with the early church, reject it as *entirely untrustworthy*, and in the following pages assign our reasons for the same.

PROPOSITION 18. *The prophecies relating to the establishment of the Kingdom of God are both conditioned and unconditioned.*

By this paradox is simply meant that they are conditioned in their fufilment by the antecedent gathering of the elect, and hence susceptible of postponement (as will be shown, *e.g.*, Props. 58–68); and that they are unconditioned so far as their *ultimate* fulfilment is concerned, which the conduct or action of man cannot turn aside (as is seen, *e.g.*, at the very time of the kingdom's manifestation, the nations, Rev. 19, will be arrayed against it). The kingdom itself pertains to the Divine Purpose, is the subject of sacred covenants, is confirmed by solemn oath, is to be the result or end designed in the redemptive process, and *therefore cannot, will not, fail.* The inheritors of the kingdom, however, are conditioned—a certain number known only to God—and the kingdom itself, although predetermined (Prop. 2), is dependent (for this also is God's purpose) as to its manifestation upon their being obtained (the time when this will be accomplished being also known to God).

Obs. 1. Some writers (e.g. Hengstenberg, Art. *Prophecy*, Kitto's *Ency.*, referred to by Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 72) hold that all prophecy is unconditional; others (e. g. Olshausen, *Com.* Matt. 24, vol. 2, p. 255) make it conditional; others again (e.g. Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 72) argue that some are conditional and some are unconditional. There is truth in all these positions, and by combining them the whole truth will appear.

Let the reader notice: (1) To make all prophecy unconditional is to contradict the case of Jonah and Nineveh, Hezekiah, the offer of the Kingdom to the Jews, the temple service of Ezekiel, etc. Take e.g. that of Nineveh: the language was absolute, "yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." Jonah understood it as absolute. But Jonah did not understand what Jeremiah (ch. 18 : 7–9) afterward declared, that underneath predictions which related to *the moral* condition of man there is involved a moral principle of government which God, in justice to His own character and attributes, and also in behalf of the good of man, necessarily cherishes, viz.: that the good or evil predicted of any person or people is dependent upon their moral action. The language of Jeremiah, as Fairbairn justly observes, cannot be otherwise explained: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it," etc. (2) It does not follow from this that all prediction is limited by such a restriction, and hence in its fulfilment is conditioned by the action of man. This would be to narrow it down to mere contingency. If dependent on the repentance and faith of man, then there could be no certainty of its truthfulness, for it may fail, or it may not, according to the use made of moral freedom. Whilst this conditionality is evidently true so far as man is personally or individually concerned, to apply this to those predictions referring to *the Divine Plan of Redemption* is at once to limit the foreknowledge of God, making it impossible to prove that He foreknew the end from the beginning. Such a process would lower prophecy to a very indecisive proof of God's Omniscience and Power. But if God, on the other hand, evinces His foreknowledge by showing in His predictions (as many do) what this freedom of man's will accomplish (without interfering with, or curtailing it), and that He can, and often does, overrule it so

that it shall not interfere with a set purpose (as e.g. Rev. 17 : 17), *then* there is a most decisive proof of God's Omiscience and Power, of a fixed design which *will ultimately* be realized ; and then, too, His appeals to predictions possess a validity and force which, if altogether conditioned, they otherwise could not possess. (3) While both facts are found to be true, conditioned as to personal freedom and unconditioned as to God's ultimate purpose, some take advantage of this feature, and under its shelter make more of the prophecies conditional (e.g. in reference to Jewish nation, kingdom, etc.) than is allowable by the positive declarations concerning *the Divine Purpose* in the Redemption of man and the world. The student, then, must be guarded in the application of the principles which underlie the prophecies.

Obs. 2. The passages (Numb. 23 : 19, 1 Sam. 15 : 29, etc.) which speak of predictions as unconditional, and those (Jer. 18 : 7–10, etc.) which intimate their conditionality, are easily reconcilable from the simple fact, that the purposes of God run in connection with moral freedom, and that whilst the former is not set aside by the action of the latter, yet in the cases of individuals and even nations sufficient latitude is given so that there shall be no violation of that freedom. It may be proper to give some marks by which we may distinguish predictions that will finally be fulfilled from those that are merely conditional. They are the following : 1. Predictions that are bound up with the Divine Plan of Redemption, as e.g. those refering to Christ's birth, life, death, etc. 2. Those which are confirmed by solemn affirmations or by an oath, as e.g. Numb. 14 : 20, 28, Heb. 6 : 17, etc. 3. Those that are incorporated in the Covenants, as e.g. the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants. 4. Predictions which expressly declare that they will take place irrespective of what man will do, as e.g. Dan. chs. 2 and 7, the Apocalypse, Ps. 89 : 33, 34, etc. 5. Predictions that form the basis of succeeding ones and of promises, as e.g. Nathan to David, 2 Sam. 7 : 5–17 (this at first sight might seem an exception, but in another place its due fulfilment will be proven). 6. Those that are illustrated by a parable, as e.g. parable of the tares, net, nobleman, etc. (the parable enforces, or takes the fulfilment for granted). 7. Predictions relating to the destiny of the good, whoever they may be. 8. Those referring to the destiny of the wicked, whoever they are. 9. Prophecies given to the Jews respecting other nations, and not to those nations themselves for purposes of repentance, as e.g., Babylon, Tyre, etc. 10. Those that relate to the establishment of the Kingdom of God, being a revelation of God's will and pleasure respecting redemptive ordering. 11. Those that describe the final restoration of the Jewish nation, this being (as will be fully shown hereafter) essential to secure the manifestation of the Kingdom and the Salvation of the Gentiles.

Stillingfleet gives (*Orig. Sac.*, quoted by Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, App. D.) four marks for prophecies of an absolute character, viz.: 1. A prediction accompanied by a miracle, by which authenticated as God's fixed purpose, 1 Kings 13 : 3. 2. A prediction, when the things foretold exceed all the probabilities of second causes, as deliverance from Egypt, Babylon, etc. 3. A prediction confirmed by an oath, Numb. 14 : 28 ; Ps. 89 : 31–36 ; Heb. 6 : 17. 4. Predictions concerning blessings merely spiritual, because such blessings flow from grace and not merit.

A number of writers, in opposition to us, make prophecy conditional. This arises from (1) applying nearly all predictions (pertaining to the future) to the present dispensation, and not seeing them verified as given, claim that they are conditional. (2) From not noticing that God has a fixed Purpose, and that the unbelief of individuals and of nations cannot defeat that Purpose. (3) In not distinguishing between what relates to the individual and what to the Divine Purpose, as e.g. God purposes to make a certain number of Kings and Priests, which number will be made up notwithstanding the unbelief of many. (4) In not observing that the postponement of fulfilment, occasioned by

the unbelief of man, does not warrant the belief that there will be no fulfilment. (5) In not perceiving that if God's promises relating to the future are conditional, then His Word becomes unreliable to such an extent that fulfilment cannot be predicated of it, and hence history fails to become the witness that God claims. (6) In not noticing that they lower the foreknowledge of God; for if He promises in explicit form a certain event that is to take place and it does not, owing to man's action, then if prophecy is to be a confirmatory witness as intended, the failure, or the reason for the same, ought also to be stated. (7) In not seeing that they reverse the test given by God Himself (Deut. 18 : 21, 22), in answer to the question, "If thou say in thy heart, *How shall we know* the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, *if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken*, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously." (8) In not considering how they themselves constantly violate such a rule when referring to Christ, their view of the Kingdom, etc., claiming that the things believed by them were predicted and thus realized. A writer in the *Princeton Review*, Jan., 1861, on "The Fulfilment of Prophecy," opposes the notion of conditionality on the ground that (1) it is opposed to the inspired criterion, Deut. 18 : 22; (2) Jeremiah 18 : 7–10 did not nullify this test, as appears Jer. 28 : 9; (3) the specific nature of prophecy demands it; (4) Nineveh no objection, for, as Hengstenberg observes, we have only the general statement of the preaching, and not the preaching itself. Comp. p. 12, Lange's Com. on Hosea.

Obs. 3. In view of the important bearing that this point has upon several subjects connected with the Kingdom, it may prove desirable to answer, briefly, a few of the more generally used objections urged against our position. Fairbairn (avoiding the extremes of many writers, and more or less favoring a due medium) says (p. 60, *On Proph.*): "The announcements, consisting of direct promises of good things to come, can only be expected to meet with fulfilment in so far as the church is true to her calling." This is only a half-truth; the promises of future good will be fulfilled, notwithstanding the church's failings, for this God expressly declares (Lev. 26 : 44, 45, Lev. 5 : 42, Isa. 62, Ezek. 14 : 22, 23, and in numerous passages), not indeed in the unfaithful, but only (and here is the condition) in the faithful. The objection stops short at this half truth, forgetting to add (which makes it unconditional, i.e. not dependent on man) that God will secure the faithful in whom the promise, *to its fullest extent*, will be realized.

To indicate the correctness of our position, reference is made to Fairbairn's concession (*On Proph.*, p. 62), when he tells us that the rule applied to good things does not hold good when evil is threatened, for the latter is unconditional. But this is a distinction without any difference; for if the blessing can be forfeited by evil doing, then also the punishment can be averted by repentance and well doing. The truth appears to be this: they are conditional as to individuals, who, according to their action, will be blessed or punished; and they are at the same time unconditional so far as *the purpose* of God is concerned, which is to fulfil His promises to the good and His threats to the evil, i.e. the promises and threats both will inevitably be verified in actual realization. This also covers the leading objection urged by Olshausen (*Com.* Matt. 24): "Everything future, as far as it concerns man, can only be regarded as conditional upon the use of this freedom." This is most certainly true, but only to a certain extent, so far as the individual personally is concerned, and does not affect the prediction or promise itself which is based on two things: (1) God's purpose, and (2) those will be raised up in whom it will be carried out. So far as we are personally concerned it is conditional, for we can choose, etc., but in reference to man even it is unconditional on the ground that it is based on the foreknown fact that *some men* would experience it. This really is, after all, both Olshausen's and Fairbairn's view, although advantage is taken by others to press their language beyond their intention. Thus, to illustrate, an inheritance is predicted and promised to the saints. The saints are conditioned (i.e. they must possess the required characteristics conditioned), but not the predicted inheritance, which will most assuredly be given to those (others, if necessary) for whom it is intended. The future things, therefore, in themselves are not conditioned, *only* our personal relationship to the same.

The promise and the threat both remain on the same footing, seeing that both will be experienced by some. Even when the individual is specifically mentioned or hinted at (as e.g. Paul, Judas, Peter, John the Baptist), the foreknowledge of God embraces the fact that the person designated will, with use of freedom, perform or experience what is predicted. Matt. 19: 28 is no exception, seeing that Judas (who proved unfaithful) is carefully excluded by the expression: "Ye which have followed me."

Obs. 4. The Kingdom itself is not dependent on the acceptance or rejection of its doctrine by man. Man's entrance into and enjoyment of it is conditioned on his character, but the Kingdom itself will most certainly, *at the appointed time,* appear. It belongs to Jesus the Christ; it is His inheritance, the result and product of Eternal Wisdom in behalf of man and the world. Jews may reject it (some Jews also, Knapp's *Theol.*, p. 324, reject Jesus as the Christ, and account for the non-appearance of the Messiah and Kingdom on the ground of the conditionality of the promises—sinfulness preventing their realization), Gentiles may pass it by as unworthy of credence, men may even ridicule it as fantastical, etc., but its establishment is *so certain,* that if absolute necessity required it, God would, rather than failure should intervene, raise up children for it by an immediate (Matt. 3 : 9), supernatural creation. We hold that (Rom. 11 : 29) "*the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,*" i.e. God changes not; man may change, but God's purposes to bestow gifts upon man through Jesus Christ and His Kingdom shall never fail, for (Numb. 23 : 19) "*God is not a man that He should lie; neither the Son of man that He should repent; hath He not said, and shall He not do it? or hath He spoken and shall He not make it good?*" (Comp. Zech. 1 : 5, 6; Isa. 14 : 24, 27; Ezek. 24 : 14; 1 Sam. 15 : 29; Isa. 46 : 9, 10; Ps. 89 : 35, 36; Isa. 48 : 3–6; Tit. 1 : 2; Heb. 6 : 18; Jam. 1 : 17, etc.) Hence two extremes are to be avoided: one is to press the conditional side so far as to involve no settled purpose in God concerning Redemption; the other, to urge the unconditional aspect until it gives hope where none exists.

Let the reader carefully observe this fact, that the Kingdom of God itself is not conditioned, because the promises pertain, in inheriting it, to the seed of Abraham; for if the natural seed at any time makes itself unworthy of it, a seed, engrafted, will be raised up unto Abraham. The promises of God fail not because of the unworthiness of any to whom they are tendered. He will provide, as will be abundantly shown hereafter, the requisite regal body by which the Kingdom shall be powerfully and triumphantly manifested. The inheriting, and not the Kingdom, is conditioned. In this connection, to avoid mistake, another feature must be constantly kept in view, viz.: that the Kingdom is intimately and essentially connected with *the Jewish Commonwealth,* that it is the Theocratic Davidic throne and Kingdom restored under the mighty Theocratic Personage Jesus Christ, and that hence (1) all inheritors *must be engrafted,* and (2) the Jewish nation itself *must inevitably be restored* to its land. This at once indicates the logical and scriptural position of the early church, which insisted that the prophecies pertaining *to the Jewish nation,* whilst conditional as to individuals, and to the nation for a certain determined period, would finally be realized as given. Therefore, one of *the essential* elements of prophetical interpretation is this: to observe that the prophecies relating to the future glory of the Jewish nation—indeed postponed on account of sinfulness—are *not* conditional, but present us *an ultimate* purpose, which shall be verified in its actual history.

Attention is thus early in the argument called to this feature, that the student may keep it before him as we proceed in the development of scriptural facts and statements. The importance of this is not overestimated, seeing that neglect of these cautions has embarrassed and vitiated the interpretation of much Scripture. Two illustrations may suffice: Dr. Alexander, *Com. on Isa.*, following others in elucidating the predictions pertaining to the Jewish nation, is very careful to show how the curses were fulfilled in the history of that nation, but with equal care bestows the blessings promised *to the iden-*

tical nation—to the church. The Christian church is *substituted* for the Jewish nation, and prophecy is lavishly *accommodated* to the substitution. Thus e.g. one of the strongest efforts in this direction is found in the comments of Isa. 63, but he overlooks the entire connection—who is pleading, whose cities are wasted, who is to be restored to the land, the reference to the Sec. Advent, the day of vengeance and year of Jubilee, in which deliverance to a down-trodden people is given. As this passage will be considered at length hereafter, it is passed by with the remark that all such interpretations assume as their foundation that the promises to the Jewish nation are conditional, and the nation failing in meeting the conditions, it will never be restored, and it will never realize the fulfilment. But strange, it is still supposed that the promises themselves remain *intact when* appropriated to the church, provided some incongruities are let alone, such as the promises of the return of material prosperity to a down-trodden land, etc., which is to be spiritualized. Waggoner (*Ref. of the Age to Come*, p. 74) plainly says under the heading, "The conditional nature of the promises made to the Jews :" "It may be remarked that all of God's promises to man are conditional. To deny this is to advocate Universalism, and even to deny Free Agency," etc., quoting in proof of such conditionality Ex. 19 : 5–8, and then argues that the Jews being disobedient, not complying with imposed conditions, the promises of God will ever remain unfulfilled. This is taking a one-sided view of the case ; it is true to a certain extent and within a given time, but *utterly untrue* in so far as it implicates the non-fulfilment of the promises *ultimately* to the nation. For the promises of God, given with the foreknown knowledge of the defection of the nation and its resultant rejection during "the Times of the Gentiles," are based on and confirmed *by the oath of God* (Ps. 89, etc.). As already shown, the Divine Purposes are not limited by what man does. Thus e.g. in reference to the Kingdom, with which the Jewish nation is allied, and in which the nation is promised a pre-eminent commanding position, *the promise is most specific ;* and hence, no matter how many reject the conditions, or how the nation must suffer a prolonged punishment for sin, a sufficient number will be gathered out of the obedient who will form its ruling force, and the nation itself will, *as also promised*, be brought to repentance and faith, resulting in its glory *as predicted*. We must leave the discussion of the restoration to Props. 122, 123, and 124. It may, however, be added : if the Kingdom and the promises pertaining thereto depend merely upon the reception or rejection of the truth by the Jewish nation, *how* are God's promises to be verified to the believing portion of the nation and to that engrafted line? If the fulfilment is conditioned by the disobedience of the unfaithful portion, are the pious Jews to miss the promises of the Kingdom on account of the wickedness of others? Are the promises given to David made null and void? This opens an abyss for our opponents. At present, it may only be said that such a course would neither be *just* to man nor honorable to *the oath-bound* promises of God. Therefore, the Bible teaches us that God, foreseeing this defection of the large portion of the nation, *postpones* this Kingdom, *both* as a punishment to the nation and as a merciful provision, that He may gather out from among the Jews and Gentiles the people necessary for its re-establishment upon a glorious and triumphant basis. The truth is, that this whole matter rests on the question whether the covenants which declare this Kingdom to pertain to the Jewish nation are *temporary or not*. This will be discussed in its proper place, and then the reader will be prepared to decide whether the Jewish nation is entitled to any special privileges in virtue of its covenant relationship. Some writers cannot, and do not, distinguish between the Mosaic covenant and the Abrahamic and Davidic, placing all in the same category. Hence a confusion, and worse, a corresponding restricted interpretation, which quotes prophecy just as it can accommodate it to the church.

PROPOSITION 19. *The New Testament begins the announcement of the kingdom in terms expressive of its being previously well known.*

This is an important feature. Any theory at variance with this fact is, to say the least, open to the suspicion of being defective. The statement in the Proposition is one that has been noticed and duly acknowledged by numerous writers of almost every shade of opinion. The preaching of the kingdom, its simple announcement, without the least attempt *to explain* its meaning or nature, the very language in which it was conveyed to the Jews—all presupposed that it was a subject *familiar* to them. John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Seventy, all proclaimed the kingdom in a way, without definition or explanation, that indicated that their hearers *were acquainted* with its meaning.

Obs. 1. On the face of the opening pages of the New Test. it is taken *for granted* that the Kingdom was something *well known, already the object of faith and hope.* Theologians generally, either unable to reconcile this with their church theories, or deeming it unimportant while acknowledging the fact, pass it by in silence, or give us some apologetics to account for it, which are derogatory to the age, to the believers then living, and to the Word. The destructive critics, seeing here a point of leverage, insist upon it that this was evidence of the prevalence of "Jewish forms," and scoff at it as a decided indication of weakness and failure. By us—for we make no apology, needing none—it is regarded as *prerequisite and essential* to the truthfulness and unity of our doctrine.

Obs. 2. The feature in the Prop. is *an indispensable accessory.* Without it, there would be a flaw, a missing link in the chain; with it there is completeness;—for if the Kingdom is to be understood in *its literal covenanted aspects* as predicted by the prophets, then it is easy to see that the New Test. *consistently* announces the same. If the Kingdom, however, is what the multitude now believe and teach, *then* the announcement is singular, strained, and even inconsistent with the circumstances of the age, the true meaning of the Kingdom, the preaching presented, and the alleged substitution. Nothing, if the latter is correct, in the shape of apologetics can save it from the condemnation and jeers of unbelievers, for, at the most, it would be a mere humiliating accommodation to Jewish prejudice and ignorance. There is no escape from this dilemma.

We are willing to accept of the strictures passed on this feature of the New Test. (viz.: its accommodation to the grammatical sense of the Old Test.) by Strauss, Baur, Renan, etc., and instead of seeking out *some way of escape* which in itself lowers the truth and the character of God in giving such a sense, find in them (avoiding their unjust

conclusions) *renewed strength and power.* As the objections of unbelief will hereafter be met in detail, it is sufficient, for the present, to say that Von Ammon (*Bib. Theol.*), and after him many others, throw doubt on the credibility of the Scriptures on the ground that the New Test. in the very outset indicates that John the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples were susceptible to the errors and prejudices of their Jewish forerunners and hearers, and that consequently, instead of there being one great design relating to the future as attributed to them, we have, in view of the *subsequent change* in the meaning of the Kingdom (i.e. in the discarding of *the strictly grammatical sense* and the substitution of *a spiritual sense*), only detached, isolated positions, lacking cohesion and unity. Sherer (*Mis. of Relig. Crit.*) takes the same view, objecting to the authority of the New Test., because it thus evinces the influence of Jewish traditions, Rabbinical arguments, Messianic hopes and expectations not in accordance with external facts. Numerous testimonies of a similar nature might be adduced from recent writers; these, avoiding their deductions, we will accept, and show, step by step, in a logical, scriptural manner, (1) how they take the unreal nature of the expected and preached Messianic Kingdom *for granted*, and (2) how every writer unjustly overlooks *the expressly predicted postponement* of the realization of those Messianic hopes, and from such a deliberate ignoring of a scriptural fact draws inferences to suit his own fancy and theory.

Obs. 3. To impress this point, let us place ourselves in the position occupied by the first hearers of "the Gospel of the Kingdom." Consider that the Old Test. is alone in our hands, and that *the plain grammatical sense* is the one in which we receive the predictions of the Kingdom. Suppose, under such circumstances, we would have heard John, Jesus, and the disciples preach the Kingdom of God in the manner indicated, what would have been the impressions made upon our minds? Certainly, among other things, that we *already knew* what the Kingdom was, viz.: the Theocracy as it existed previously, permanently united with the Davidic throne and kingdom. The preaching, let us not forget, *directly appeals to a well-known kingdom*, and surely we, too, would have, under its influence, imbibed *the very views* of the Kingdom, which the mass of the church now regards as a Jewish weakness, a lack of discernment, in the early history of this subject. But the question, which but few ever consider, is, whether, after all, this *was an error.* The answer will follow, in detail, with proof attached.

Obs. 4. If the Kingdom, as multitudes maintain, was not thus known; if it is correct to assert that the Jews and the disciples at first utterly misapprehended its meaning; if the announcement denoted one thing to the hearers and yet contained in itself a spiritual idea which the future was to develop—*how* comes it, then, that Christ *could send out disciples to preach the Kingdom without previous instruction* as to its real meaning; and even invite strangers (Luke 9 : 56, 57, 60) to "*Go and preach the Kingdom of God.*" Why does not John and the disciples first receive preliminary counsel, so that, themselves freed from *alleged* error, they may properly teach others respecting the Kingdom? It can be safely asserted (the proof following, as the argument is continued) that it is a well-grounded belief that the Kingdom was something that they were acquainted with, and concerning which, as to its nature or meaning, they *needed not*, owing to its plain portrayal in the Old Test., any special instruction. No other explanation will cover the facts in the case, or sustain the character and position of the first preachers of "*the Gospel of the Kingdom.*"

PROPOSITION 20. *To comprehend the subject of the kingdom, it is necessary to notice the belief and the expectations of the more pious portion of the Jews.*

This is a rule, covering doctrine, laid down by the ablest of writers; it is found in works introductory to the Bible or in defence of the Scriptures (*e.g.*, Horne's *Introduction*, vol. i., p. 393, Birk's *Bible and Modern Thought*, ch. 12, Dunn's *How to Study the Bible*, etc.), as a leading one in the doctrinal interpretation of the Word; its importance and value are urged by various considerations as the only possible way to attain to *a consistent sense* of a doctrine. If the rule applies to doctrine in general, especially ought it to be observed in that of the kingdom.

Modern systems of theology are erected in such an elaborate and systematic mode, a scientific and philosophical manner, that they are widely different from the simple and unscientific—yet purposely designed—treatment of doctrine in the Bible. The effect sometimes is, that the student, attracted by the elegance and magnitude of the superstructure of such systems, underrates the more rugged but firmer stones of the foundation in the Scriptures. Impressed by modern modes of thinking and the results of modern thought, he forgets to transport himself back to the ancient manner of thinking and expression. He lives in a world very different from that which existed when prophets predicted and disciples preached. This naturally leads to misconception and misinterpretation of the Scriptures. Hence it is, that the rule (which Horne, in *Introd.*, justly remarks, is constantly violated by commentators and others) appropriately commends itself: "We must endeavor to carry ourselves back to the very times and places in which they (the Scriptures) were written, and realize the ideas and modes of thinking of the sacred writers."

Obs. 1. It is universally admitted by writers of prominence (e.g. Neander, Hagenbach, Schaff, Kurtz, etc.), whatever their respective views concerning the Kingdom itself, that the Jews, including the pious, held to *a personal* coming of the Messiah, *the literal* restoration of the Davidic throne and kingdom, the personal reign of Messiah *on David's throne, the resultant* exaltation of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, and *the fulfilment* of the Millennial descriptions in that reign. It is also acknowledged that the utterances of Luke 1 : 71 ; Acts 1 : 6 ; Luke 2 : 26, 30, etc., include *the above belief*, and that down, at least to the day of Pentecost, the Jews, the disciples, and even the apostles *held to such a view*. It is not denied, by able Protestant or Romanist, Christian or Unbeliever, that they regarded the prophecies and covenanted promises as *literal* (i.e. in their naked grammatical sense); and, believing in their fulfilment, looked *for such a restoration* of the Davidic Kingdom under the Messiah, with an increased power and glory befitting the majesty of the predicted King; and also that the pious of former ages would be *raised up from the dead* to enjoy the same.

Obs. 2. It is noticeable, that in all the rebukes given to the Jews by John the Baptist, by Jesus and the apostles, not one refers to their belief and expectations concerning the Kingdom. The rebukes pertain to their superstition, traditions, bigotry, hypocrisy, pride, ostentation, violation of duty, etc., but nothing is alleged that they *misapprehended* the Kingdom of the prophets in its fundamental aspects. This is indeed abundantly taken *for granted* by theologians, but without *the least proof* to sustain it. The student will see, as the argument proceeds, that such supposed ignorance would *reflect severely* upon the covenants, prophecies, and preaching of the first preachers of "the Gospel of the Kingdom."

Obs. 3. A few brief testimonies are annexed: Van Oosterzee (*Theol. New Test.*, p. 53–55), alluding to the belief of the Jews, informs us that they held to Messiah's coming in a time of tribulation (which the New Test. confirms at the Sec. Advent), when Antichrist was reigning, and which would result in a great battle (so also Rev. 19, etc.) with hostile world powers. The Christ will be a descendant of David's, will be anointed with the Holy Spirit, will set up his Kingdom in Israel, will remove evil and suffering, will introduce peace and blessedness, perform great miracles, awake first the pious dead Israelites, triumph over the heathen, and allow also non-Israelite nations to enjoy salvation. He then adds: "*Of this Salvation, Jerusalem will be the centre; the purified earth, the theatre; and the restoration of all things, the crown.*" Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 115), under the title "Messianic hopes," says: "The object of Christ's coming may be stated in general terms to be *the foundation* of the Kingdom of God." "There was needed, first, *a political, moral, and religious restoration of Israel*, such as the ancient prophets had foretold," including "the *recall* of the dispersed Jews," and "*the re-establishment* of the throne of David." Schmid (*Bib. Theol. N. Test.*) declares that the Jewish faith embraced the idea of "*a Kingdom of kings and priests; indeed of a Theocracy under a monarchical form,*"—"*an ideally real Theocratic Kingdom of the Messiah.*"

Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 323) has a singular statement. First, he acknowledges that "the ancient opinion" of the Jews was that "He (Christ) would be a temporal deliverer and a king of the Jews, and indeed a universal monarch, who would reign over all nations. Thus they interpreted Ps. 2 : 2, 6, 8; Jer. 23 : 5, 6; Zech. 9 : 4, seq." Secondly, he confesses: "*The apostles* themselves held this opinion *until after* the resurrection of Christ, Matt. 20 : 20, 21; Luke 24 : 21; Acts 1 : 6." Thirdly, he endeavors, as a support to his own theory of the Kingdom, to make out that a small number, instancing Simeon and the malefactor on the cross, did not so much expect *an earthly kingdom as spiritual blessings*. Fourthly, he makes out that *many* united the idea of an earthly kingdom and spiritual blessings. His concessions are all that we need; the effort to introduce the modern spiritualistic view in the case of Simeon and the malefactor fails—(1) because all Jews believed in *the plain grammatical sense* of covenant and prophecy; and (2) because otherwise he makes these two to take a higher rank in the true knowledge of the Kingdom than the apostles (comp. above his concession), who were *specially instructed in and preached the Kingdom.*

Obs. 4. Some writers (as e.g. Thompson, *Theol. of Christ*, p. 33) take the unwarranted liberty of *assuming*, that at the First Advent the Jews (Nicodemus is instanced) believed themselves to be "*already in* the Kingdom of God by virtue of their birth in the lineage of Abraham," and therefore only "looked to the coming of the Messiah for a higher assertion of that Kingdom." *This is misleading.* Where is *the slightest proof* for

so sweeping an assertion? All testimony is opposed to it. Instead of the Jews believing themselves *to be in* the Kingdom, they were looking *for it* to come. In the very nature of the case, it could not be otherwise, since all the prophets foretold its *downfall*, and its *re-establishment* under the Messiah. While holding that their relationship to Abraham would give them admittance therein when it arrived, there is no reason to think that *a single Jew* believed himself to be "*already in*" the Kingdom. On the other hand, we have the most abundant testimony to the contrary in Jewish faith, Jewish tradition, and the intimations of their belief in the New Test. Nicodemus, thus singled out and a foreign faith thrust upon him, was a Pharisee, and the Pharisees (Luke 17 : 20), instead of holding that the Kingdom was already here and that they were *in* it, demanded of Christ "*when the Kingdom of God should come.*"

As intimated under Obs. 3, some writers endeavor to smooth over this Jewish faith as much as possible. Knapp has been instanced. Another specimen in the same direction is to be found under Sec. 99, 1 (4), in his *Ch. Theol.*, where he tells us that some of the Jews gave to the Kingdom "a moral and spiritual sense, denoting and comprehending all the divine appointments for the spiritual welfare of men, for their happiness in this and the future life," etc. The truth is, that this is taking a modern spiritualistic conception of the Kingdom and fastening it upon the Jews, who *never* thus entertained it. Knapp gives *no proof* for his assertions, and they are not susceptible of any. All Jews held to the Messiah's Kingdom in the same way, viz. : as the re-establishment of the Theocracy, allied with the Davidic throne and kingdom, and whilst some laid more stress on the temporal advantages and blessings resulting therefrom, others united with those the highest spiritual and moral happiness. The student, at the vestibule of our argument, cannot be too cautious in receiving such statements unguardedly made by good men. Attention is thus called to them, since they have an important bearing in shaping the interpretation of Scripture. Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 105), admitting that the phrases "Kingdom of heaven" and "coming time" "were frequent at this time on pious lips," adds : "It seems clear that Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Keim (as against Volkmar, etc.), are right in believing that there was at this time (at the First Advent) a fully developed Messianic tradition." Aside from the direct arguments adduced in favor of such a view, the manner in which the New Test. begins (Prop. 19) is amply sufficient to prove it. Hence we deprecate such misleading statements as the following: Walker (*Philos. of the Plan of Salv.*, p. 128), after referring to the views of the Jews at the time of Christ's appearance (viz. : that they believed that the Messiah "would deliver them from subjection to Gentile nations and place the Jewish power in the ascendant among the nations of the earth," etc.), says : "Although *some* of the common people may have had some understanding of the true nature of the Messiah's Kingdom, yet the prominent men of the nation, and the great body of the people of all classes, were not expecting that the Kingdom of Christ would be *purely spiritual*, but that it would be mainly temporal." Now where is *a particle of evidence* that any Jew—much less "some"—had the slightest idea of a "purely spiritual" Kingdom. If it existed, the favorers of such a spiritual ideal would only be *too happy* to produce it as favoring their own view. They, by such efforts to link their modern conceptions of the Kingdom with some *unknown* Jews, only increase the difficulties of their view, for they make these unknown persons *far superior to the twelve*, who, although enjoying *special* teaching and revelation, and *actual* preachers of the Kingdom, entertained (e.g. Acts 1 : 6) the Jewish view down to the ascension of Jesus.

Obs. 5. If, in support of our Prop., Jews were selected, who are not approvingly mentioned in the New Test., it might be alleged that they misconceived the truth. It is proper, therefore, to confine ourselves to such as are evidently spoken of with divine approbation; who were under the divine guidance, and whose statements remain uncontradicted. Being pious, accredited believers, their testimony, whatever it may be, should have considerable weight, and be received as reliable. In confirmation of our position, we appeal to the expressed views of Elizabeth and Zacharias, of Mary and Joseph.

Let this be amplified. Take Elizabeth and Zacharias, who were "righteous" and "blameless," and the phraseology of both fully accords with the idea of the literal Kingdom believed in by the Jews. When e.g. appealing to the prophets as predicting a horn of salvation in the house of David to save the nation from its enemies, to perform the covenant made with Abraham, etc., what was their understanding of this matter? Certainly an implicit trust through the Spirit, that *all* that the prophets predicted would be verified—not something else, but the real predicted subject matter conveyed by their expressions, received in strict usage with the common laws of language. That is, they understood the prophecies in their *plain grammatical sense*, and thus trusted in a literal, earthly kingdom to be erected. The proof that they did so is very evident in the history of their son John the Baptist. The son could not receive, being instructed by them, any other idea of the Kingdom than they themselves possessed. Now it happens that the very writers who so significantly laud and magnify "the enlightened piety" of Elizabeth and Zacharias, and endeavor to engraft upon their language *modernized* notions respecting the Kingdom, all, without exception, estimate John's knowledge of the Kingdom as very "limited and Jewish." Well may we ask, *How comes it*, if the parents were so enlightened that the son, *specially consecrated*, etc., failed in obtaining the same views? The simple fact is, that the knowledge of the Kingdom in both parents and son did not materially differ from that entertained by Nathanael, Nicodemus, or the Jews generally. Next, take Mary and Joseph, and from the announcement of the angel down to the very last—just like the apostles Acts 1 : 6—they believed literally (what has since become so unfashionable, and is stigmatized even by pious men as a mere "Jewish form" or "husk") that "*the Lord God will give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever*," etc. *Why* they thus believed, and *whether* they were correct in it, will be apparent when we come to consider the covenants and promises. The comments of men that these Jews were miserably mistaken and self-deceived are far-fetched and derogatory to the Word; and if they only came from unbelievers it might be safely passed by; but coming also, as they do, from able advocates and defenders of Christianity, it is depressing to the truth. It gives a deplorable cast to the age and to the Scriptures, which, on their face, encouraged such faith and expectations. It ignores the express declarations that some of these Jews (as e.g. John the Baptist) were filled with the Holy Ghost when they held to this faith, and boastingly asserts *the modern supremacy* over these "ignorant" Jews. We, on the other hand, deeply feel that respect for the Messiah-announcing angel, due regard for the utterances of the Spirit, a proper estimation of the character of those ancients, require us to insist that these Jews *well knew* what their own language indicated, and that they were *not deceived* in its application. Consequently we object to the statements made by the writer of the Art. "*Kingdom of God*" (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*): "In these (prophetic) passages the reign of the Messiah is *figuratively* described as a golden age, when the true religion, and with it *the Jewish Theocracy*, should be re-established in more than pristine purity, and universal peace and happiness prevail. All this was doubtless to be understood in *a spiritual sense;* and *so* the devout Jews of our Saviour's time appear to have understood it, as Zacharias, Simeon, Anna, and Joseph." Afterward he confesses that "this Jewish temporal sense appears to have been also held by *the apostles* before the day of Pentecost." Observe: (1) The confusing of "figurative" with "spiritual;" (2) that the apostles not holding to this spiritual conception before the day of Pentecost were not "devout Jews;" (3) that it is admitted that the language predicts a Jewish Theocracy, true religion, peace, and happiness, but this, grammatically taught, is to be spiritualized; (4) that the four persons named thus spiritualized it (!), having higher spiritual attainments than the Twelve—at least, being more "devout."

Obs. 6. A large class, to make the ancient Jewish faith unreliable and inapplicable, fully admit the same, but then gravely misjudge the belief by pointing to the result, i.e. *the non-realization* of their faith, as evidence that the Jews were *mistaken* and wholly *ignorant* of the true idea of the Kingdom. No such Kingdom as they anticipated was raised up under the Messiah, and, *therefore*, this evidences either the human origin of their faith, or else that the language must in some way be susceptible of a meaning different from that contained in its legitimate grammatical sense, which they, in their ignorance, could not understand. But the question is, *were they mistaken?* This is too much taken *for granted*, and upon its

assumption a huge superstructure arises. Briefly and anticipatingly: the non-fulfilment thus far is *no evidence* against the faith, for there are *valid and satisfactory* reasons given in the New Test. *why* it should not down to the present time be realized. This is far from saying that it *never will be* attained. "*The Word of the Lord abideth forever,*" and every "*jot and tittle*" will be fulfilled in God's own time and way. This is simply prejudging the case from unreliable data—a jumping to conclusions from false premises. The reader may, prematurely in our argument, endeavor to decide *how* it comes then that this Jewish faith, if so erroneous and shown to be void by what actually occurred under the Messiah, still continued generally, almost universally, in the Primitive Church for three centuries.

Obs. 7. Another large class, agreeing with the former in the result, inform us that the non-fulfilment of the Jewish Messianic Kingdom expectations, indicates a Jewish misapprehension of Scripture language; and that hence, however the grammatical construction may demand it, the language, covenant and prophetical, expressive of such a faith must be interpreted to correspond with the result thus far attained. The non-fulfilment becomes both the rejecter of the ancient faith and the apologist for applying *a spiritualistic* interpretation. It is *assumed* that the prophecies relied on by the Jews to sustain their faith must mean something very different from its natural meaning—in brief, words, phrases, and sentences that had *a definite* meaning for centuries are, under the impulse of this misconception of the actual facts in the case, *transmuted into something else* to suit existing circumstances. This, too, is represented as faith in the Word—a reception of its divine teachings with implicit confidence. Need we be surprised at infidelity exulting in the gross confusion thus occasioned, and the more gross by implicating as utterly unreliable representative men, men of faith in the ancient church.

The question returns, Were the Jews really mistaken and is any one authorized to engraft another and diverse meaning upon the prophecies which excited their faith, in order that the language may be reconciled with a certain supposed result? The simple, sad fact is this: in this whole matter the Word of God is *unfairly handled* by the multitude. According to their notion of the church as the covenanted Messianic Kingdom, both the primitive and Jewish faith *must be* discarded, and the predictions of the Word *must be* made to accommodate themselves to this Church-Kingdom theory. The true and honorable method is the following: If the events did not take place, and have not yet occurred as predicted and believed in by these ancient worthies (i.e., as far as relates to the Kingdom), it ought to suggest the inquiry, *Why* have they not been realized? and *then* receiving the plain reasons *presented in the Word* why they have been withholden, deeply ponder them, and allow them *the weight* that divine teaching possesses. It is premature to assume, without mature examination, the foregone conclusion that they will never be verified in the believed-in grammatical sense, and thus bring reproach on the Scriptures containing and leading to such a sense; thus heap discredit on the belief of those ancient saints, making them misguided and ignorant Jews; thus hold up to scorn the faith of the Primitive Church, regarding it as mistaken in the leading doctrine of the Kingdom; and then, as a resort against infidelity, search for some *accommodation theory* to shelter those believers and the Scriptures. How can it be shown, with the reasons before us of *the postponement of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent*, that God will not, as predicted, ultimately perform this glorious work? Instead of spiritualizing the language of the Word away into vagueness; instead of decrying the hopes of the pious of former ages (with well-intentioned motives and feelings), would it not be better to look at the most solemnly given assurances, coming from the Christ Himself, that these things are *purposely* postponed? Some preliminaries must first be logically passed over before we are fully prepared to discuss this postponement; if the student will patiently follow our

steps he will be enabled to appreciate the *irresistible* force of the reasons assigned—reasons which for several centuries influenced and pervaded the Christian Church.

Obs. 8. The Apologetics of the Church makes too many concessions to unbelievers respecting the Jewish and Primitive faith, and, alas, too many sneers—according well with the ridicule of infidelity—are cast at their "low," "grovelling," "carnal" views of the Kingdom. Gentiles, in their self-approbation of position and favor, forget the caution given by Paul in Rom. 11 : 20.

Would it not be well to reflect over that which Peter tells us (1 Pet. 1 : 10-12), and not hastily accuse those to whom things were revealed, and to whom the proclamation of the Kingdom was intrusted, as knowing nothing of *the true nature* of the Kingdom and its resultant salvation. We, having the advantage of additional revelations and fulfilment, know indeed more respecting the method of God's procedure, the duration of the postponement, the manner in which the Kingdom is to be manifested, the events which are to precede and accompany it; but they, as well as we now can, knew the main, leading predictions concerning the Kingdom, correctly apprehended the great outlines, perfectly comprehended its nature and relationship to Christ—for all these *were plainly* given in the Scriptures, connected with covenanted promises and confirmed by oath. The difficulties of distinguishing between the First and Sec. Advents (which many eminent men now experience in appropriating prophecies to the First that only pertain to the Second), a smitten and triumphant Saviour, a crucified and exalted King, etc., did not, by any means, efface a scriptural view of the Kingdom itself. This is already shown by the preceding Proposition; for, if otherwise, then no satisfactory reason can be assigned for the extraordinary manner in which the New Test. opens, taking, as it does, a previous knowledge of the Kingdom for granted. If they did make a mistake in their absorbing contemplation of the glorious Kingdom of the Messiah so as to overlook the antecedent humiliation, suffering, and death of the King, let not the man accuse them of ignorance concerning the Kingdom, which led to such a restrainment of prediction, when he to-day reverses their conduct by confining himself so much to the sacrifice that he overlooks the Kingdom.

Obs. 9. The force of Prop. 16, begins to appear. The knowledge that we have of this Kingdom is invariably attributed to the Old Test. Jewish and Primitive belief—over against the modern notion which would *only* find it in the New Test. and then *by inference*—based itself upon what *the Old Test. declared* concerning it. This fact meets us at the very beginning of the Gospels, and comes to us directly in the early preaching of "the Gospel of the Kingdom." *What Kingdom* is taken for granted as known? Evidently the one predicted in the older Scriptures, and hence, *without an investigation* of the Old Test., from whence the Jews and the first Christians obtained their views and expectations, it is simply impossible to obtain *a correct idea* of the Kingdom. The New Test. begins with the conviction that the source of all true knowledge concerning it is to be found in the Word of God previously given.[1] And this information imparted is not merely elementary in the sense that it is to be superseded by something else, for, as we shall show, it is so encompassed by covenant and prophecy, so imbedded in the Divine Purpose as unfolded and attested to *by oath*, that it becomes and ever remains *unchangeably essential and fundamental* in its nature. God *will not, cannot* produce a faith by the unvarnished grammatical sense of His Word, existing for many centuries, and *then* supersede it by another through men engrafting a different meaning upon *the identical* Scriptures which led to the former. Multitudes, indeed, dream that this actually takes place, but it is a vain, idle vision, productive of *vast injury* to the truth.

[1] One of the greatest marks of declension in Church Theology was the neglect that the Old Test. received in certain ages, and one of the most recent signs of improvement is the great attention which it now receives from many able writers in Europe and this country. This was brought about, in a great measure, by the severe attack of Rationalists, etc., upon that portion of Holy Writ. Whatever may have originated the valuable contributions, especially by German theologians, in this direction, it is now fully conceded that without the Old it is impossible to properly comprehend the New, and that both are indispensable to preserve a unity in the Divine Purpose. It is suitable to add, that this is specially and pre-eminently true of the leading doctrine of the Kingdom.

Obs. 10. The belief in this Kingdom had a preservative influence upon the Jewish nation. For, inspired by the hopes set forth in prophecy, it preserved even under the most adverse circumstances a tenacious trust which largely contributed in keeping them from the enervating influences and the idolatry of Asiatic nations. It kept them also, as Mill observes (*Rep. Gov.*, p. 41), from "being stationary like other Asiatics." The hope of the future, as prophetically allied with the nation, served as a bond of union, imparted patience under trial, and kept them separate and distinct among other nations.

PROPOSITION 21. *The Prophecies of the Kingdom, interpreted literally, sustain the expectations and hopes of the pious Jews.*

This is *universally admitted*, even by those who contend that the same prophecies are susceptible of a different interpretation. The plain literal sense *expressly* teaches what the Jews anticipated; and no author has yet arisen who has dared to assert that the grammatical construction of the Old Testament language, received according to the usual laws, does not convey the meaning found therein of *a literal restoration* of the Theocratic-Davidic throne and kingdom as expected by the believing Israelites. Even after the attempted undue advantage taken of this circumstance by unbelieving writers, and after Apologists have informed us that this naked sense is only "the husk" to be discarded, no one has attempted to call the fact of such an existing sense into question.

Believers, infidels, and semi-infidels teach this fact; every author and commentator consulted, every Life of Christ, every Introd. to the Bible, etc., fully admits it. With infidels it is a standing joke that the prophets predicted such a Kingdom. Thus e.g. Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 86) calls it "a gigantic dream for centuries," and "they dreamed of the restoration of the house of David, the reconciliation of the two fragments of the people, and the triumph of the Theocracy," etc. "They dreamed of the Messiah as judge and avenger of the nations," of "a renewal of all things." In view of this, he informs us (p. 266) that "the first Christian generation lived entirely upon expectations and dreams," and that it required "more than a century" for the church to disengage itself from such "dreams," which, however (p. 251), were more or less held, although but "a fantastic Kingdom of God," etc. All that our argument at present requires is simply to direct attention to the concession, however scornfully put, or however attempted to be weakened by accommodation, that the Jewish and Primitive faith is based on *an acknowledged* grammatical sense. We are not concerned at the protest, that if the covenant and prophecies are thus understood, then there is presented "an ideal Jewish King," "languid dreams," "impracticable pedantries," "carnality," etc. The concession is all that is required at this stage of the argument, forming a necessary and important link, for it evinces a correspondence existing between the Word and the early belief.

Obs. 1. Here, then, is something that all, both Jew and Gentile, frankly admit, however some may afterward attempt to break its force and continued application. Let the reader keep this point in view: here is a sense (let it be despised and rejected) that all acknowledge *does exist;* and this sense, thus contained in the Word and for many centuries received by the pious, is *the one* that we receive, until it is proven that there is *a command or revelation* from God to set it aside, or until it is shown that it is in direct conflict with Revelation itself. We have by its adoption (Prop. 4) *a sure foundation* for interpretation, based on a sense which all are forced, willingly or unwillingly, to concede *is found* in the Scriptures; and one, too, which, with a proper theory of the divine and inspired, cannot be easily discarded without *doing violence* to the Word and to the wisdom of

God in bestowing it. This sense *obviously contained* in the Scriptures formed the scripturally derived basis of the Jewish hopes.

Having this allowed sense—i.e. the grammatical—one that the words naturally contain, the student is placed on ground, acknowledged to pertain to Scripture, by which he can test other alleged senses, varied in form, that others engraft upon it. If the careful reader finds that this literal sense produces *a harmonious whole, an unbroken unity* in the Divine Purpose (the great test after all), he surely is authorized, in confirmation of faith, to receive and treasure it as a most precious guide.

Obs. 2. Two classes array themselves against this obvious, admitted sense entertained for centuries. The one party, enemies of the revealed truth, honestly accept of it as existing, but discard it on the ground of its conveying human, not divine, notions and expectations. The other class, friends of the truth, also find and admit this sense, but believing it to be "gross and carnal," endeavor to adapt its language to their own ideas of the fitness of things, and hence attach to it *another, distinct, separate sense* (some even adding two or more), which, rejecting the grammatical, we are to receive as the true intended one.

May it be allowed, without reflecting upon any writer, to say, that such an Origenistic appliance of language which casts us loose from a sense *actually contained* in the inspired Record, is taking *dangerous and undue* liberty with the Word of God. Look at its sad results in the overwhelming mass of mystical interpretation which a taxed ingenuity and an apparently profound learning have heaped upon the Scriptures, rejecting the visible, outward Kingdom taught by the prophecies and substituting for it the vaguest of explanations, and making it appear that God said *one* thing but meant quite *another;* the Jews, John the Baptist, the disciples, being deceived by what was said, not being able to comprehend the spiritual and mystical interpretation that afterward such men as Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and others bestowed upon the grammatical sense. If we reject this one fully acknowledged sense, who can prove to us that *any other* of the conflicting senses, added by men afterward, *is inspired, is truly the Word of God?* What guide have we then—man's added sense, or the one given by God? Thus e.g. if David's throne and kingdom is *not* David's throne and kingdom as the words indicate, and as fondly believed in for centuries, but is, as men in their wisdom afterward developed, the Father's throne in heaven and the Father's Kingdom on earth and in heaven, *how then* can we reconcile it with God's own assurances of veracity, desire to instruct, undeviating truthfulness, etc., that He would clothe His own gracious and merciful words in a dress *calculated to deceive,* and which *did beguile* the Jews and Primitive Christians, His children, into a false faith and hope. No! *never, never* can we receive any theory, however plausibly and learnedly presented, which thus *reflects on God's goodness,* makes Him virtually a party to gross deception, and which degrades the intelligence and piety of former saints. Who can censure us for believing in a sense so generally admitted *as given by God Himself,* placing ourselves where prophets, pious Jews, and the early Christians stood? Having thus in the outset a vantage ground, needing not to prove what multitudes already concede, let us lay aside our "worldly wisdom," and in a childlike dispostion for instruction, follow this grammatical interpretation, carefully gathering up the detached portions, and see where it will lead us. It will reveal a strangeness most surprising, a sublimity most inspiring, and a beauty most delightful, in God's work.

Obs. 3. In view of the faith of the Jews, and from whence derived, it may well be asked: Is it reasonable to suppose that God would give utterances by His prophets respecting a Kingdom, which, taken in their usual literal sense (making due allowance for the usage of figures common to all languages), *positively* denote *the re-establishment,* in a most glorious form under a Son of David's, *of David's cast-down throne and kingdom,* etc., and yet that all these assurances must be taken in a different sense? Men, eminent for ability and piety, tell us that such a transformation is demanded. They may, under the specious garb of "a higher sense"

honestly think to elevate our notions of the predictions, but in reality it is a lowering of the sense actually contained in the Word; for attributing to it (through human authority) another sense, it virtually assumes the position that Holy Writ contains language and ideas that *cannot* be maintained; that God, foreknowing the result, *intentionally* conveyed one meaning whilst (like the Delphic oracle) another was intended.

Let the careful student, at the threshold of our subject, reflect whether such a discrepancy is not sufficient of itself to cause a thorough reinvestigation of this matter. If the Kingdom is not such as these Jews held it to be, who is *justly chargeable* with their error, if it be not the great Author of those prophecies? Every reflection cast upon the Jewish faith in this direction in fact recoils back upon the Giver of the predictions, seeing that on *their surface* is the meaning which led to the universal belief. Now in all honesty, every believer, desirous to vindicate both the Scriptures and the Author of them, must turn away from theories which necessarily reflect upon the Bible, its Author, and the hopes excited by its plain grammatical sense. In the following pages it will be shown at length, every step supported by Scripture, that God gave the prophecies *as truth*, couched *in truthful language* in their grammatical sense; that all, *as written*, will yet be fulfilled; and that the hopes of His people, excited and fostered by *the express language*, will not, as multitudes hold, be disappointed. We may hesitate to adopt, under all circumstances, the bold expression of Pascal: "God owes it to mankind not to lead them into error;" for God, in the provisions made and in the truth given, does not encroach upon an element of liberty, freedom of choice, in human destiny from which may arise error and even crime (by perversion, etc.), as the painful history of Christianity and the world attests. While this may be viewed as permissive and in accord with moral freedom, yet Pascal is correct if the language is applied *to a revelation given by God*. His language, or the ideas conveyed by the same, involve the God directly, personally, and, therefore we cannot, dare not, believe that He will give a revelation that will, if the grammatical sense is received, lead into error.

Obs. 4. As intimated under previous Props. and above (Obs. 2), this grammatical sense thus received and introduced into the New Test. without any declaration of a change, is seized by unbelief as evidence of the non-inspiration of the Scriptures. Thus e.g. Morgan (*Moral Philosopher*) finds, what Baur and others have developed, decided indications that portions of the New Test. contain a deposit of *Jewish-Messianic ideas*, obtained through adhesion to the plain sense of the Old Test. The Swiss Rationalists (Hurst's *His. Rational.*, p. 436) declare on this ground that Jesus Christ is not the Messiah foretold by the Prophets and preached by the Apostles, simply because He did not establish the Kingdom as plainly predicted, etc. They, and others, insist that a fatal discrepancy exists which is not removed by the Christ and the spiritual Kingdom created by theologians. We acknowledge, *as essential*, this "Jewish-Messianic" deposit; we admit that under a misapprehension of the actual postponement of the Kingdom and the still future realization of those "Jewish-Messianic" predictions, theologians have too readily spiritualized the prophecies to make them applicable to Christ, and to the Church at present (and thus make the Messiah and Kingdom assume characteristics *very different* to those assigned in prophecy); but we beg all such to consider, what they on both sides *carefully ignore*, the express promises that all such Messianic expectations *are only to be realized at the Sec. Advent.* The verification of them, owing to sinfulness, *was postponed*, and the object of following Propositions is to bring forth this truth prominently as given by Jesus Himself.

Obs. 5. Men, in their eagerness to rid themselves of the grammatical sense of the Old Test. prophecies and the consequent Jewish belief, resort to the

most desperate arguments and reasoning. Some of these have already been given; others will be presented hereafter; one may be appropriately mentioned in this connection. It is said (and even Martensen, *Ch. Dog.*, p. 235, falls in with the notion) that "the prophecies themselves are typical." This conveniently enables the student to reject the literal sense, and engraft upon it whatever he may consider a suitable fulfilment of the type. It is *a dangerous procedure*, opening a wide door to arbitrary interpretation, and it is pointedly condemned by the rules (comp. *Introds.* to the Bible) specifying and controlling types.

This assumption is a modern philosophical conceit that admirably answers to cover up deficiencies in making out the Church-Kingdom theory—i.e. it attempts to reconcile prophecy with an alleged fulfilment in the church. But it is *unscriptural and destructive* to prophecy; it removes the veracity of God's Word in its grammatical sense by leaving the fulfilment at the option of the interpreter; it weakens an appeal to prophecy, undermining its strength as proof. While there are a few prophetical types (e.g. Isa. 22 : 2; Jer. 13 : 1-7; Jer. 16 : 2, etc.), these are but rare, exceptional cases; the immense mass of prophecy, in no shape or sense, is typical, but real descriptions or representations in language of things to come. Prophecy is a delineation of the future, and not an adumbration of a thing typified, not something that in itself represents an antitype, excepting only in so far as language ordinarily may by use of figure or symbol represent the future. Strictly speaking, however, Prophecy when employing symbols or figures of speech is not typical (Comp. Sec. 3, Part 2, Book 2, Horne's *Introd.*), and to make it such gives place to endless mystical exegesis. Martensen himself affords an illustration of the latter, when, in support of the typical nature of Prophecy, he quotes 1 Cor. 13 : 9, prophecy being also "in part," overlooking its plain meaning that our present limited knowledge is only compared by the apostle with what it will be hereafter, there being no allusion to the characteristics of Prophecy. Having previously shown the nature and intent of Prophecy (Prop. 17, etc.) as the grand guide into the Divine Purpose, it is unnecessary to repeat.

Obs. 6. It is only when we retain *the expressed sense* of prophecy as held by the Jews and Primitive Church, and as admitted to be contained in it, that one of the offices of Prophecy is fully maintained. Thus e.g. Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 32) justly observes that "it is the pre-eminent design of prophecy both to furnish the age to which it is given with a knowledge of itself, that is, of its position and obligations, and also to render the same service to every succeeding age, in so far as its condition, wants, and obligations are similar to those of the former." He explains this by adding that "Prophecy designs, by means of its divine knowledge, to inform the generation of men to whom it is given, respecting both their present acquisitions and also their actual wants, for the purpose of guiding alike in the right employment of the former, and in an earnest search after all that must yet be acquired, before their wants are supplied." Take, now, for granted the supposition of the multitude that for many centuries the Jews miserably misunderstood the prophecies, that they had no correct ideas of the Messiah or of His Kingdom, etc., and *what becomes of the instruction* of prophecy to the generations of men who held to the grammatical sense? And if the office of prophecy really was to *impart* information, to give *certain* knowledge, to *clearly* indicate the present and future state, how could such an office be compatible with *the unjust inference* now made by theologians, viz.: that this information and knowledge was concealed in *an inner, hidden sense*, which would require the raising up of *such* men as Origen, Jerome, etc., to bring it forth out of its "husk," and that for ages men, eminent for piety, must be content with "the outward shell."

Never can we receive any theory which *thus degrades* "the light" that God has given; and, briefly, it would be well for us to be guarded, lest by rejecting what all are agreed the prophecies *really contain*, we place ourselves in the posture of, and ultimately receive the rebuke given to, the disciples: "*fools and slow of heart to believe what the prophets had spoken*" (Luke 24 : 25).

PROPOSITION 22. *John the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples, employed the phrases "Kingdom of heaven," "Kingdom of God," etc., in accordance with the usage of the Jews.*

It is admitted by all authorities that this phraseology was current among the Jews, and was adopted by the first preachers of the Kingdom.

Compare e.g. Knapp's *Ch. Theol.*, p. 323 and 353; Pres. Edwards's *His. Redemp.*, p. 395; Neander's *Life of Christ*, also, *His. Chr. Ch.*, *His. of Dogmas*, etc. Commentaries, Apologetical works, Dogmatics, etc., distinctly announce this fact. Parkhurst's Gr. Lex. refers, as all do, the phrases to a derivation from Dan. 2 : 44 and 7 : 13, 14. Meyer (*Com.* Matt. 3 : 2) says that the Rabbins often used it (referring to Targ. Mich. 4 : 8, Wetstein, p. 256, with which comp. the Mishna) to designate the Kingdom of David's Son. But we allow an opponent (already criticised, Prop. 20, Obs. 5, note) to testify. Art. "*Kingd. of God*" (M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclop.), which spiritualizes these phrases. makes this frank confession: "There is reason to believe not only that the expression 'Kingdom of heaven,' as used in the N. T., was employed as synonymous with 'Kingdom of God,' as referred to in the Old Test., but that the former expression had become *common* among the Jews of our Lord's time for denoting the state of things expected to be brought in by the Messiah. The mere use of the expression as it first occurs in Matthew, uttered apparently by John the Baptist and our Lord Himself, *without a note of explanation, as if all perfectly understood what was meant by it, seems alone conclusive evidence of this.*"

Obs. 1. The Prop. needs no proof, for the fact is self-evident. First is to be found the well-known expectations of the Jews based on a literal interpretation of the prophecies; next, these are summed up in the expressive phrases "Kingdom of heaven," etc., taken, as numerous writers inform us, from Dan. 7 : 13, 14; finally, John, Jesus, and others take *the very phraseology* adopted by the Jews to designate *a certain definite Kingdom*, and use it without the slightest intimation or explanation of *a change* in its meaning; and this employment of the phrases, with a correspondent Jewish meaning attached, continued (as admitted by our opponents, e.g. Prop. 20, Obs. 3, n. 1) at least down (Acts 1 : 6) to the ascension of Christ.

Some, indeed, tell us that Christ had a different conception of it; but they give us *no direct proof*, but only the most remote inferences of their own. The Scripture relied upon for such a view will be examined hereafter in detail. At present it is sufficient to say, that even those addicted to the theory that Jesus gradually engrafted a new meaning, i.e. spiritual, upon the notion of the Kingdom, still frankly admit that Jesus employed *the Jewish* mode of expression (Neander calls them "Jewish forms," as e.g. in "Ser. on the Mt."). Additional proof and illustrations will be given, to save repetition, under the Props. relating to the first preaching of the Kingdom. Our argument and doctrinal position demands that the language of the Jews by which their anticipations were expressed and the language of John and Jesus should happily correspond. Explain it as we may, this *certainly* is the case, and thus far decidedly in our favor.

Obs. 2. Here, at the very fountain head, in the presence and under the sanction of the Master Himself, there must be *no discrepancy*. The fond

hopes and the ardent anticipations, aroused by the speech of the prophets, are too dear to be trifled with, or to be confirmed by a mere spirit of accommodation. It would, if the Jews were in error on *so fundamental* a point, be simply cruel to adopt their expressive language and *thus confirm* them in an alleged blunder, a vital mistake.

With due respect and love toward the eminent men who differ from us, it can be unhesitatingly said, that an error here, and continued for several centuries in the churches established by the apostles, cannot but *vitiate* the entire succession. A rule in law, often quoted, holds good in this place: "Quod initio vitiosum est, tractu temporis convalescere non potest," or the old adage is applicable: "As the fountain, so the stream." Men tell us that the phraseology used, "the Jewish forms," employed, was only "the husk;" *let it be so*, we claim it to be a *God-given* "husk," amply sufficient to satisfy the longings of humanity. No! if these noble preachers of the Kingdom are to inspire unshaken confidence, we must not, with infidels, acknowledge that they believed in, and proclaimed, "Jewish error." For, if this is done, the fountain head itself is corrupted, and all the sophistical glosses, philosophical conceits, additional senses developed, heaped upon it by way of explanation, extenuation, or apology, cannot hide from captious critics the ugly feature—one, too, so glaring and wide-reaching that no person, addicted to reflection, can pass it by without serious misgivings.

Obs. 3. When significantly pointing to the fact, that the idea of a Kingdom of God was familiar to every pious Jew, for which he longed, and prayed, and waited, and that the first preachers adopted the very language in familiar use by the Jew to signify his hope, Apologists inform us (*Ecce Deus*, p. 329) that "Christ came to give that conception a profounder interpretation, and a more intensely spiritual bearing," that "the Jew had a carnal idea of a spiritual fact." But where is *the proof* of this carnality and substitution? Neander, and others, in reply, tell us, that it is found in the higher spiritual conception being wrought out *afterward* in "the consciousness of the church." When, where, and by what instrumentalities, was this accomplished? Was it done by Origen, or Jerome, or the Popes, or the Councils, or shall we allow the claims of Swedenborg and a host of fallible men in this direction? Admit this, and we plunge ourselves into *an abyss* of pretensions and demands, exalting uninspired men above those who were under the special guidance of the Spirit.

It is impossible, *with consistency and safety*, to leave the original Record, and seek for a doctrinal position is so important a matter, derived from men who lived *after* the apostolic period. If the notion of a Kingdom, such as was *afterward* developed by the Alexandrian school, is not to be found in the Gospels, in the opening of the New Test., as recent valuable works on the Life of Christ frankly confess, then surely it is not taking unwarranted liberty to reject it as unreliable, contradictory, and the mere added opinion of fallible men.

Obs. 4. In view of this alleged change in the meaning of the Kingdom, the Liberalists, etc. (as e.g. Johnson's *Orient. Religs.*, p. 794), assert, that Christ proclaimed a Kingdom to come, but "of the institutional meaning of the approaching change, and of the special ways in which his own name would be exalted therein, his record gives no sign that he had the least presentiment." This indicates unfamiliarity with the covenants and the prophecies, the Jewish faith and that of the New Test., for (1) it was not necessary to enter into any explanation concerning *the nature* of the Kingdom, it being something that was well understood, as seen by the adoption of Jewish language, etc.; (2) it is utterly unfair to pass by the Scripture given by Jesus illustrative of the reasons *why* the Kingdom was

not *then* realized as anticipated by the Jews and disciples; and (3) it is uncandid to ignore *the express declarations* (which will be presented in their place hereafter) of a postponement of the Kingdom believed in until the allotted times of the Gentiles had expired, because of Christ's rejection by the nation.

The usual method of dealing with Johnson's objection is to urge that the time for developing the true idea of the Kingdom had not yet arrived, and, therefore, but little is said respecting it, because the Jews and even the apostles themselves were (Acts 1 : 6) unprepared for it. Thus e.g. Schlegel (*Phil. of His.*, Lec. 10) fully admits the views of the Jews concerning the Kingdom and apologizes for their opinions by saying: that the portrait of the Deliverer was drawn by the prophets "in *such vivid colors* in those ancient prophecies, that the description might, in many passages at least, *be easily mistaken* for one of an earthly monarch;" and adds, that the Jews were the more excusable since "all the followers of our Saviour and His most trusty disciples, were *at first* under the same delusion," etc., and finally explains these discrepancies by taking refuge in some generalities, especially that of "a higher spiritual signification" being ultimately attained. But what force has such reasoning with the unbeliever, which places the Divine Teacher, His forerunner, the disciples, and believing Jews in *a most unenviable position*—one opposed to all our notions of propriety and honor? Let the reader keep in view, as additional reasons are presented in the progress of our argument, the utter inability of the prevailing view to reconcile this early belief and usage of language with its modern transformations and substitutions.

Obs. 5. The student is directed to a proof that this subject affords in behalf of the early origin of the Gospels. In looking at the opening of the New Test., the subject-matter of the Kingdom, how it was introduced and retained its "Jewish forms," it shows how unfounded is the view of Edelman, etc., that the New Test. was written in the time of Constantine, or that of more recent writers who make the Gospels proceed from the Alexandrian school, or to be an offshoot of the latter part of the second, or the production of the third century. The Alexandrian school could not possibly, with their ideas of the Kingdom, have originated the Gospels, and this is true of all the later periods assigned.

Thus e.g. the later origin of the Gospels is sufficiently disproven by the exclusive preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom to the Jewish nation (Comp. Prop. 54). Such an idea of exclusiveness could not, in the nature of the case, have originated at so late a period as that assigned by Strauss, Baur, etc., it being opposed to the actual condition of things then existing. Sentences confining the preaching of the Kingdom only to the Jewish nation, ascribing salvation to the Jews, etc., could not have been concocted at the times assigned: it is opposed to the habits and mode of thinking already introduced. Unbelievers themselves acknowledge this, as e.g. the Duke of Somerset (*Ch. Theol. and Mod. Skep.*, ch. 4), who refers to "a Jewish kingdom under a national Sovereign," as clearly taught, and then gives us some reasoning, based on this fact, in favor of the early production of the Gospels. (1) He tells us that the first generations of Christians had in many respects "the distinctive features of Judaism," especially in their notion of the Kingdom. (2) That in "a subsequent generation" "the whole character of Christianity was already changed." (3) Hence, "this chronological testimony appears to refute the theories which ascribe the Gospels to a later period."

PROPOSITION 23. *There must be some substantial reason why the phrases "Kingdom of God," etc., were thus adopted.*

Amid the diverse and antagonistic theories, the only one that rescues the Word from unjust suspicions, that preserves the integrity of the New Testament from entangling concessions and alliances, that honors the faith and intelligent piety of ancient believers, is that which affirms that the truth itself was contained in the derivation of this phraseology, in the hopes excited by it, and in the subsequent adoption of it.

One party (e.g. Apostolic Fathers, with whom we agree) holds, that the adoption of the Jewish phraseology precisely covered the truth, and that, although not realized at the time *for certain good reasons*, it will yet be verified. Another party (e.g. Rationalists, Freethinkers, etc.) asserts that no reasonable excuse can be given for the use of such language, and that all the parties employing it were under a delusion. Some (e.g. Semler, etc.) explain it by the accommodation theory: that John, Jesus, and the apostles accommodated themselves to the prejudices and ignorance of the Jews. Others again (e.g. Neander, etc.) find reason for its use in the development theory, that an outward envelopment of "husk" was well adapted for future growth, the requisite preliminary. Some (e.g. Thompson, etc.) suppose that a very spiritual conception was really taught while the old form was only held in phrase. Others (e.g. Barnes, etc.) admit the difficulty, but without attempting an explanation or removal of it, confine themselves to the new enlightenment given at the day of Pentecost, which they declare transmuted the meaning. Still others (e.g. Renan, etc.) declare that the language was used at first in good faith as the Jews themselves understood it, but that Jesus, finding His own hopes and expectations unrealized by the unbelief of the Jews, changed His plan and a new meaning was introduced. To indicate the extremity to which men are often pushed in the attempt to assign a reason, an extreme and far-fetched one—proven mistaken by the facts—is that of Fleck (*De Regno Div.*, noticed by Lange, *Com.* Matt. 3 : 1-12), who says that Matthew chose this phrase "in order to distinguish the Christian Kingdom of God more fully from the Jewish theocracy." Acts 1 : 6 is a sufficient answer.

Obs. 1. The attacks of Rationalistic criticism has induced the advocacy, by many, of the accommodation theory. This, however, is a virtual concession to the force of destructive criticism, and, as such, is hailed as a decided indication of weakness. It is reluctantly wrung from the advocates of Christianity, because, with their theories of the Kingdom of God, with their rejection of the Primitive view, they could not invent a better refuge from their assailants. It is but *a sorry refuge* in the end, seeing that it teaches, when stripped of its circumlocutory and apologetic dress, that the Jews held one notion of the Kingdom and Christ entertained another; and that for fear of the Jews, who were unprepared through prejudice to appreciate the Kingdom, Jesus adopted their language, saying *one thing*, but all the time meaning *something else*. Or, in other words, He taught, under a borrowed garb, what the language *did not and could not* indicate to the Jew, as evidenced in the history of His own disciples, Acts 1 : 6. But is such a hypothesis, for a moment, *tenable?* Can we entertain the idea that teachers of the character and profession like John,

Jesus, and the disciples, would directly or indirectly connive at that which is false? The moral and divine position of the persons makes the supposition inadmissible. If it were allowable to do so in reference to *so vital a subject* as the Kingdom, *how* can we be sure that other declarations are not also an accommodation? What criteria could be given to distinguish between the false and the true? No: such a theory, however well intentioned, is a virtual lowering of the divine teaching of Jesus, a rendering of the utterances of the first preachers an uncertainty, and a yielding of Revelation to the sneers of unbelief at its lack of coherence.

It is the fashion of a large class of modern critics and historians (in otherwise estimable writings), unable to reconcile the preaching of John, etc., with their own notions of what the Kingdom should be, to inform us that the first preachers of the Gospel of the Kingdom accommodated themselves in the doctrinal exposition of the Kingdom to the prevailing opinions and prejudices of the Jews, waiting for time and cautiously given lessons to enlighten them by degrees, etc. Many who censure Semler for pressing his theory beyond the bounds of propriety, and have even written against his more gross departures and denials of truth, do not mend the matter when they themselves, on the leading subject of the Kingdom, *fully admit* such an accommodation, on the ground that the Jews were not prepared for the real truth. For, receive this, and then it logically follows: (1) John, Jesus, and the disciples must have *taught error*, so far, at least, as the outward form and the Jews were concerned; how else, unless in their *usual acceptation*, could the Jews understand their words? (2) If the Jews misunderstood them, *how* could they be held accountable for it, when thus tempted to a misapprehension by the ambiguous use of current language? (3) The pure character of Jesus is presented to us in an invidious and disreputable light. So long as the theory is advanced, so long a dark flaw appears, and all the apologies annexed to it *cannot* sustain His spotless reputation. The only accommodation in Jesus, and from whence this theory is inferred, consisted in His concealing, or not avowing, certain truths pertaining to His Person and the Kingdom until His disciples were better prepared for them, but *never* did He speak without uttering *the truth itself*, both as to His Person and the Kingdom, sometimes plainly, sometimes in figure; *never* did He use language which was specially adapted to lead into and confirm error on account of the prejudices of others. It cannot be proven that He *in any way* sought refuge in words, that were outwardly compliant with "Jewish error." If this were so, then Revelation itself would become involved in uncertainty, no one being able to discriminate between mere accommodation and its opposite. (Comp. Knapp, Horne, Schmucker, Storr, Titman, Heringa, and others, who expose this fallacy.)

Obs. 2. In immediate connection with the accommodation theory, not pressed however to the same extreme, is that of the development theory. While noticed under Prop. 4, yet its important bearing to our subject and its extended use, will allow additional remarks. To avoid misapprehension, let it be premised that we also believe in development, in the progress of Christianity, in the continuous gathering of the elect, of "them that believe." We also hold to doctrinal progress in a certain sense, distinguishing between the primary and inferred truths; the former being solely contained in the Scriptures and obtained by comparison of them; the latter being the result of reasoning induced by such comparison, by observing the statements, history, analogy, etc., of doctrine. The former belongs more to the vision of faith, the latter to that of reason; for the one contains things beyond human knowledge, and the other is the outgrowth of the activity of man's mind, arising from induction, deduction, inference, etc. Having already defined our position under Props. 9, 10, 15, it is sufficient to add, that we cordially accept of the truthful utterance of Dr. Schaff (quoted Hurst's *His. Rational.*): "Christianity itself, the saving truth of God, *is always the same and needs no change*, yet this can by no means be affirmed of *the apprehension* of this truth by the human

mind in the different ages of the church." Two cautions are only to be observed: (1) never to elevate this apprehension of the truth by the human mind and expressed in books, writings, etc., to the same standard of excellency as that of the Scriptures themselves; and (2) never to allow such an apprehension to be rated as a legitimate progression of divine inspiration. On these two points, the development theory pushed to an extreme, offends. This will be presented, to save space, in the following note.

It may be well, first of all, to notice that this notion of doctrinal growth, under the development theory, from the imperfect conception of the apostles to the full revealed truth in "church consciousness" (whatever this glittering generality may mean), is sought to be based on two passages of Scripture, viz.: Mark 4 : 26–29 ; Matt. 13 : 31–33. The Parables will be examined in detail hereafter ; it is sufficient to remark on the first one, which is regarded (Neander, *Introd. to Ch. His.*) as the keystone of the arch, that the seed sown, the blade, the ear, the full corn in the ear, have *no reference* whatever to doctrinal progress or development, for if it had, *then*, logically, the harvest at the end would be a harvest of doctrines fully grown, an evident absurdity. What is here meant is clearly seen by the parallel passage in Matt. 13 : 24–30, when the tares and wheat are separated, etc. Truth, doctrinal truth, the same that Jesus and apostles taught, is the seed deposited in the heart, and its moral influence is delineated. The parable clearly, in its connection and design, shows that the seed has its effect on the man, its germ being holiness, producing piety in the individual, which enlarges and develops. The seed of truth is always *the same*—it changes not—being the same to-day that John, Jesus, and the apostles sowed ; otherwise, taking the development for granted we would sow, not seed, but the blade or the ear, or even the full corn, which is an absurdity. The analogy that they seek to draw out of it, does not hold good ; the growth is represented as continuous, but such a doctrinal growth is not to be found in the church, for as the history of the church attests, faith in some very important points was frequently shifted and became antagonistic.

The development theory, virtually taking a low estimate of the contents of Scripture, and yet anxious in some way to honor them, has recourse to a divine outgrowth from them in man in order to obtain decisive truth ; and this alleged result of outgrowth it elevates to an equality with, and even, in many instances, above the Scriptures. Take the most guarded and able expositor of this theory, as Dr. Neander, and the student becomes painfully conscious that something sadly defective must exist in a system which causes so good a man to teach that the mental and moral condition of the Jews, the disciples, and the apostles was such that Jesus had to give them the truth in *a very diluted* form—so fine indeed that it was only "the germ," and this surrounded by "a materialistic husk." Gravely, honestly, naively we are told, that this "husk" was the only thing that was perceived and appreciated until a process of growth removed it. Conceding that some things were not revealed until a later period, that other things were purposely given with obscurity (comp. Props. 11–15), it is an unfounded and damaging opinion that a leading doctrine, the prominent subject of preaching, the opening doctrine of the New Test., was thus confined in "a husk," and finally correctly apprehended. The tendency of such a theory is to disparage the early ministry to the Jews and to lower the apostolic times, showing that by growth the church has undergone *material modifications* in doctrine, and then defending *such radical* changes on the ground of progress, and appealing for proof, to sustain all this load, to the authority of "*church consciousness.*" While admitting the idea of progress and growth, but in a different way, it does not follow that such modifications, because they took place in the church, are indicative of *true progress*. Indeed in the Word itself we are warned against doctrinal and other changes as productive in error, fruitful of unbelief, and prolific of evil. Under the plastic hand of this theory, some venture even to take the relapses, divisions, weakness, etc., of the church, and turn them into signs of life and vigor, telling us that these things were necessary for the age as educators, forerunners, etc., in order that greater good might result therefrom. In a specious philosophical manner attempts are made, in violation of all order, to weave into the web of Christianity, as essential to progress, conflicting theologies, rival sects, the corruptions of man, etc., until finally, as Eaton (*Perm. of Chris.*, p. 45) says : "It is like a tree drawing its growth from its own dead leaves." Men of ability will, in this direction, sagely declare that what was once truth in one age must, in the march of progress, give place to other truth *better adapted* to the knowledge and wants of man—the successive shells give place to new-

fledged outcomers. This *nonsense*—for it is nothing less—passes for wisdom with many who profess intelligence, not seeing that it strikes *a vital blow at all established truth*, and leaves us no firm scriptural foundation for our feet. Let us not credit such palpable absurdities, which, intended by amiable men as a defence of Christianity, strike deadly blows at the very heart of all scriptural truth, and ultimately find their resting place in a disguised formula that evil in growth is a necessary adjunct to produce the good, obtain the proper symmetry, etc.

The last expressed thought is abundantly justified by the use to which this theory has been applied. Under the friendly manipulations of men like Dr. Neander, under the amiable, kindly handling of Dr. Nevin, under the pious touch of Rev. Miller, it might not result in great injury, however it prevented a reception of apostolic truth because of its supposed incipient state. But this fascinating favorite of so many of the Orthodox happens to be *a double-edged sword*, that cuts both ways. The Hegelian view that every development of life starts from its lowest, poorest form to rise to a higher and richer one by slow degrees, and which was deemed so appropriate to cover up supposed (not existing) deficiencies in doctrine, has been seized by the Tübingen Baur and others, and has been applied with tremendous force to the apostolic times, so that the multitude, misled by the caricature given of its beginning (the lowest form), and trammelled by its apparent contradictions, violently oppose the Bible itself. Christianity, too, is put down as a development in the history of universal religion, which in this onward growth, constant advancement, irresistible progress, must give place to "the full ear in the corn." Leckey (*His. Rational.*) informs us that in the progress of the race, Christianity was indeed a necessary but still imperfect development, and that the highest will be found in reason accepting from all the past forms of belief that which best corresponds with the freedom of progressive reason. This is a favorite theory with Freethinkers (e.g. *Essays and Reviews*) of every class (as e.g. Büchner, etc.), and under its ample folds they find congenial shelter and warmth for their various systems. With united voice, aided and strengthened by honest and unsuspecting believers, they tell us that the early church did not clearly apprehend the truths of Christianity, especially *not* that pertaining to the Kingdom; that it was enveloped in Jewish forms and Jewish thought; and that it required centuries of natural progress from the lower to the higher before the truth could be fully presented; and which truth, finally in the shape of well grown "wheat," is harvested by themselves. How large a number of books are issued to-day full of this plausible theory, in which unbelief characterizes doctrinal Christianity as "a stage of progression in the human mind," and portrays "all religious truth as necessarily progressive," so that we, by development, can improve upon the "germs" given by God and His Son. It acts out this spirit by changing, adding, striking away, and substituting, until it glories in producing a *new* religion, the much boasted one of humanity. Its humanity can be safely admitted.

Let no firm believer of the Supremacy of the Word, even if in a Christianized form addicted to this theorizing, censure us for writing so plainly our convictions. It is a subject upon which we deeply feel, knowing full well that it is the great obstacle in the way of intelligent men to a return to the Primitive doctrine of the Kingdom, and that it is the grand source from whence issue the shafts poured against the teaching of the apostolic church. Its ramifications are found everywhere and its adherents form the immense majority. Leckey (*His. Rational.*, p. 183) thus eulogizes its extent: "This idea of continued and uninterrupted development is one that seems absolutely to override the age. It is scarcely possible to open any really able book on any subject without encountering it in some form. It is stirring all science to its depths; it is revolutionizing all historical literature. Its prominence in theology is so great that there is scarcely any school that is altogether exempt from its influence. We have seen in our own day the Church of Rome itself defended in 'An Essay on Development,' and by a strange application of the laws of progress." Every student knows the tremendous influence that this theory is now exerting in its modified or extreme, Christianized or rationalistic, forms. Rioting in its *assumed* intelligence, it starts out with the principle, often glossed over and refined with velvety language, that the writers of the New Test. were not infallible, for in some things (e.g. the preaching of the Kingdom) they were in error, encompassed by "Jewish forms;" then it advances the self-satisfying notion that in and through the church there is a progressive revelation of the truth, so that as the Gröningen school (re-endorsed by the Parker school, etc.) boldly proclaims, Augustine stands higher and knew more of the truth than John or Paul, Luther had far more than Augustine, more recent divines of eminence have more than Luther, and, to keep up the intended comparison, these Gröningens (Parkerites, etc.) have more truth than all the rest that preceded. Here, at least, is modesty in a modified, developed form! How

prevalent to-day, under its influence, in organized bodies, sects, conventions, etc., is the spirit of the Leyden school (Hurst's *His. Rat.*) that, owing to these "husks" found in the early mistaken preaching, we must distinguish between the Scriptures and the Word of God; that the former are human compositions, containing some truth, it is true, but that the latter, which God reveals in the human spirit and in the progress of man, is to be vastly preferred; thus opening the cry from ten thousand thousand throats, "We have the revealed Word of God in its advanced and latest form." From whence mainly come those questionings of the Primitive view of the Kingdom of God; those assertions that the Jews, disciples, and early Christians grossly misapprehended the Kingdom; those affirmations that the Reformation showed its weakness and inconsistency by substituting the authority of the letter for that of the Spirit; those claims of the exclusive possession of the truth to the disparagement of "holy men of old;" those epithets of scorn and derision so liberally applied to the grammatical sense of the Scriptures? They spring chiefly from this development theory, forming "the Modern Theology," "the Liberal Theology," "the Free Religion," "the New Church," etc. The theory itself is abundantly developing fruit in the hands of infidelity, making men wiser than the Scriptures, far better preachers of the Kingdom of God than John the Baptist, disciples and apostles; and this is either elegantly or offensively maintained according to the culture of the adherent, thus calling upon us to put our trust in men as they successively arise. We desire, however, a more solid foundation than the shifting utterances of men, one superseding another in endless succession, and this we find *only* in the plain teaching of Revelation, embraced even in the first preaching of the first great teachers commissioned by heaven. For us, the development theory, as currently expounded and incorporated in theologies, is *too latitudinarian* either for doctrine, well-grounded conscious belief, logical connection of Scripture and history, and honorable, consistent defence of the truth. Pushed to its *extreme*, it constantly shifts its position, claims new and antagonistic doctrine (or none at all), casts aside faith and exalts reason, glories not in prophets and apostles, but in modern scientists, buries itself in hypotheses, mere speculations, and calls such divine revelations. In all its varied forms, one distinguishing feature appears, viz.: that it is destructive to *the authority* of the Scriptures by raising above it the utterances of fallible men. This is clearly seen in the history of the leading doctrine of the Kingdom.

The development theory is also becoming patronized by Roman Catholic theologians (e.g. Dr. Newman), for it becomes the best medium through which to apologize for doctrines unknown to the first teachers of Christianity, and for the non-reception of doctrines (e.g. Millenarianism) once generally held in the church. It is admirably adapted to excuse and gloss over the recent authoritative doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility. J. H. Newman (*Essays*, etc.) tells us that Christianity required time for its comprehension and perfection, and hence, to understand it, a growth is necessary, so that we in this age, availing ourselves of the teachings (growth) of the church, understand divine truth better than apostolic fathers, etc., because time enables it to free itself from all foreign elements, etc. This then is applied to the doctrinal statements of the Bible—e.g. the early preaching of this Kingdom—and we are justified in receiving "*the traditions of men*" in their place. "Liberal Christianity" desires no better basis than this to rest itself upon; and numerous recent works abundantly avail themselves of it. Even if the mildest form of its advocacy by Neander and others is carefully examined, it leads us precisely to this Roman exaltation of church authority. It, too, begins with a lower form and rises during the centuries to a higher; it also tells us that the noticeable deficiency of true knowledge of the Kingdom in John, the disciples, and apostles—this presentation of "the husk" containing the still unappreciated "germ"—is to be fully made up in *the aftergrowth* of the church, i.e. in its teaching and consciousness. If we ask, whose teaching or consciousness is to be followed as a guide, the Romanist's response comes back to us: that of the church in the decisions of Popes or General Councils; the Protestant, wedded to this conceit, answers: that of the church as contained in Councils, Synods, Creeds, etc.; and both in the reception of a doctrine (e.g. of the Kingdom) afterward fastened upon the church, elevate this to an inspired position, making it of equal weight with the Scriptures, and if it happens to be opposed to Holy Writ, even placing it above the Word. Practically there is no difference between the two; both profess that their church decisions emanate from the Holy Spirit; both claim that the truth developed by growth is superior to the germinal doctrine of the Kingdom; both decide that the utterances of the prophets (i.e. the interpretation), the expectations of the Jews, the first preaching of the Kingdom, the faith of the disciples, must be tested, as to the amount of truthfulness, by what *the church said and decreed* long after; both attempt to correct the grammatical sense by an added one

to make it a little more accordant to present views; and both, by such a judgment of doctrine under the plea of growth, degrade God's own revelation to a secondary place. This may answer to prop up a tottering system, but we earnestly protest against this leavening process being introduced into—with the purest of motives—Protestantism—a process by which, under the plea of progress and development, the authority of Bible truth is certainly undermined. Let us be sure of this: that any *professed increase* of knowledge which *conflicts* with the plain meaning of the Bible is not in the direction of true development.

Even men who are strongly inclined to our views, and in many places admirably sustain them, fall into this development theory. Thus e.g., to indicate how it influences even the minds of earnest thinkers, let the reader calmly consider Lange (*Com.*, vol. 1, p. 236–7) where the parables, under this notion, are treated as representing a historical succession of periods or stages in the church. This can only be done by an arbitrary use of the parables, forcing them from their legitimate design, and making them inconsistent one with the other. They indeed represent or illustrate things pertaining to the church, individual and world, in relation to the Kingdom, but no such succession can be possibly obtained from them without violence. Many examples, where this theory is pressed into the aid of interpretation or application of Scripture, will suggest themselves to the reader. We may conclude, then, by saying, that a theory which can take a once universally entertained faith of the church (as in this doctrine of the Kingdom) and substitute another for it without the express warrant of God's own Word, is *certainly unreliable and defective.* And any theory which, under the specious plea of progression and perfection, promises constantly increasing and advancing knowledge until the development brings forth the blaze of the noonday Sun, runs directly against *the plainest teachings* of the Holy Scriptures that inform us of the contrary. If there is a truth clearly taught it is this: instead of looking for such pleasing growth, we are exhorted to look for continued apostasy, rejection of the truth, etc., until it culminates in the oppression of the church, the martyrdom of saints, and such fearful woe that the Lord Christ Himself shall come in vengeance as the Deliverer. Alas! why will men allow some favorite theory to obscure the clearest announcements of heaven?

Obs. 3. Others arise who totally ignore any reason whatever for such phraseology. Advocates of progress, they do not even seek to employ the phrases as expressive of a higher or deeper meaning, gradually evolved in the advancement toward perfection of knowledge. Like the Parker school, they tell us that God is constantly issuing New Testaments, inspired by the same common, universal inspiration, and the later supersede the earlier. The Kingdom once preached is an idle dream, fit for ignorant Jews and disciples; for inspiration in others (as e.g. Renan) has announced it to be "a chimera." Many, too, that would recoil, justly, from being classed with such men, adopt theories respecting the Kingdom and the early belief, which *logically and consistently* places them on a leading doctrine of the Bible in the same category. Allusion has been made to such under Prop. 5, and it is found that they all claim, under special enlightenment, the liberty of rejecting the meaning attached to the Kingdom before, and at, the First Advent, and for several centuries following. They assume the additional liberty of substituting a meaning, which to them seems correspondent with their ideas of things now existing.

It is a sad fact, that it has become fashionable to place the fulfilling of the law and the prophets in a purely moral light, and *the more spiritual* it can be made to appear, *the more satisfactory* the explanation. The literal aspect of the subject is overlooked, passed by in silence, or obtains a subordinate toleration, both as it refers to the First and the Sec. Advent. The great boast of the age, coming from the most adverse directions, is *the wonderful increase* of spiritual knowledge—a spiritual illumination that smiles at and ridicules the simplicity and credulity that can believe what the plain grammatical language of the opening New Test. teaches. Men arise, and, under the seductive influences of mystical conceptions, gravely claim that they, like—yea, some even more than—the apostles, are led into all truth by the Spirit. For all such there is an unerring test: if

any teaching is directly opposed to that which is recorded in Holy Writ, it is to be rejected at once, because the Spirit will not be in conflict with truth previously given. Truth is harmonious and not discordant; the Spirit is not antagonistic to itself. Admitting progressive knowledge in some things, it is derogatory to true knowledge to say, as do others (*Ecce Deus.*, p. 39), that the men of to-day know everything concerning the Kingdom better than the original disciples and apostles; which, echoed from many a platform, is levelled at the foundation of scriptural authority in order to secure its overthrow. For, if we are better witnesses, more competent to state the truth than those *specially selected for this purpose by Jesus*, what force can their words possess? To avoid this destructive rock of unbelief, it is necessary to hold that *true* progressive knowledge must be in strict accordance and sympathy *with the first preachers* of the Kingdom of God. Cast down the position that the Holy Scriptures contain the doctrinal truth, and the wide door is opened either to boasting unbelief, or to the traditionalism of Roman Catholicism, or to the vagaries of mysticism, Swedenborgianism, Fox, Ann Lee, Joseph Smith, and a thousand others (including the latest, J. T. Curry of Georgia, the so-called "prophet and apostle of a new dispensation"), together with the speculations of Spiritualists, Liberals, Freethinkers, Friends of Light, etc. If we once cast loose from the anchor *provided by heaven*, there is no end to the claims made upon our belief—every one, too, assuring us that he has the truth. The simple fact is this: it requires an immense amount of assurance and pride (without questioning the honesty and motives of the parties) to think that we know far more than Peter, John, Paul, etc., when all our knowledge of divine things is based on that given by them, and when we really have but a small portion of that which they possessed under *the special guidance* of the Spirit. Hence, we repeat, that increase, growth in our knowledge must, *so long* as we receive the Scriptures as divine and authoritative, be *in unison* with them. Every enlargement of doctrinal apprehension, every conception of doctrinal truth, must find its affinity, its foundation in the Word of God. In the development of view, that which occurs outside and as a consequence of the Divine Record, the expression of human opinion, must be carefully distinguished from a doctrinal growth legitimately (i.e. by comparison, analogy, etc.) derived from Holy Writ (comp. Prop. 9, Obs. 3, on Doctrine). Any growth unnatural to the Word itself (i.e. not plainly contained in it) may be set down as a foreign growth, produced by grafting on the stock a branch taken from an outside source. Men in search of truth must return to *the old-fashioned notion* that God's words are "*pure words*," and that *His doctrine* does not require the devices of human wisdom either to be remodelled, or changed, or burnished. They speak for themselves.

Obs. 4. Others, again, under the plea of *non-essential*, pass by this early use of phraseology and its resultant effect on the church. In the reaction against formalism, infidelity, etc., they go to the extreme of asserting that a few elementary truths, sufficient to reach the masses, such as repentance and faith, are all that are requisite. Their theological sphere is the most narrow and contracted, and the great fundamental theological questions relating to the Divine Purpose in Redemption are totally ignored. This class finds no difficulty whatever in the early preaching; for whatever does not directly teach their view of the Kingdom is easily made to do so by spiritualizing the grammatical sense.

Obs. 5. One of the most skilful, but abortive, efforts to reconcile the utterances and expectations of the disciples and apostles with the notion of a present spiritual Kingdom, is given by Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol. of Apos. Age*). He frankly acknowledges, what he calls their Judaistic views, etc., but in the attempt to explain the matter, most amazingly sacrifices the character of the apostles. Their reputation and scriptural standing as *inspired* teachers, suffers in many a sentence, and a devout believer of the Word arises from the perusal of the work with a deep feeling, that if Christianity needs a defense *so depressingly apologetic, and so shockingly degrading* to the first teachers of it, then something is *radically wrong* in its fundamental source. It will not answer to find, with a Hegelian micro-

scopic vision, a germ here and a germ there enveloped in a rude "husk." Truth, when thus handled, must, and does, suffer in the house of its friends.

Many writers of eminence fully admit what they call "Christianity circumscribed at first within the narrow limits of a people's hopes," but assert as Reuss, "The more conversion and faith were recognized as the essential elements of the Gospel, the more did mere hope become subsidiary." Right here is one of the difficulties: hope, which is also one of the essentials ("we are saved by hope," etc.) of the Gospel, is placed in the background because deemed "circumscribed," and individual religious experience, mystical conceptions, etc., take its place. Illustrations drawn from various authors will follow in succeeding Props.

Obs. 6. We are indebted to Jerome, and others like him, for the peculiar style—now so familiar—in which the old views respecting the Kingdom of heaven are sought to be eradicated, as based on no solid reason, by using the epithet "Judaizers." Thus e.g. in his note on Isa. 11 : 10–16, he lays down the broad, erroneous canon (which Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 254, seems approvingly to quote): "Let the wise and Christian reader take this rule for prophetical promises, that those things which the Jews and ours, not ours (but) Judaizers, hold *to be going* to take place carnally, we should teach *to have already taken place spiritually*, lest by occasion of fables and inexplicable questions of that sort (as the apostle calls them), we should be compelled *to Judaize.*" What an admirable guide! Under the plea of carnality, which is made to cover *the grammatical sense and literal fulfilment*, the prophecies are to be spiritualized, *no matter how*, only so that they teach nothing which may be accounted "Jewish." Need we wonder that the truth was overpowed by such tactics of interpretation.

Obs. 7. All these methods assume as fundamental, that the Jews and early believers were certainly mistaken and deluded. Not one attempts to give a valid reason for the belief entertained. Now the impression made to cover up a supposed deficiency in the Jews and first preachers, and also produced by the rejection of the doctrine of the Kingdom (held for several centuries), on the specious but treacherous ground of superior knowledge —no matter how obtained, by growth, spirit, reason, spiritualizing, etc.—is this: that if the Word of God is really founded on what it professes, viz.: the inspiration of holy men, *it must not* contain so glaring an inconsistency. We shall now proceed step by step, continually fortified by Scripture, to show that the inconsistency *only exists* in the imagination of men; that the grammatical and historical sense is *fully sustained* by a continuous Divine Purpose; that the first preachers of the Kingdom, although not acquainted with all the designs of God in relation to the Kingdom, were not in error on *the nature* of the Kingdom itself; and that neither they, nor Jesus, by the use of the literal sense, *accommodated* themselves to the prejudices, etc., of the Jews, depending on a future development or revelation for a purer doctrine. To do this, constant appeal shall be made "*to the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them*" (Isa. 8 : 20); but while thus employed, it is hoped that the reader will not fail to imitate the noble Bereans (Acts 17 : 11), who, instead of looking outside of the Scriptures for growth, etc., "*received the Word with all readiness of mind, and*

searched the Scriptures daily to see whether these things were so." Such a position is the more necessary, since many professing to make this appeal darken *the simple testimony* of Holy Writ to sustain an honestly entertained theory—a failing to which, through infirmity, we are all liable. Hence the greater need of caution, and of a personal reference to the Word.

PROPOSITION 24. *The Kingdom is offered to an elect nation, viz.: the Jewish nation.*

This election is so plainly stated in Scripture, and it is so currently admitted in our theological works, that it needs no proof. Such passages as Deut. 7 : 6 and 14 : 2, Rom. 11 : 28 and 9 : 11, etc., are decisive, that the sovereignty of God chose in the descendants of Abraham, the Jews, a people *through whom* should be manifested his Divine purpose in the salvation of man. Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 71) has aptly said, in view of children being raised up to Abraham against the course of nature: "He, therefore, chose in Abraham a people which was called into existence *only* by his almighty creative power." This election is not to be regarded, as some tell us, an act of favoritism, but as founded in *that wisdom* which adopted it (as the end will manifest) as the best means, under the circumstances in which fallen humanity was placed, to reach, consistently with moral freedom, the largest portion of mankind, having in view the ultimate establishment and triumph—in opposition to depravity—of God's Kingdom.

The Kingdom was offered to this chosen, elected nation, as is evinced, e.g., in Ex. 19 : 5, 6, where it is declared that if faithful and obedient, it should be God's "*peculiar treasure above all people*," and it should become "*a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.*"

The reason for such election is given, e.g. Deut. 7 : 7–11, and the assurance of its perpetuation is also presented in God's love and oath. The reader ought not to overlook this, as it has an important bearing on the subject of the Kingdom, as developed more fully hereafter. Some infidels ridicule the smallness of the Jewish nation in this connection, as if it was unworthy of Deity to stoop so low and exhibit such interest to a few people; but the Spirit expressly asserts that the nation was not chosen "because ye were *more in number* than any people; for ye were the *fewest* of all the people." God thus forestalls the wretched attempt at witticism so current in recent books. In reference to the passage Rom. 9 : 11, Schmucker (*Pop. Theol.*, p. 117) justly argues that it does not relate to personal salvation, but has a national aspect. But he, with many others, emasculates the force of the election when he only makes this nation God's "external, visible people, whom He determined to separate from the rest of mankind and make the depositories of His religion." This, as the reader will see, is only a small portion appertaining to their election.

Obs. 1. The Kingdom itself thus offered to them is *a divine-political* (church and state united) dominion, over which *God Himself, as an earthly Ruler,* presides or rules as the Supreme. Moses and the Prophets clearly show this by constantly uniting the divine and the political in their instructions; by making God's commands, both civil and religious, the sovereign law; by stating that the object of the nation's call, and the bestowment

of peculiar privileges and power, was the overruling and superseding of all earthly governments, thus exalting their God and King *over all;* and by teaching that through the Kingdom thus established, *all nations* should ultimately be brought under the subjection and allegiance of the great King.

As we proceed, the Scriptures teaching this will be abundantly adduced; for the present it is sufficient to direct attention to the beginning and end of God's plan. Who doubts that this was the purpose (i.e. to make it a universal dominion over the earth) when God determined this kingdom from the foundation of the world? Theologians justly tell us that anything less would have been derogatory to the honor, the sovereignty of God. Why, then, gloss over Dan. 2 : 44 and 7 : 14, 18, 27, etc., and deny that God ever contemplated for this Kingdom such *a union* of church and state, *a political dominion wholly under divine control?* It is a refreshing omen to see men hostile to our views, still admit, as Neander, etc., that God's purposes in relation to this Kingdom must *inevitably* —if Scripture is fulfilled—exhibit itself in a great, *outward political world dominion*, under divine rule and guidance. Hundreds of quotations (some will be given hereafter) from eminent men attest that *such* is the scriptural idea. Men, too, like Dr. Arnold, feel that the biblical idea of such a dominion has been kept in the background, and they strive to revive it, but mistake *the time* and *manner* of its manifestation, attributing to this dispensation and to present means *what* Holy Writ ascribes to the following dispensation and to Jesus the Christ. Such deep thinkers as Rothe are nearer the truth, and coincide with prophecy, when they make the church, as now existing, but a temporary institution, making it to be united with the state in one great theocratic ordering, and the realization of such a permanent union depending on the future personal manifestation of the Saviour Jesus. Look at the end contemplated, as predicted by the prophets (e.g. Zech. 14 : 9, etc.), and given in the last testimony of Jesus (Apoc. 11 : 15, etc.), and this is *the grand position* that the Kingdom of God is to attain: absolute control over all the kingdoms of the earth—such a world-wide dominion that all nations shall bend in joyful, blessed obedience to its behests. This was the Kingdom offered to the Jewish nation.

Obs. 2. The attention is now directed to the fact that the Jewish nation is an elect nation to whom a Kingdom is offered—which election, although occupying *an important place* in the consideration of the Kingdom, is passed over or ignored in many theologies, even in recent Bib. Theologies, just as if it was *not reconfirmed* by the apostles. Explain it as we may, this election is *a fundamental fact,* which (as will be proven hereafter) has a deep and permanent significancy in relation to the Kingdom.

The infidel, of course, rejects the claim, and makes it the subject of ridicule. The *extreme* Calvinist finds here a very tender place, in which (as e.g. Pres. Edwards, etc.) he manifests a glaring inconsistency. With his views of election in reference to the individual, viz.: that it is fixed and eternal, he cannot possibly explain this election of the Jewish nation, *so long* as he claims that it was transient, failed, etc., and takes the blessings promised to this elect nation and heaps them upon Gentiles. Hence it is that for the sake of theory he wisely (?) passes it by as a discordant element. The low Arminian, who makes all election to consist in foreknown belief, etc., finds in this subject some stubborn facts, indicating that God's ultimate purposes are not invariably thus conditioned, and he, too, turns from it as unwelcome. The student willing to receive—whether Calvinist or Arminian, irrespective of previously formed opinions—the teachings of Scripture, will not turn away from this point.

Obs. 3. Briefly, let some of the reasons underlying the Prop. be presented. (1) The Jewish nation, as a nation, was thus chosen; for the Kingdom having in view, as intimated, a divine political world dominion, it is *pre-eminently suitable* that *a nation*—alone susceptible of kingly government, etc.—should be selected for its acceptance and final realization. God in His Sovereignty and mercy raised up this nation. It is customary

with some writers to designate this election "a historical claim," which, indeed, may be allowed, but has no particular signification. (2) Admitting cheerfully the historical connection as indispensable, we see in it a deeper design, out of which history itself arises. The election embraces *a nationality*, viz. : the natural descendants of Abraham in their associated capacity. It includes them all, so far as descent *in a certain line* is concerned (as well as those who may be *adopted* by the nation), which is clearly seen by what some term "exclusiveness" (but actually necessary, indispensably so, to preserve *a unity* in the intended dominion), or by "the middle wall of partition" which divided them from other nations, or by the declaration of Paul (Rom. 9 : 4 and 11 : 28), that even to the unbelieving Jews pertained "*the adoption*," i.e. this election in view of national connection, and that, although "enemies" yet, "*as touching the election* (i.e. this choice of the nation), they are beloved for the father's sake." In other words, none but a member of this nation, being a Jew, had this Kingdom offered to him until the election—unmistakably enlarged—embraced others by way of adoption as *the seed of Abraham*. (3) This election of the Jewish nation was an absolute, unconditional (i.e. relating to the Purpose of God) election so far as its national descent from Abraham is affected, i.e. the kingdom is *solely promised to the descendants of Abraham* in their national aspect (which is verified, as we shall see hereafter, by the covenants, *confirmed by oath*) ; and hence arises the necessity of Gentiles (as we shall show), who shall participate in this Kingdom, *being grafted in*, becoming members of, the commonwealth of Israel. (4) The unbelief and sinfulness of the nation may, indeed, for a while remove the mercy and favor of God, but it does *not remove the election ;* for when the children of Abraham, composing this nation, are gathered out, *both* natural and engrafted, the election, never set aside, conditions *the restoration of the nation in order that the promises to the nation*, as such, and to the faithful Jews, as members of the nation, *may be fulfilled*. Hence the restoration of the nation is *invariably linked* with the setting up of the Kingdom.[1] (5) The Scripture indicative of this continued election will be brought forth as our argument advances. It is amply sufficient at this stage to direct the earnest attention of the reader to the last, solemn, most intensely impressive words of Moses, *Deut.* 32 :1–43, in which the elect condition of the nation is delineated, then a deep and long-continued apostasy is represented as pertaining to this favored nation, followed by prolonged punishment ; but this does not vitiate the nation's election, for God's Purpose in reference to it still stands good, and the promise of the Eternal, Unchangeable is recorded, that *the same elect nation*, chastened and scourged, scattered and dispersed, shall be recalled and exalted in glory. (6) While the nation, comprising the natural descendants of Abraham, is thus chosen, it does not follow that every individual in it is thus personally elected. The election is *twofold*—in its reach after the nationality, and in its application to the individual member of the nation. It, in the latter case, only pertains to the believing, obedient portion of the nation. This Paul, in Rom. 9 and 11, distinctly teaches. The nation in its corporate capacity may reject the truth, but God, when for a time punishing the nation, instead of raising up children to Abraham out of stones (Matt. 3 : 9) to keep up a seed unto Abraham, gathers them out from among the Gentiles, grafting them in, adopting them with preceding believers as the nation, restores the Jewish nationality as pre-

dicted, and *gives to them* the Kingdom—His Divine Purpose is carried out; His election fails not. But with the individual it is far otherwise: God chooses him conditioned to faith and obedience, and if these fail, if the conditions are unfulfilled, then God has no other purpose; the individual fails to become of the elect, the chosen, the predetermined number, to whom the Kingdom is given. In the case of the nation the ultimate Divine Purpose is *unalterable;* even if the nation for a time prove unfaithful, that Purpose is assumed by the Saviour (e.g. Matt. 19 : 28) as *unchangeable;* but this is *not so* with the individual, for in this particular the assumption is, that he may not receive the Kingdom—some other one (Rev. 3 : 11) may obtain the crown.[1] (7) The election is made *in view of this kingdom*, so that it can be established and manifested. Through the elect Jewish nation, in its restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, under the personal rule of David's Son in glorified humanity, and through the elect (natural and engrafted) Jews, who are "chosen in Him (Christ) from the foundation of the world" (i.e. they being predetermined associated rulers with Christ), shall this *divinely constituted world dominion* be exhibited. These particulars, thus epitomized, will be fully confirmed by the Propositions following, the Scripture proof being given and the various objections answered.

[1] Baldwin (*Armageddon*, p. 88) totally misapprehends the elect condition of the nation in the Divine Purpose, and hence gives place to such ideas as the following: "The sole and simple secret of their (Jews) existence, as a distinct people, is *their infidelity*. And God has no further interfered in this preservation than may be implied in His making their sin their curse." According to this new theory—advanced by various writers and held by some sects—unbelief is a most excellent national preservative! Those who deny the future restoration of the nation are met in their denial by this election and its design.

[2] Reference is made to the doctrine of election to distinguish between that pertaining to the nation and personal election or choice. How the latter is produced, etc., does not fall within our discussion. The temperate view of Horne (*Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 23, footnote) is ours; to which we may add, that persons discussing the subject of personal election too much overlook the foundation of this term as seen in *the predetermined number* of inheritors of this very Kingdom. In this conection it may also be said, that some of the Jews recognizing the election of the nation, so distinctively taught, made it cover the personal election of the individual—thus relieving him of responsibility, and making birth a sufficient test and merit. Thus e.g. Turretin (quoted by Horne, *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 394) gives a passage from the Codex Sanhedrin, which affirms: "that every Jew had a portion in the future world," and another from the Talmud, which says: "that Abraham is sitting near the gates of hell, and does not permit any Israelite, however wicked he may be, to descend into hell." The mere sign of circumcision, although a sign pertaining to the elect people, did not in its outward application make one of the elect unless accompanied by a corresponding moral and religious spirit. So Jesus teaches, John 7 : 34–44. But still the elect were circumcised as a sign of covenant relationship. The same is now true of baptism; the outward, unless accompanied by the inward, avails nothing, although every believer receives it as indicative of covenant relationship.

Obs. 4. Recent writers (e.g. Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 60) speak very disparagingly of reckoning *the natural descent* from Abraham as part of the election, stating that the election had sole reference to a higher, viz.: a spiritual distinction and significance. But this is *antagonistic* to the Word and the facts as given. How comes it, then, that the covenants are given *to* the Jewish race? That this election is *confined to the Jewish race and those adopted into* that race? That the election is traced directly *through the descendants* of Abraham and those incorporated *as Abraham's seed?* That all the prophets, all the inspired teachers, Jesus and the

apostles, *are Jews?* That the election of the nation is recognized *by* Jesus and the apostles, and that the Gentiles were only afterward admitted *by special revelation, and then only as the acknowledged children of Abraham?* These and similar questions must first be answered before we can possibly accept of such a theory. The misapprehension arises from not discriminating that the true seed are faithful Jews, or become such by faith, being *the actual* descendants of Abraham, or *accounted such—part of the race* to whom the covenants are given. It does not follow, because God designs to exalt and bless the nation, that a disobedient Jew will obtain the blessings of election; for while the race, as a race, is chosen, it is not said that every individual of the race is also ultimately chosen. The fact is, that very few, comparatively, may avail themselves of the opportunity afforded; but that does not vitiate the election of the portion of the race that is faithful, and it does not alter God's final purpose in reference to the nation itself. If we reject this, then we surround the calling and separation of *the Jewish race* with insurmountable difficulties. The effort to spiritualize it away is not sustained by *a single fact.* Let the reader but consider: if the election only embraced the pious, *irrespective* of Jewish descent, why was the election hedged around *by the restriction of descent?* why was the calling of the Gentiles *postponed* to a definite time? why *forbid* the first preachers of the Gospel of the Kingdom to go to the Gentiles, etc.?

Theologians speak most depreciatingly of this election, and of the Jewish view based on it. It is true that some Jews perverted it to the extent, that personal salvation, no matter what the life, was deduced from it. But the perversion does not affect the doctrine. Dr. Knapp (*Ch. Theology*, p. 319), misapprehending the election in its reference to the Jewish nation, thus endeavors to rebuke Jewish belief: "The national pride of the Jews led them into the mistake that God had *a special regard for them;* that they were more agreeable to him than other nations; that they exclusively were his children; and that the Messiah was only designed for them," etc. That God had "a special regard for them," that He esteemed them *beyond other nations,* that they were *specially* under His fatherly care, that the Messiah was from them and for them, etc., is *specifically asserted,* and the Jewish covenant relationship *conclusively proves it.* Even Knapp himself, if ever saved with perfected Redemption, will be saved as *an adopted son of Abraham's.* Knapp's references to sustain his rebuke have no force argumentatively, for the one based on the rejection of the Kingdom by the Jews, and the other on the foreknown rejection of the nation and call of the Gentiles, overlook the predictions and promises that such a rejection is *only temporary*—the nation is punished for its unbelief and sinfulness. Gentiles, alas, forget the relationship that they sustain, as believers, to this *very nation;* and such rebukes fall, unjustly, upon the foundations of our hope. On he other hand, it is a matter of surprise that Jews are so unappreciative of their most honorable extraction, that some foolishly endeavor to conceal their Jewish origin, even to the changing of their names, as e.g. from Abraham to Braham, etc. The day will come (comp. Prop. 114) when such conduct will be reprobated.

Obs. 5. The saying of Augustine, quoted with such evident approbation by Fairbairn, "The faith of Abraham is the seed of Abraham," has been received by multitudes as containing the whole sum of truth, when, in point of fact, it simply grazes the truth. If Augustine is correct, why confine the election to a certain period *exclusively* to the Jewish race, and why, when afterward the election embraced the Gentiles, have the believing Gentiles held as *grafted in and adopted as one* with that same Jewish race? This at once removes volumes of sophistical reasoning on this subject. The Jew, if faithful, was of the election; the Jew, if unfaithful, was reckoned as a heathen; but it was *still the Jew, the actual descendant* of Abraham, that was saved. *Why the Jew?* Because God made a cove-

nant with their ancestor, and gave certain promises through that covenant *pertaining to that ancestor's seed.* If any one says (as, alas, many do), perverting the language of Paul applicable to another feature, that the having the blood of Abraham in their veins amounted to nothing (which is true, when accompanied by unbelief, as Jesus taught), he simply fails to recognize the plain fact *that Jews* were called, and *not* Gentiles; a covenant was made *with Jews, and not* with Gentiles; the promises were given *to Jews*, and *not* to Gentiles; that salvation *is of the Jews*, and *not* of the Gentiles; that this salvation is yet to be openly manifested *through the Jews*, and *not* through the Gentiles; and that Gentiles receive and inherit *with* the natural descendants of Abraham *only as they are incorporated.* If some, or many, of the Jews made themselves *unworthy* to receive the promises, that does *not alter the unchangeable fact,* that the worthy descendants, and engrafted ones, of Abraham do obtain them. Hence we dare not say: "Their condition did not essentially differ from that of the heathen," because *facts* are against it.

Obs. 6. Therefore it is inconsistent to make (as e.g. Fairbairn, Whately and others) this elect people *a type* of others—the type of a future people—thus misapplying the word "Israel." The reason is apparent: a type prefigures or foreshadows something that is to be accomplished or realized in the future, but the election made out an accomplished, constantly realized fact; for *they themselves* were chosen, and not typically chosen to represent some future choosing; and hence, as we shall show, the elect in the future, i.e. in this dispensation, are held up to us as a *continuation* of the elect nation—of the same divine purpose in selecting a people who, ancient and modern, are to be constituted members of the same covenanted people, and thus, by virtue of their relationship, the inheritors of God's Kingdom. If they are such members and heirs, it is folly, destructive to a proper apprehension of much Scripture, to make them types.

The typical arrangements ("the shadow of things to come"), which were designed to sustain the faith of these elect, are unnecessarily *confounded with the elect* themselves, and this introduces confusion, breaking the unity of the Word. If a Moses, or Aaron, or Joshua, in their official capacity sustained the relation of types, it does not follow that *their election* is also typical, for if it were, then the natural result of types would appear, viz.: that when the antetype is revealed the type itself must vanish, thus destroying the hopes, etc., of these ancient worthies. It is therefore misleading to say, as Martensen (*Ch. Dog.*, p. 233), that the Jewish nation is "the typical people." The nation is *no type*, for it composes *the real Kingdom of God* when the Theocracy is manifested within it; and, hence in view of this relationship, the necessity of incorporation with it. If it were merely typical of another people (viz.: Christian believers in the church), why must such a people *also become* Abraham's seed? The only Scriptures adduced by Martensen in support of his opinion, say nothing of the typical character of the nation, but refer to certain acts (1 Cor. 10 : 11) that were typical, and (Heb. 10) that even in the Theocratic ordering some incorporated religious rites were only a foreshadowing of "good things to come." Nowhere is *the nation itself* made a type, for this, if done, would be *fundamentally opposed to covenant and promise.* This misapprehension of an important fact by so careful a writer as Martensen, and which necessarily colors the interpretation of much Scripture, only reminds us how careful man ought to be when dealing with the things of God. Even Macknight (*Com.* Rom. 9 : 8) declares: "The natural seed (is) the type of the spiritual, and the temporal blessings the emblems of the eternal." Our argument, as we proceed, will conclusively show that the Theocratic ordering alone, *inseparably* joined to the nation, proves the nation no type.

Obs. 7. Pressense (*The Redeemer*, p. 61) says: "The election of a family and of a people has not for its object to create *a privileged race.*" This

against Deut. 7 : 6 ; Rom. 9 : 3–5 and ch. 11, and a host of passages, besides the important part this people is *yet to play* (Prop. 114) in the world's history. He endeavors to show that the election is a ministry by which others are to be blessed. While most cheerfully and reverently acknowledging that the present and ultimate purpose of this election is to bless all the families of the earth, yet to effect this very design one object is to raise up *a privileged class, through whom* this shall be effectually and permanently accomplished. This will be seen under the Propositions relating to the Covenants, the Kingship and Priesthood of the saints, etc. Even Pressense contradicts himself when afterward he speaks of the Jews' isolation, receiving revelations, promises, etc., *above all* other nations, which certainly indicates them to have been a highly privileged people. Failing to perceive that the election itself is bound up in and part—outwardly expressed—of the Divine Purpose, he boldly adds the following : "A transient (?) fact (viz. : election) having a special object is converted into a permanent fact. They (certain interpreters) make the church a satellite of Judaism, called to shine in the future only (?) with the brightness which it borrows from that system. That there are blessings reserved (why ?) for this people, we cordially concede, but that their destiny shall forever be as if it were the axis of universal religious history, we deny, even in the name of Abraham's election." Alas ! when the stock upon which we are grafted is thus slightingly treated ! How largely it affects the interpretation of God's Word and Purpose ! Our reply to this—as well as to the expression : " Humanity exists only for the Jews, and not the Jews for humanity"—will be found under the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants and the calling of the Gentiles, for our reliance is upon Scriptural evidence.

It is proper to refer to this matter in this connection, that the reader may clearly see the fundamental questions that must, preparatively, be discussed. Theology, departing from the Primitive Church view, has too often grossly misconceived and perverted the election of the Jews, because *all* the purposes contemplated by that election have *not yet* been made manifest. And some deny that it any longer exists, being, as Pressense asserts, " *a transient*" matter. Our faith in this national election must be like Paul's (Rom. 11), that, cut off from its realization for a period, it is still sure, and will be openly shown by their being re-engrafted, because *God's purposes are unchangeable*, and cannot be defeated by man. If the election is " transient " and not continued in engrafting Gentiles, who are to inherit the promises given to the elect Jews ; how do Pressense and others indulge the hope of inheriting the promises with the Patriarchs ? It is still true to-day, if we properly apprehend *the foundations* of our hope, what God puts in the mouth of man, as a suitable, comprehensive petition in Ps. 104 : 4, 5. It is vain to interpose our own systems, as if they were God's arrangements.

Obs. 8. " The middle wall of partition" proves both the election and the elevation to a privileged class. But many writers (e.g. Hodge, *Sys. Div.*, vol. 3, p. 810) boldly and self-confidently assert, without the least Scripture to sustain it (being sheer inference), that this " middle wall" was broken down *between the Jewish nation and other nations.* This is *a grave mistake,* as every one can readily see by a comparison of passages relating to it. The Scriptures simply declare, that the " wall" is broken down between natural Jewish and Gentile *believers,* so that all of every nationality, *when exercising faith* in Jesus, become *one* in Christ. Instead of being broken down *between nations,* the fact is asserted *only respecting believers ;* and this is proven by the additional fact, that *no other nation* sustains the same relationship to God that the Jewish does, i.e. is a covenanted nation, etc. We

are informed, however, by our opponents, that the expression means that *all* the restrictions between Jew and Gentile were removed. The Word teaches *the exact reverse,* that some still remain. Thus e.g. to *the natural* descendants of Abraham is *exclusively* given a covenant with certain promises; only those who are *identified* with the nation—this distinctive race—*have any right* to the covenanted blessings. The nation is chosen not merely as a depositary of the truth, but as the vehicle or medium through which the Saviour is to come, and finally completed Redemption in *a manifested Kingdom* under the reign of that Redeemer; for, somehow, all the prophets link the glory of the Messianic Kingdom *with* the Jewish race. The individual Jew, on the principle of faith, can only justly claim the promises given by covenant to his people. But now an emergency arises to test the validity and perpetuity of covenant relationship. The nation proves unfaithful, and now God, to fulfil this *same covenant and the identical promises* given to this people to be realized through them, extends this principle of faith to the Gentiles, *not* by demolishing the covenant and promises and election, *not* by taking the same away from the race (for then the election, *confirmed by oath,* would prove a nullity, and God had undertaken what He could not accomplish), but, as Paul expressly informs us, by *grafting* the Gentile *into the* Jewish stock, by *adopting* him (in law) as a veritable child, legally constituted descendant of Abraham, and entitled by virtue of such adoption to the privileges and blessings promised, through Abraham, to his seed, the Jewish race. If there is *no* restriction, *why is it necessary to become a child of Abraham's,* and thus inherit the promises with the faithful Jews? *This very incorporation,* so much insisted on and regarded *as essential,* proves that "the wall" is only broken down *between believers;* and to facilitate this incorporation or engrafting, the rampart itself, i.e. the Mosaic ritual, was removed, giving Gentiles better access wherever they are. The Mosaic economy—likened also to a wall or fortification—introduced to preserve intact the elect nation, owing to its separating and exclusive injunctions, is not the election; it is only a temporary outgrowth from it, and hence may be abolished without in the least affecting *the foundations,* which lie beyond it in the Abrahamic covenant. This will be seen as we proceed with the argument.

This most effectually answers the objections urged by Hengstenberg in *The Jews and the Christian Church,* when he makes "the type of Jewish nationality stamped on all nations that entered into the Church of Christ," so that, at the Christian era, "their true nationality terminated." The Church of Christ is not composed of nations, but of individuals *out of* the nations, and those very individual believers are incorporated into the commonwealth of Israel, i.e. they are by faith engrafted, and this, now accepted by faith as in God's purpose, will be *openly manifested* at the restoration of the Davidic throne and kingdom. And *then* it will be seen, that instead of "their original nationality having become the common property of all Christians" in the sense of "Christian nations," it belongs exclusively to believers. The objections urged against our view, and the resultant restoration of the Jewish nation, which *inevitably* must follow, are inferential, and are chiefly drawn from the present state of the nation, overlooking that this period is "the times of the Gentiles," which are to end so that God's purposes concerning the Jewish nation may be manifested. The simple fact is, that in this respect Hengstenberg, and others, look at the Record in the light of a *preconceived* idea of the Christian Church being the properly covenanted Kingdom of God, and this influences the interpretation of election, covenant, and prophecy.

Obs. 9. In this connection, most briefly we say, that the election of the Jewish nation, and the tender of the Kingdom to it, positively requires, if

the purposes of that election are ever carried out, *the perpetuation* of the Jewish nation, even if it be in a very reduced form, comprising a mere remnant. The *natural seed* itself *must be* preserved, in order that God's faithfulness in promise may be exhibited in and through the nation. Hence, this is most strikingly represented in Isa. 6 : 9–13, where, *after* predicting the unbelief of the nation and the consequent devastation and removal *for a time* from the land, this giving up "to destruction (is) like the terebinth and like the oak, of which when they are cut down, *only a root stump remains:* such a root-stump is a holy seed." That is, it is regarded sacred, and will ultimately become holy. Following Propositions will, at length, indicate *why and how* this is done. God will never *utterly* forsake them, but will remember what He has so often declared, as e.g. 2 Sam. 7 : 24. The punishment, the scattering and desolation, of the Jewish nation is itself proof of their election as, e.g. Amos (ch. 3 : 2), declares: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth : *therefore* I will punish you for all your iniquities." This casting off is only *temporary*, as evidence e.g. Zech. 10 : 6, etc.

PROPOSITION 25. *The Theocracy was an earnest, introductory, or initiatory form of this Kingdom.*

The Theocracy, which had typical and ceremonial observances, as Paul teaches, that were to be removed in Christ, had a form of government which, prophecy instructs us, is *to be fully exhibited* in all its beauty and excellency *under the Messiah*, the great Jewish king, David's son. A host of able writers, as, *e.g.*, Martensen (*Ch. Dog.*, p. 230), call "*the Theocracy the Kingdom of God.*"

Provisionary in some of its aspects, the Theocracy still possessed *the essential elements* of God's Kingdom, and gave an earnest only of what God intends. It was a form of government under the sole, *accessible Headship* of God Himself (Deut. 5, etc.). He was the Supreme Lawgiver in *civil and religious* affairs (Deut. 4 : 12 and 12 : 32), and when difficult cases required it (Deut. 17 : 8-13), the Divine Arbiter or Judge. In brief, the *legislative, executive, and judicial* power was vested in Him, and partially delegated to others, to be exercised under a restricted form (Deut. 16 : 18, etc.). All the people (Deut. 29 : 10-13), in their *civil, religious, social, and family* relations, were to acknowledge, and be obedient to His expressed will. He communicated His will according to an ordained manner, and when not declared, or where there was doubt, the princes or leaders could come for inquiry and receive specific directions. As an indication and reminder of this Supremacy, all the people were required at certain times in the year (Deut 16 : 16, etc.) to visit the place of special manifestation, and renew their vows of allegiance. The prophets (e.g. Isa. 1 : 21-24) spoke for God to the highest and lowest, and their rebukes were in the name of the Supreme Head. M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Monarchy, Israelitish," says: "According to the sense of the Mosaic constitution, the Hebrews were erected into a kind of republic under *the immediate dominion of Jehovah, forming a strict theocracy.*" Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 2, p. 391) gives as the true idea, and distinctive nature of a Theocracy, "*the formal exhibition of God as King, or Supreme Head of the Commonwealth;* so that all authority and law emanated from Him, and, by necessary consequence, there were not two societies in the ordinary sense, civil and religious, but *a fusion of the two into one body*" (comp. his able article on "The Jewish Theocracy" and Locke's definition in "Treat. on Toleration").

Obs. 1. Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 113) has aptly defined: the "Theocracy is *a government of the State by the immediate direction* of God; Jehovah condescended to reign over Israel in *the same direct manner* in which an earthly king reigns over his people." Gleig (*His. Bible*, vol. 1, p. 218) says: "With wisdom worthy of Himself, He assumed not merely *a religious*, but *a political*, superiority, over the descendants of Abraham; He constituted Himself, *in the strictest sense* of the phrase, *King of Israel*, and the government of Israel became, in consequence, strictly and literally, *a Theocracy.*"

Comp. Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 41, Art. "*Theocracy*" in Smith's *Dic.;* Kitto's, Calmet's, etc., *Cyclops.* Indeed, many, unaware how fundamental an accurate knowledge of the Theocracy is for a proper understanding of the Kingdom of God, and how largely it enters into the composition of the Millenarian argument, make all the concessions possible, viz.: that it is *the Kingdom of God*, a kingdom on earth, over which God rules in a special, direct manner as an earthly king, etc. References in abundance might be adduced, for good definitions are to be found in many able works. Josephus

(C. Ap. 2 : 17) appropriately called this government of God's over their nation, so different from a simple monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, or any other form, "*a Theocracy*," which expresses the leading fact, that of *God Himself being the recognized King*. Some definitions are defective, and lead to error on an important point. Thus e.g. Dixon (quoted by Stanley, *His. Jewish Ch.*) pronounces it to be "a government by priests, conducted in the name of God." Stanley (Lec. 7) forcibly shows that this is opposed by the facts, and then correctly says: "The Theocracy of Moses was not a government by priests as opposed to kings; it was a government *by God Himself*, as opposed to the government by priests or kings. It was, indeed, in *its highest sense*, as appeared afterward in the time of David, *compatible* both with regal and sacerdotal rule." Originally and primarily all civil and religious law proceeded from God, and others in the government were *subordinates* to carry into execution *the supreme will* of the King, i.e. God. The Theocracy is something then *very different* from the Divine Sovereignty, and must not be confounded with the same, as e.g. is done by the able lecturer Cook who (as quoted in *Cin. Gazette*, March 27th, 1877) says: "We must assert, that the fact of the Divine Immanence in matter and mind makes the world and nations a Theocracy." The word is abundantly perverted; Romanists apply it to their church; Protestants, to the Christian Church; Unbelievers, to priestly rule; writers, to Christian states, and even (as Milligen) to the Turkish state, etc., thus violating *the fundamental and essential* idea involved in its meaning. Baring-Gould (*Orig. and Devel. of Relig. Belief*, p. 134) correctly gives the meaning, when he says that "Jehovah, the Most High, was the Sovereign of the race, reigning *directly* by Himself, and *indirectly* through Prophet, Levites, Judges, Kings, and the Law;" but he fails in two points: (1) when he makes the Theocratic form to have already existed *in the days* of the Patriarchs, and (2) when he remarks: "*the apostolic and sub-apostolic age* was one of pure divine theocracy. To this succeeded the sacerdotal theocracy of the Middle Ages, gradually tending toward the regal theocracy, exhibiting itself in the consecration of kings and resignation to their hands of the appointment of prelates and the regulation of ecclesiastical discipline." The simple fact is, that since the overthrow of the Hebrew Theocracy, God has not acted in the capacity of *earthly Ruler*, with a set form of government, *for any nation or people* on earth; and the application of the word to any nation or people, or organization since then, is *a perversion and prostitution of its plain meaning*. Rogers (*Superh. Orig. of the Bible*, p. 77) justly observes: "The Jewish system of government was *a genuine Theocracy*. God was presumed to have constituted Himself *Monarch of the State*, and hence its *contrast* with every other form of government in the ancient world. It was an anomaly. *Politics* were identified with *religion*, the *sacred* and *civil* codes were *essentially one*, and the priestly functions assumed a paramount importance. God was the invisible but *real* Sovereign. Moses himself was merely His servant and administrator; he did not affect to be, like the Grand Lama, or even the Pope, the visible representative and vicegerent of God." As this Theocratic idea will form *an important element* in our argument as it advances, a few more references may be in place. *The Ancient His. of the East*, p. 99, says: "The fundamental principle of this legislation is the supreme authority of God over the people of Israel (1 Sam. 8 : 7; 12 : 12). *He was in the literal sense of the word their Sovereign*; and all other authority, both in *political and civil* affairs, was subordinate to the continual acknowledgment of His own." Wines (*Com. Heb. Laws*, p. 48–9) says that Jehovah was "*the Civil Head of the State*"; "God was, by the compact which we have been considering, constituted *King of the Hebrews*, a defection from Him was a defection from their rightful sovereign." And (p. 268) "God was *the temporal Sovereign* of the Israelites;" (p. 456), "Jehovah was *the Civil Head* of the Hebrew state," "the law-making power and the sovereignty of the state were vested in Him"; (p. 481), "God condescended to assume the title and relation to the Hebrew people of *chief Civil Ruler*. He established a Civil Sovereignty over them;" (p. 538), "The supreme authority of the Hebrew state was in Jehovah—God Himself was properly *King of Israel*." But Wines makes it "a restricted Theocracy" and no "pure Theocracy," because it had other "civil rulers, men who exercised authority over other men, and were acknowledged and obeyed as lawful magistrates." But the institution of such subordinate rulers is *an integral part of a pure Theocracy* (as evidenced in the re-establishment), leaving *the Supremacy* untouched and fully acknowledged. The purest Theocracy, adapted to the government of nations, that reason can suggest, must *necessarily*, as a means of honoring the Supreme Ruler and advancing His authority, etc., have its subordinate rulers.

Obs. 2. The Theocracy, as once established, is only the earnest, or initiatory or introductory form, giving the grand outlines or *fundamental*

principles, because it still lacked some features to perfect it, that God intended (as will be shown hereafter) to develop afterward. Typical observances were to give place to the antitype; religious ceremonials were to be superseded by others. The King, too, was invisible; His majesty could not be revealed because a perfect Mediator was lacking—a satisfactory atonement of sin was wanting. But when the Redeemer appointed has come, when the atonement is made, when the Mediator is God manifested in humanity, *then provision* is made to insure, when the time arrives, *the visibility* of the Theocratic King Himself. Briefly, turn to the Theocracy as it existed, and then read what the Prophets declare of *this same Theocracy as it shall be manifested under the reign of the Messiah*, and it will be seen that, while *the fundamentals* which constitute it a Theocracy remain intact, yet *glorious additions* productive of happiness and blessing are incorporated with it at its future re-establishment.

Obs. 3. Here is where eminent writers fall into a mistake, that greatly influences subsequent interpretation of Scripture. Thus, e.g. Lange (*Com.* Matt. 3 : 2) calls the Theocracy the Kingdom of God in its *typical* form. (So Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. 2, ch. 4; Neander *Pl. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 499.) What, perhaps, leads to such an error, is the fact that typical rites and temporary observances were connected with the Theocracy. But while this is so, the Theocratic ordering or government, which for the time adopted these rites and observances, is *never represented as a type*. This is utterly opposed *by covenant, and prophecy, and fact*. The Theocracy did not adumbrate something else, but *was itself the Kingdom of God* in its initiatory form—a commencement of that rule of God's *as earthly King*, which, if the Jews had rendered the obedience required, would have extended and widened itself until all nations had been brought under its influence and subjection. This is seen in various promises to the Jews. The *real existence* of the Kingdom as something that existed and shall, although now set aside for a time on account of the sinfulness of nations, exist hereafter, is seen, e.g. (1) in *the actual exercise* of Sovereignty by God, which is no type, but *a reality;* (2) in its acceptance by the nation in its associated capacity (Deut. 5, etc.), which was *no type;* (3) in *the realization* of such rule, and in God calling them (Deut. 26 : 18) "*His peculiar people*," etc., which was *no type;* (4) for when this Theocracy was overthrown, *all* the prophets, with one mind and voice, proclaim that *the same identical* Theocracy shall *be restored again* with increased splendor and glory; (5) it is covenanted to the Christ as David's Son, and is, therefore, His *real inheritance*.

Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 29) forcibly says: "The fundamental and formative idea of the prophetic teaching was *that of the Theocracy*." The restoration of the Theocracy is *the key note* of prophecy. Well may it be asked, *why change all this by spiritualizing* the prophecies to make them applicable to *a Church-Kingdom* theory, which, against *the plainest* predictions taken in their grammatical sense, is supposed to fill out the measure of the Theocracy under the Messiah. The reader is exhorted to notice that, as the nature of the case absolutely demands, every prophet unites *the restoration of the Theocracy with the Jewish nation*. It is assuming quite *a responsibility* to deny this, and thus pave the way for confusion and misconception of the Kingdom of God. But we let Reuss tell us: "The prophets set forth as the end or the law of that national life, a state of society in which all the citizens should be brought into a direct relation with Jehovah, accepting His will as the sole rule of their actions, whether collective or individual, and receiving in return for this unbounded obedience, the promise of peculiar divine protection. Israel, according to this ideal conception of it, was to be a people of saints and

priests." Precisely so ; and this divine portraiture of the future will, *most certainly*, be realized in all its fulness and preciousness, *for God's words are faithful and true.* It is indicative of great weakness that many professed treatises of Theology have much to say about the Universal Divine Sovereignty, the Attributes of God, but absolutely nothing respecting *the only form of government* in which He condescends to manifest Himself, unless it be in the way of typical application. In this connection the critical student is reminded that our position is fortified by the very account given by Moses ; for the Theocratic ordering and its laws are contained in, and enveloped by, a regular historical narration, or as a writer (*Bib. Repos.*, Jan., 1848) phrases it : "It is a code of laws in a frame of history."

Obs. 4. The Theocracy has been a matter of ridicule to unbelievers, who, unable to see in it a far-reaching and most merciful Divine Purpose, reject it as utterly unworthy of the Almighty. It is *impossible*, in the very nature of the case, for any man to appreciate a Theocratic ordering, whose *heart rebels* against the demands of obedience *necessitated* by such a form of government. This is the source of the attempted witticisms in this direction, so dishonorable to the persons indulging in them, to the dearest feelings of believers, to the dignity of mere history, and to God. It is the beginning of just such *an infallible rule* as humanity needs ; and in its permanent distinctive features is indicative of wisdom transcendently superior to that exhibited in all other forms of government. This has been noticed by various writers, and will be referred to hereafter.

Thus e.g. Milman (*His. Jews*, Ap. vol. 3, p. 44) observes that "a great step in civil improvement was made in the Hebrew polity ;" and adduces it as an evidence of the overruling goodness of God, that—in opposition to the Oriental despotism, the abuse of patriarchal rule, and the tyranny of aristocratical castes—the welfare of the whole community was assumed as *the great end* in view. This is true, for the lowest as well as the highest, the poorest as well as the richest, was protected in his rights, and oppression, tyranny, etc. was impossible (Deut. 16 : 18–20, etc.) under its constitution. But it was far more than a mere "step" in the right direction—it was the form of government, given with broad outlines, which God—who knows best—regards *as most desirable* for man, indicated (1) by its first establishment, and (2) by its final re-establishment. *To have God directly for a Ruler, is both an unspeakable honor and inestimable blessing.*

The "Oracular Response" is especially the subject of unbelieving ridicule, pretending it to be on a level with pagan oracles. For a discussion of the same see e.g. Wines' *Com.* and the ch. entitled "*The Hebrew Oracle*," and other works devoted to the Hebrew Commonwealth ; Bib. Dicts., Arts. "Urim and Thummim," etc. For the student two remarks suggest themselves. 1. The "Urim and Thummim," and the mode of oracular response is unknown, as also the manner of response in the Holy of Holies, by which the Theocratic orders and will were communicated. This lack of knowledge is *providential and designed.* These things foreshadowed the Theocratic ordering in the Person of the God-man—whose union is undescribed—and this *total silence* of description, as well as overruling any description to be given by participants, is *purposely* intended in order to prevent its being claimed, perverted, and abused, as it *inevitably* would have been in the history of the past. It is something so high, and personally related to God, that a judicious silence preserves it from blasphemous use and being made the engine of ecclesiastical tyranny. 2. The replies usually given to infidels by Apologists to defend these Oracular Responses from being classed with the Delphic Oracles, etc., are sufficiently ample to cover the ground, although the main, essential reason for distinguishing between the two is either ignored or indirectly touched. The King being, from the nature of the case, invisible, and yet, as the occasions of the state required, accessible, some mode of communication between the King and nation was demanded. The Divine Oracle is, therefore, *a necessary part* of a Theocratic government ; its absence would at once, and justly too, lead the infidel *to reject* its Theocratic nature. Now the manner in which this oracle was presented in the magnificent and typical Holy of Holies and the breastplate of the High-Priest (accessible at all times as the exigencies required, and that without making it—as heathen oracles—a source of revenue to the priests), *accords fully* with the Theocratic idea, and without it a Theocracy could not possibly exist. It is customary for some writers to say that this form of communication was adapted to

the infancy or childhood of the nation and race, calling it a "condescending method" of instruction and discipline, but the student will find that immensely higher considerations—which do not lower the intelligence and understanding of the ancients, in order to flatter our superiority—influenced its adoption, viz.: the Theocratic ordering.

Obs. 5. The blessings annexed to the Theocracy are numerous, and precisely such (e.g. Levit. ch. 26, Deut. chs. 28, 30, etc.) as a people here on the earth earnestly desire to attain. They culminate in the expression (Levit. 26 : 12) : "*I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people,*" which is again reiterated (Rev. 21 : 3) at the restoration of the Theocracy.

It has been maintained that all the blessings were of a purely earthly nature, promises of abundance, peace, etc., but this is *not* correct, since *spiritual blessings*, such as the forgiveness of sin, the consciousness of faith, hope, love, adoption, etc., were pre-eminently enjoyed, as the experience of Moses and the ancient worthies testifies. Exception is taken by some because nothing is directly (as in the New Test.) said concerning the resurrection or the future life ; and from this unbelief, unable to discern the consistent policy of God in such reticence, has charged the record with inconsistency. But an exact and beautiful *consistency* is strictly observed. The reason why these things, alluded to, could not be directly revealed is this: the Kingdom is established in its initiatory form, and under the blessings received through it, God wishes His people to attain unto Abrahamic faith (in the case of Isaac), and trust that the blessings of the future—for the resurrection and future life are *included* in them—*shall, in God's way and time, be realized. Faith in the King* is to be developed. The test applied to Abraham is continued, viz.: to secure an unbounded confidence in God that *His covenant promises to Abraham* would be fulfilled, even if they required (as is the case) a resurrection from the dead. The resurrection and the future life (as will be shown under the covenant) is most strongly implied, and, indeed, without them it is *impossible* to see *how* the promises can be realized. But as this Kingdom was tendered to those then living, it would have been incongruous to have told them at that period, before the unbelief of the nation and the downfall of the kingdom made it necessary to particularize God's purposes and to explain more in detail the manner of accomplishment, that they could only inherit the Kingdom at the period of the resurrection. It would have been inconsistent (for they, the future not known, could not have understood it), as they already enjoyed the earnest form of the Kingdom. This, however, did not prevent Moses from giving intimations in his last addresses, that the faithful of all ages—without entering into particulars how God will accomplish it, after great evils had befallen the nation, after the calling of others, after a period of terrible vengeance—would enjoy God's special favor with the nation itself restored. After the Kingdom was overthrown, then circumstances, to encourage the believing, called for a more extended statement of the resurrection, which received its fullest need of being plainly taught when the Messiah came, tendered the Kingdom and was rejected. But these subjects were not ignored in the first place, as will be shown when we come to them in regular order. The objection that all the blessings, in some way, related *to this earth*, has no force, because the Kingdom of God *is a Kingdom here on the earth*, and in its final re-establishment *is still on the earth*, but an earth redeemed from the curse.

Obs. 6. Briefly, attention is directed to the fact that while this Theocracy was a Kingdom *on* or *in* the earth, it cannot be strictly called *an earthly* kingdom. Many writers (e.g. Barrow's *Works*, vol. 2, p. 705) pronounce it an "earthly kingdom," which is a mistake, made and indulged to exalt the church by way of comparison. The Theocracy is *from God ;* it was not of earthly or human origin, for it was *divine*, directly instituted *by God*, and having *God for its Ruler*. The Bible, through the prophets, insists upon this point, which a believer in the Word, seeing its *foundation and superstructure*, must concede. Hence Jesus, who is the promised King of this re-established Theocracy, well says that His Kingdom is not of this world, etc.

It may be suitable to remark that some writers (e.g. Castelar, *The Republican Movement in Europe*, p. 98, Harper's *Mag.*, Dec. 1874) endeavor to make the Theocracy a Republic, but the Theocracy, in the nature of the case, is *not* a Republic. While it is not a monarchy in the sense adverted to by Samuel, viz.: of purely human origin, yet it is a monarchy in the highest sense. It is not a Republic, for the legislative, executive, and judicial power is *not potentially* lodged in the people, but *in God the King;* and yet it embraces in itself the elements both of a Monarchy and of a Republic;—a Monarchy in that *the absolute Sovereignty* is lodged in the person of *the One great King*, to which all the rest are subordinated, but Republican in this, that it embraces a Republican element in preserving *the rights of every individual*, from the lowest to the highest, and in bringing the people, in their individuality, *to participate in the government* by the nation, as such, originally choosing the form of government, showing themselves to be "a willing people," and aiding in electing the subordinate rulers. In other words, by a happy combination, Monarchy under divine direction, hence infallible, brings in the blessings that would result from a well-directed ideally Republican form of government, but which the latter can never fully, of itself, realize, owing to the depravity and diversity of man. Baldwin (*Armageddon*, p. 47), to make out his parallel between the Hebrew Theocracy and American Republicanism, declares: "Church and State were *disunited* by the Hebrew Constitution, and placed in the relation of associates." This is *totally incorrect*, as any work on the Theocracy shows by reference to the laws and their practical workings. Such a notion is directly opposed to the meaning of a Theocracy.

PROPOSITION 26. *The Theocracy thus instituted would have been permanently established, if the people, in their national capacity, had been faithful in obedience.*

By this is meant, not that the typical and provisionary adjuncts would have remained unchanged, but that the direct, personal rulership of God (i.e., the distinctive features which constituted it a theocracy) would never have been, for a time, set aside, and that the blessings promised under a Theocratic rule would have been amply realized. No humble believer of the Word, reading the covenant made at Horeb and pondering the blessings and curses announced by Moses, can doubt this supposition. It is true God foreknew the nation's defection, which is already freely predicted by Moses in his last addresses, but this does not prevent him from offering this Kingdom for their continued acceptance and retention in accordance with moral freedom.

What God would have done, in case the nation had ever proven faithful, in providing for the Salvation of man (i.e. by way of atonement), we are not concerned, for, while feeling that His wisdom would have been equal to the development of a plan to correspond with such faithfulness, we do know (and this confirms our faith) that this Theocracy itself is formed in an initiatory manner in view of the *foreknown* apostasy, and that out of it, in the royal line, might come the Saviour—thus vindicating the knowledge of God. We also are assured, that this same Theocracy—rejected by some—contains a divine plan for the accomplishment of great ends, reaching from and through the Jewish nation over the earth ; and that the unfaithfulness of man, however it may delay the final result, cannot alter or reverse it. Objections based upon what might have been, or how, in certain contingencies, God would have ordered things, are always unsafe ; seeing that we must take affairs as they have transpired and trace God's overruling Providence in them. Taking this scriptural view, it is impossible to break the force, e.g. of Isa. ch. 58 or of Jer. 17 : 25, which sustain our Proposition. The expressive language e.g. of Ps. 81 : 13-16 is sufficient : " O that my people had hearkened unto Me, and Israel had walked in My ways ! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned My hand against their adversaries. The haters of the Lord should have submitted themselves unto Him ; but their time should have endured forever. He should have fed them also with the finest of the wheat ; and with honey out of the rock should I have satisfied thee."

Obs. 1. The erection of the Theocracy, and the exceeding great promises annexed to it just before entering Canaan, where the matter was to be tested—promises, too, which, if experienced, would exalt the nation *above all other* nations in power, wealth, plenty, etc.—has been pronounced by unbelievers as exceedingly extravagant, full of Oriental hyperbole. Some late writers take the liberty of sneering at God's " little Kingdom" as contrasted with the mighty empires of " the poor heathen," and sarcastically compare the power and resources of the Jewish judges and kings to that of present Arab sheiks. This attempt at wit fails, because it does *not allow* the Record to speak. The comparison, unjust in several particulars,

does not notice that the reason why such promises were not experienced and became history, lies in the non-performance of certain imposed conditions—in the recorded unfaithfulness of the Jews.

When obedient, sufficient assurances are given in the history of the Jews to indicate that, if they had continued so, God also would *have been faithful* to His promises in elevating the nation. And in justice to God Himself, it must be kept in mind, that the measure of their success was proportioned to His foreknown knowledge of the coming hardness of their hearts. It would have been unwise to exalt the Jews to a degree for which *nationally* they were unprepared; and, therefore, in all His dealings with them, He keeps in view the final purpose, viz.: to bestow without stint all blessings when *the time had fully come* that this same Theocracy, under the Rulership of an immortal King and subordinate rulers, would be established on a basis of stability and perpetuity, in which it would be impossible ever to pervert them. He, who sees the end from the beginning could not, owing to the depravity of man, and the moral constitution of man under government, shower His rich blessings profusely until He had first a reliable, tried, redeemed, God-fearing and serving race gathered out of the Jews and other nations, who, by their station, power, influence, etc., *would insure* a complete and perfect fulfilment of *God's own idea* of government associated with Redemption. When we come to the final restoration of the Theocracy, this fact (as we shall show) exhibits itself prominently, and vindicates the wisdom, mercy, and justice of God in the past.

Obs. 2. The institution of the Theocracy with the claims annexed to it, and the laudation put upon it by God Himself, marks not only its *desirableness,* but that it is the *settled purpose of* God ultimately to establish its supremacy.[1] Its development, final attainment, is conditioned only by the gathering of a people, who will "*be willing in the day of His power.*" God, too, cannot and will not violate His own character, His moral government, and man's free agency, by forcing this Kingdom with its blessings upon an unwilling people. He may employ persuasion and correction to a certain limit, but beyond that He never proceeds. However we may explain this—for some things in this conection are probably beyond human comprehension, and honest differences of opinion may arise—the fact itself is historical.[2]

[1] For God never fails in any of His undertakings. If we are to believe men who reject this Theocracy, *then* He failed to establish a Theocracy *commensurate* with the promises, being insignificant in civil and political power when contrasted with earthly empires. We are, however, content to await *God's own time* for its re-establishment (Comp. Proposition 201).

[2] The Theocratic promises could not be realized, because *the supreme love* for the Ruler was lacking in the nation. However excited in individuals, the nation by its sinfulness showed itself unworthy of it. Hence *God's plan* for developing it in the future, which plan we propose to follow to its consummation. The Theocracy was not simply preparatory but initial, in the sense of its being *a real* Kingdom of God, which was established in order to show forth to the nations of the earth the distinguished blessings flowing from it. Had the Jewish nation been faithful to its engagements to the Supreme King, had the subordinate rulers obeyed the Supreme Will, *then* the nation would—as promised—have multiplied its blessings, enlarged its advantages and power, secured a supremacy over all other people, and become the benefactors of the race in disseminating the knowledge and truth of God. The place of its manifestation geographically considered (centrally located), the form of government, the special promises given to it, the King at its head, etc., evidence this, but, alas! depraved human nature forbade its realization.

The student will observe the language employed by us in the previous Prop. and in this one respecting the Theocracy, viz.: that it was *initiatory,* by which we mean that in some of its laws and provisions it was susceptible of changes (but not in its fundamentals). Jesus Himself intimates only the relative goodness of some of the laws, Matt. 19 : 8 ; Mark 10 : 5 ; comp. Ezek. 20 : 25, which Wines and others claim as teaching that some of the laws were "not absolutely the best, though they were relatively so." Mon-

tesquieu (quoted by Wines, *Com.*, p. 119) sagaciously observes that this passage "is the sponge that wipes out all the difficulties which are found in the law of Moses." The entire spirit of the Bible clearly indicates that while the Theocratic idea and its main supports are retained, *special* statutes and provisions were given because deemed the best adapted for the age and people. For some of the laws were changed and others annulled (see Wines, Michaelis, and others specially devoted to the Laws), as the advanced and altered condition of the nation made requisite. (The phrase "forever" appended to repealed laws—e.g. comp. Lev. 17 : 7 and Deut. 12 : 20, 21—simply indicates that laws remain only in force until repealed or annulled by the Lawgiver. Hence if the Jews had remained faithful, other changes, adapted to altered circumstances, might reasonably have been anticipated, just as changes will be introduced at the restoration, without affecting the Theocratic form.)

Obs. 3. The reader will *carefully* observe (as use will be made of it hereafter) that this Theocracy is very different from God's universal, general sovereignty exercised by virtue of His being the Creator. Kurtz (*His. Old Cov.*, vol. 3, p. 104) says: "As the Creator and Governor of the world, He was the Lord and King of every nation, but He did not base His kingly relation to Israel upon this foundation; He founded it rather upon what He had done especially for Israel: it was not as Elohim, but as Jehovah, that He desired to reign over Israel," etc.; He also distinguishes between a rule, the result of "unconditional necessity," and one the "consequence of the free concurrence of the people"—one arising from Creation, the other from Redemption. Kurtz is right in thus discriminating; but to make it more accurate, it is proper to add, that God also founds this Theocratic rule upon His having produced this nation, as in Isaac's birth, out of due course of nature, and He appeals to His Creatorship (e.g. Deut. 32 : 8, 15, and 30 : 20), as a reason why this Theocratic rule should be accepted; but the main consideration urged is, that through the Theocracy, God's rule thus specially manifested through one nation, and finally embracing all nations, *the Redemptive Purpose shall be accomplished and God's Sovereignty in all its fulness be recognized by every creature.* Attention is directed to this now to show: (1) that a *special*, significant Kingdom was instituted; (2) this Kingdom was pre-eminently *the Kingdom of God*, to distinguish it from mere earthly kingdoms; (3) such a Kingdom, differing from all others in that it had *God Himself acting as earthly Ruler*, was given to the Jewish nation as a *special* favor and blessing, with the idea of extending it, eventually, over the earth; (4) that if rejected or withdrawn from the nation, for a time, on account of unworthiness, the nation is still under God's general sovereignty; (5) that anything less than such a Theocratic rule, in which God is personally accessible and rules over the nation, is a lowering of condition, the non-bestowment of a most distinguishing privilege. The propriety and force of this, will be seen as we proceed in the argument.

Suppose e.g. that the Jewish nation is again restored to God's favor and their land without a restoration of the Theocracy, then no matter what church privileges are bestowed, the nation, as such, forfeits its highest, dearest, noblest privilege and blessing. And yet such is the position accorded to it by various writers, over against—as will be shown—the most express promises to the contrary.

Obs. 4. The mournful comments and sad rebukes of the Prophets over the unfaithfulness of the nation, its lack of appreciating Theocratic privileges, and the resultant withdrawal of the Ruler, are sorrowful evidences of the truth of our Proposition. Nearly every one, in this connection,

points out two things: (1) that a return to God with full allegiance to Him in the Theocratic order, would secure a return of God's blessing (thus showing God's purpose to be a continuous one), and (2) that upon such a return at some period, indefinitely stated, in the future, this Theocratic rule—a special, distinguishing privilege—is *invariably connected* with the nation, where God chose to place it. (Thus e.g. comp. Mal., chs. 3 and 4; Levit. 26, noticing v. 42; Deut. chs. 30, 31, 32, and 33.)

The Jews themselves, in e.g. "The Liturgy of the Jews" (Art. on, *Littell's Liv. Age*, Oct. 7th, 1876), acknowledge their sinfulness: "We acknowledge that we have sinned; that we have acted wickedly. O Lord, according to all Thy righteousness, we beseech Thee, let Thy anger and Thy wrath be turned away from Jerusalem, Thy City and Thy Holy Mountain; for it is on account of our sins and the iniquities of our ancestors that Jerusalem and Thy people are become objects of reproach to all around us," etc.

PROPOSITION 27. *The demand of the nation for an earthly king was a virtual abandonment of this Theocratic Kingdom by the nation.*

This is explicitly stated; for when (1 Sam. 8 : 4–9) the elders of Israel desired a king, God told Samuel, "*they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them,*" and entered against it a "*solemn protest.*" On the day of presentation (1 Sam. 10 : 17–19), Samuel protested: "*Ye have this day rejected your God,*" in this matter of asking for a king. To show the nation "the great wickedness" it was guilty of "in the sight of the Lord in asking you a king," to Samuel's word was added (1 Sam. 12 : 16–19), by way of attestation, a severe thunder-storm in harvest time. The sinfulness consisted (ch. 12 : 12) in saying that "*a king shall reign over us, when the Lord your God was your King.*"

This desire for a King, like other earthly kings, was expressed before, but regarded as sinful. Gideon' (Judg. 8 : 22, 23) was offered the Kingship a hereditary monarchy, but he, appreciating the honor of the instituted Theocratic ordering, refused it, saying: "*the Lord shall rule over you.*" Kitto's *Bible His.*, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, make Abimelech the first King of Israel. The question was proposed to the *Ch. Union*, and it correctly replied (Aug. 22, 1877) that Abimelech exercised authority during the anarchic days described by Judges, but that in no proper sense could he be called King of Israel, being a mere chieftain, a Judge, and that Saul was the first of the Kings who exercised royal authority.

Obs. 1. No deeper insult could scarcely be offered to God than such a request indicated. This is seen by considering the Being who condescended to be their Ruler, the blessings that He promised, and the design He had in view in thus becoming, in a direct manner, King over the nation. The only extenuation for such "wickedness," as Samuel intimates, is found in their distressed circumstances, also brought upon them by unbelief.

Schlegel (*Philos. of His.*, Lec. 6), speaking of the Jewish Theocracy, says: "This constitution has been called a Theocracy, and so it was in the right and old signification of that word, by which was meant a government under the special and immediate Providence of God." This, excellent as it is, is only a half-truth, for the Providence of God is thus exerted in behalf of the nation because it is a government of which *He Himself* is the acknowledged Ruler. This is proven by our Propositions. This, too, seems to be Schlegel's idea in the phrase quoted, for he correctly rejects the interpretation (now even used by many respectable writers) which gives such a latitude to the word as to make it a priestly dominion, or which confines it too much, or even exclusively, to the priesthood (saying that Moses was no priest, etc.). Then, justly, he regards the desire of the Hebrews to have a king like other nations, "a wish which, in the higher views of Holy Writ, was regarded as the culpable illusion of a carnal sense." The student, therefore, will keep in view the fact that a Theocracy is far more than the exercise of a special and immediate providence; it is an earthly relationship of Kingship over a nation in which the honor and glory of the King is deeply concerned.

Obs. 2. Some writers when adverting to this point are not sufficiently precise in their language. Burt (*Redemp. Dawn*, p. 242) says: "The idea of an earthly monarchy does not seem to have entered the Mosaic constitution," and "the idea of a monarchy did not enter the Mosaic system, and cannot be regarded as a natural development of that system." Jahn and others declare that an "earthly monarchy was out of harmony with the Mosaic economy." Such views are the result of stopping short at Samuel's protest and not carefully noticing *what followed.* On the other hand, Hengstenberg and others maintain that the monarchy was a necessary development of that constitution or system. Such plainly ignore *the protest* of God, which, if it means anything, certainly denotes that God did not deem it *necessary.* Hence neither party are correct, although both have a portion of the truth. Notice: 1. The Theocracy was a monarchy, but God was the monarch. This is so clearly evidenced by the facts that it is now acknowledged by talented writers, as e.g. Wines (*Com. on the Laws of the Anc. Heb.*), who says that God was accepted by the nation as their "Civil Ruler, Monarch, and Political Head;" "the Sovereignty of the nation was vested in Him." 2. It was a monarchy over a nation here on earth—the kingdom was here and not elsewhere, as the rule, decisions, etc., were administered here, so that while divinely constituted it also sustained an earthly relationship. 3. While the idea of a monarchy was bound up with the Theocracy ("*the Lord your God was your King*"), it was not requisite, nor was it a natural development of the Theocratic idea, that this style of monarchy should be yielded up for another merely human, or for one acting in conjunction with the other; this the express language and rebukes of Samuel forbid. 4. But while the yielding of God to the desire of the Jews does not evince a natural or legitimate outgrowth (His protest being sufficient to indicate this), yet we shall show, step by step, how, by not conceding His authority to another, etc., He could, in mercy and forgiveness, *engraft* even such a kingship into the Theocracy itself. 5. God, foreseeing this very sin of the nation, made provision for it already through Moses (thus evidencing *both* His foreknowledge and a Divine Purpose to be accomplished). To avert the evil, and overrule it for good, He gave express directions (Deut. 17 : 14–20) that the choosing of such a King should be under *His exclusive control,* and that such a King *must acknowledge* the Theocracy as existing—i.e. God's supremacy in the Kingdom—making his rule *subordinate* in all respects to that of the Chief Ruler. 6. God could do this the more consistently and engraft this Kingship into the Theocracy, because the Theocracy contemplated its latest and most glorious manifestations *to be a Rulership of God in the man Jesus.* Thus, at some future time, in the line of the kingly race selected, the Theocratic idea would be openly exhibited, and the two elements be perfectly blended in *one,* enhancing *the glory and majesty* of the King. The contemplation of such a Plan ought to produce the most profoundly reverent and grateful feelings.

Newman, in his *His. of the Hebrew Monarchy,* passes by the Theocracy, and begins, as the starting-point of connected history, at the election of Saul. He entirely overlooks *the essential part* of a Theocracy, viz.: God ruling over the nation as an earthly king, and that, as we shall show, this Theocratic idea was enforced over the kings. Hence his work is vitiated by a fundamental error, nullifying his destructive criticism. The same is true of numerous works, otherwise able, that have a moulding influence over many.

PROPOSITION 28. *God makes the Jewish King subordinate to His own Theocracy.*

According to Samuel's statement, God pardons the nation on the conditions that it still, with the king included, acknowledges him as *the continuous Supreme Monarch*, and that the king chosen shall enforce the laws given by his superior in authority. In this entire transaction God's theocratic rule *is preserved intact*. The earthly king was under certain imposed restrictions, and was threatened, in case of disobedience, with the displeasure of, and punishment from, *the still recognized Civil Head* of the nation. This was felt and freely confessed by Saul (1 Sam. 13 : 12, and 28 : 15), David (1 Sam. 6 : 20, and 7 : 23–26, etc.), Solomon (1 Kings 3 : 8, 9, and 6 : 12–14, also ch. 8, etc.), and others.

This submission is indicated, e.g. by building "a house unto the Lord," in and through which the Will of the great Ruler might be obtained and confirmed. When the kings forgot their position and trust, or directly rebelled against their Head or Chief, the result was that the prosperity of the king and nation was checked, the original blessings were withdrawn, intended good was withheld, and the curses given through Moses were experienced. Solomon (2 Chron. 9 : 8) acknowledges this subordinate position, when he accepted of the Queen of Sheba's expression (the knowledge of which had evidently been previously imparted), that he was, "*set to be king for the Lord his God.*" The reader will not fail to observe that the nation receiving Saul as king, then concurring in his rejection, and then accepting of David, clearly indicates that it realized its Theocratic position as a nation. The prompt acquiescence in Samuel's appointments shows that it believed him to act under the divine direction of the Chief Ruler, and this was evidenced to them by the miraculous thunder-storm (a storm ridiculed by unbelief, but highly proper and *Theocratic* in the grave crisis). In addition to the references given under the previous Props., we add the following. M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Monarchy," speaking of the change introduced, says : "The King, however, was only empowered to *administer the Theocratic government as a Viceroy of Jehovah*, the heavenly Sovereign, and was bound to this law as *the highest authority*, so as to exclude the idea of *an independent and absolute* monarch." Wines (*Com. on the Laws*, p. 548, etc.) remarks on the foreseen provision of Deut. 17 : 14-20, that "Monarchy was permitted to the Israelites;" that the choice of a king was limited, so that the nation "was not to appoint any one as king who was not chosen of God;" and that "*the law*, and not the king's own will and pleasure, was to be *the rule* of his administration." The student will find in Deut. 17 : 14-20 express provision made by fundamental law, defining and limiting the power of future kings, obligating them to keep the law of God, thus, in the same vindicating both the supremacy of the Head of the nation as Chief Ruler, and His foreknowledge of the result when the nation was "come unto the land" which their Ruler gave it.

Obs. 1. It follows, therefore, that Josephus (Ant. 6 : 3 §§ 2, 3), and those who receive his view, are mistaken when they end the Theocracy with the Judges. The *concession*, made by the nation and earthly king, was such that God could, in equity, pardon the people and continue His august, special rule.

Fulton, in *Government: Human and Divine*, p. 20, makes this mistake, saying: "The very Kingdom of Israel was a *professed* Theocracy, with God as King and the man who filled the throne on earth only vice-king or deputy; we say *professed* Theocracy, because *the real* Theocracy of the Jews *ceased* when they chose a human king." Now the reverse of this is the truth, as abundantly seen in God's own words. This will be more clearly seen as we proceed. For the present, over against Fulton we quote Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 467), who well observes that the rise of royalty (i.e. the reign of the earthly kings) was not "*the end of the Theocracy*," but "rather its modification, and at the same time its development;" and "that the King over this people must not be an autocrat, but rather *a theocrat, par excellence*, a viceroy and minister of God." We may add, as a hint, that this very Theocratic feeling and submission, so characteristic of David, is what pre-eminently constituted him a man *after God's heart*, notwithstanding his lapses.

Obs. 2. In addition to the priesthood, the given law, and the access to God on particular occasions, a safeguard was thrown around this subordinate kingship to prevent it, either in its hereditary character (in case of wicked successors), or in its State and Religious officials (in designing, ambitious men), from interfering with the rights, laws, truths, etc., of the Supreme Ruler. This was done by what Augustine (*City of God*, 17 : 1) and Stanley (*His. Jew. Ch.*, 1 Ser. S. 18) have called a "prophetical dispensation, which ran parallel with the monarchy from the first to the last King." King and priest were to yield to the authority of the Prophet, simply because the latter directly revealed the will of the Supreme King.

This has been noticed by numerous writers, as e.g. Kurtz (in *Sac. His.* and *His. of Old Gov.*), Delitzsch, Auberlen, Hengstenberg, etc. Hence, too, Stanley (Lec. 18, *His. Jew. Ch.*) calls it a "vulgar error" to represent "the conflict of Samuel with Saul as a conflict between the regal and sacerdotal power," for, as he observes, Samuel was no priest, and it was doubtful whether he was of Levitical descent. It was as a prophet that Samuel spoke, as one directly commissioned by God. The priesthood, indeed, served as a check and as directors, but as they, too, were liable to forget their allegiance and duty, the prophet was the purest revealer of the King's will and pleasure. J. Stuart Mill (*Rep. Government*, p. 41) curiously observes the practical effect of this safeguard in these words: "Under the protection, generally though not always effectual, of their sacred character, the Prophets were a power in the nation, often more than a match for kings and priests, and kept up, in that little corner of the earth, the antagonism of influences which is the only real security for continued progress."

Dean Graves (*On the Pentateuch*, Pt. 1. Lec. 1) has framed a strong argument (reproduced by Wines in *Com.*, p. 180, etc.) on the ancient existence of the Pentateuch, derived from the fact that the regal form was subsequently introduced, and that it placed such restraints upon the kings, abridging prerogatives, curbing their power, so that the improbability of any king (as e.g. Josiah, etc.) forging it, or accepting it from others, with its imposed conditions, is self-evident. We may add that a form of government, such as delineated in the Pentateuch, with its peculiar code of laws, punishments, etc., is so patent a matter for a whole nation to consider, that a fabrication of the same, and its imposition upon a nation as something that had previously existed, when it is false, is simply an utter impossibility. Men are never willing to place themselves under such restraints (or to trace their disasters to a violation of them) unless they are authoritative, and they know the source and legitimacy of the same—thus confirming the testimony of Jewish quotations, commemorative rites, festivals, etc.

PROPOSITION 29. *This Theocracy or Kingdom is exclusively given to the natural descendants of Abraham, in their corporate capacity.*

This follows from the preceding Propositions, and cannot be denied by any one without doing violence to the Scriptures. For the entire tenor of the Word shows that the nation was selected and favored *in this respect* beyond all other nations. No others could enjoy the privileges and blessings which it conferred, and contemplated to confer, without being adopted into the nation, and provision for such a contingency was early (Ex. 12 : 48, Numb. 9 : 14) made.

Obs. 1. The Proposition simply repeats, in another form, an idea to which it is desirable to give some prominence, since it has an important bearing in tracing the proper conception of the Kingdom. It teaches that the Kingdom is solely given to *the seed of Abraham*, which embraced the Jews. For God condescended only to act *as earthly Ruler* in behalf of that *one* nation, the *election* being thus practically demonstrated in their nationality. If this Kingdom is to be given to any other than a believing Jew, we certainly, in view of the plain language confining it to such (Comp. Prop. 24), ought to have the matter stated in the most express manner. If Gentiles, *as Gentiles, without adoption or engrafting*, so that they shall be *legally* regarded as Abraham's seed, can receive this kingdom, then, in view of the numerous counter statements to the contrary, the most precise and determinate instructions should be presented, affirming the same. Now the lack of these—our opponents relying on pure inference—is evidence of the correctness of our position, that the Kingdom belongs to the faithful Jews and to those who are received as such because of faith in the Messiah. Abraham's seed, however produced, *natural or engrafted*, receive the Kingdom.

Obs. 2. So sure is this Kingdom to the seed of Abraham, by virtue of *covenant and oath*, that when the Lord was displeased with the nation at the establishment of the Theocracy and threatened its extermination, yet, to insure the fulfilment of His *pledged* word, He proposed that of Moses He would raise up such a nation. The same is intimated by John the Baptist (Matt. 3 : 9) when, the Jews refusing to repent, he told them that God could, if it was requisite, raise up children to Abraham by supernatural power. Such instances teach that, rather *than fail*, God can work to any extent demanded, *but always in the Jewish line*—i.e. all who are ever to enjoy His special Theocratic favor must, in some way, be regarded as the descendants, the children of Abraham.

Obs. 3. This gives us one of the reasons why intermarriages with heathen were forbidden, why Ezra and Nehemiah manifested such zeal in purging the Jewish nation, why the amalgamation of the Jewish with other nations was prohibited. The introduction of others into the nation could only be lawfully preferred in accord with a proper confession of faith, and then could they participate in the Theocratic privileges and blessings.

Obs. 4. No reader of the Old Test. can fail to see that the Theocratic idea is *the nation's foundation principle*, permeating all that pertains to it.

Why is it that in the Scriptures God passes by (excepting in a few hostile predictions) the mighty monarchies and kingdoms of the earth, which are *the boast and pride* of profane history, and centres His interest alone in the small Jewish nation? Unbelievers consider this a great defect, and ridicule its occurrance. But the answer is a consistent and logical one: God, in virtue of *covenant and relationship*, could not consistently take any other position in honor to Himself, and the nation which forms the basis of His Theocratic rule and manifestation.

Obs. 5. This feature, the Theocracy alone pertaining to the Jews, was their proud boast, as seen e.g. Deut. 4 : 32–40, Ps. 147 : 20.

Obs. 6. This is the Key to the significant superscription of the cross: "*This is the King of the Jews.*" But *whilst* we must not forestall coming phases in our argument, leaving them to arrive in their regular historical and logical order, yet it may be in place to urge the reader to consider why Jesus should be *specifically* designated on the cross *only* as "*the King of the Jews*," and not of Jews and Gentiles or of nations generally. There must be some valid reason *why*, as the King of the Jews, He becomes the King over all nations.

PROPOSITION 30. *The Prophets, however, without specifying the manner of introduction, predict that the Gentiles shall participate in the blessings of this Theocracy or Kingdom.*

This needs no special proof, for the fact is satisfactorily evidenced that, although the prophets announced it and Jesus declared it, the apostles even did not understand *how* it could consistently (in view of our preceding Propositions) be done, until the principle and order under which it could be accomplished were revealed to Peter (Acts 10 and 11), and acknowledged in a council (Acts 15). Hence it is called a mystery revealed (Eph. 3).

Obs. 1. If these predictions were not given, *a strong proof* of God's foreknowledge and determination to carry on His Divine Purpose would be lacking. Even already by Moses (Deut. 32 : 21, 43) it is foretold, and as the anticipated unbelief and perversion of the nation arises and its rejection for a time is insured, the announcement becomes more bold and frequent.

Obs. 2. If such prophecies were wanting, then the objection would arise that God had not revealed *a definite Plan*, or made *provision* in that Plan for *the temporary* failure of the Jewish nation. Therefore, aside from their relationship to us believing Gentiles, they are exceeding precious predictions, indicating *completeness* in the Divine Purpose.

Obs. 3. The very manner in which the predictions are given manifest the wisdom of God. One feature is carefully kept in the background until the time has arrived for fulfilment, viz. : *how* the Gentiles are to have part in the blessings of Abraham, seeing that the promises pertain to Abraham's seed. While the kingdom belongs to the Jews, and the nation renders itself unworthy of it, and God's Purpose is to turn to the Gentiles, yet *the mode* of incorporating these Gentiles is left for future revelation. The call of the Gentiles is given in a way that implies that certain events connected with it must *first* be fulfilled and *additional revelation* be given before it can be properly comprehended. In the very nature of the case, it could not be otherwise, for if every event, link after link in the chain of Providence, had been revealed systematically and minutely, it would have interfered with the moral freedom of man, or it would have placed him in a position from which to consider himself the victim of unalterable predestinated circumstances. Thus e.g. had the Word predicted all the events respecting the First Advent and its result, the conduct of the Jews, Romans, etc., in such a form, as necessary preliminaries to the call, it would have been terribly depressing, and it would materially (2 Cor. 2 : 8) have interfered with the fulfilment of

events. There is, consequently, *a deep wisdom*, such as man could not evince, in those isolated, broken predictions. A blessed *sufficiency* is given to vindicate God's knowledge, to impress His mercy, and to invite trust in His Power, that the Messiah will be (as the Jews also held, Mac. 2 : 7, 14) "the King of the world."

Obs. 4. The reader will notice, too, that this calling of the Gentiles, while in a few places spoken of as a result of Jewish unbelief and punishment (as e.g. Deut. 32 : 21), is more generally, almost universally, predicted by the prophets to occur *in connection with* the Jewish nationality. It is a matter either taken for granted or directly mentioned *in immediate combination with* the Jewish nation. The reason for this is, that while the Gentiles enjoy special favor during the period of the nation's dispersion, yet, as Paul (Rom. 11 : 12, 15) asserts, they shall realize immeasurably *greater blessings* when God's kindness and faithfulness shall restore the nation to its former Theocratic position. The privileges and rich results of the Theocracy restored are to be enjoyed by the Gentiles (thus e.g. Isa. 11 : 10–16, chs. 60, 55, 62, etc.).

Obs. 5. The Kingdom being given to the nation, and this being based on covenants and promises *confirmed by oath*, (1) no other nation can obtain it without *a recall* of the covenant relationship ; (2) such a recall is *nowhere* asserted, but *the perpetuity* of the same is most explicitly and repeatedly affirmed ; (3) the nation, for a time suffering the withdrawal of God's special Theocratic ordering, does not *vitiate* the covenant relationship ; (4) hence, the participation of the Gentiles in the covenanted relationship (and through this, to an inheriting of the blessings of the Kingdom), must depend (as has been stated) upon their being, in some way, *adopted* as the seed of Abraham. Precisely here was the mystery, which baffled even the apostles until *specially* enlightened.

Obs. 6. The original bestowment of the Theocracy being in a most solemn, public manner, if ever the Jewish nation is to forfeit its relationship to that Theocracy, this must be done in as public manner, or, at least, the most explicit statement must come from God to this effect. This *has not, cannot* be done—although multitudes, misled by *the temporary* punishment of the nation, infer it—without violating God's *pledged* word. Hence, the importance of closely tracing the call of the Gentiles, and noticing its connection with the Jewish nation.

Obs. 7. Infidelity has never yet attempted to explain by what mental process the prophets could predict this call of the Gentiles when so directly opposed to Jewish election and covenanted relationship. Unbelief cares not to study the delicate and most admirable traits of Divine Wisdom in the predictions, given in general terms, and leaving, for the best of reasons, the filling up of the web of events to the time of fulfilment. Unbelief cares not to contemplate prophecies given thousands of years ago, and most wonderfully fulfilling, without interfering with moral freedom, for this would lead to the supernatural.

PROPOSITION 31. *This Theocracy or Kingdom was identified with the Davidic Kingdom.*

Passing by the Davidic covenant (to be adduced hereafter), which distinctly exhibits this, it is sufficient, for the present, to remark that *after* the Theocratic Ruler deposed Saul, owing to disobedience, he chose David, and having made for wise reasons (e.g., in view of the prospective seed of David, Jesus, "the Christ") the Kingdom hereditary in David's family, he received that throne and Kingdom and adopted the same as *His own throne and Kingdom.* The Theocracy and Davidic kingdom, in virtue of a *special and peculiar covenant relationship* between the two, were regarded *as one*, and in the future *so identical* in destiny that they are *inseparably linked together.*

Comp. Props. 27 and 28. This union, and the subordination of the kings, as well as the divine right running only in the line of God's own choosing, shows how we are to estimate the unfounded assertions of those who make this Kingship a despotic or unlimited monarchy, with the notion of thereby enforcing "the divine right of kings" and "the passive obedience of subjects." What terrible outrages on humanity have been committed, under the false claim that they were sanctioned by the governmental institutions of God! How tyrants have ruled and crushed their subjects, under the pretence of being a legitimate outgrowth of Theocratic ordering; and how crimes of the deepest dye have been condoned under the plea that "the anointing oil" of priestcraft made them *per se* "the Anointed of the Lord!" (Comp. Props. 164 and 163.)

Obs. 1. This is also evidenced by three things—(1) The Davidic throne and Kingdom is called the Lord's. Thus, e.g. in 1 Chron. 28 : 5, it is "*the throne of the Kingdom of the Lord over Israel*"; in 2 Chron. 13 : 8, "*the Kingdom of the Lord*"; and in 2 Chron. 9 : 8, the King is placed by God "*on His throne to be King for the Lord thy God.*" (2) The King was expressly designated "*the Lord's Anointed*" (1 Sam. 24 : 6, 2 Sam. 19 : 21, etc.). (3) The Prophets, after the establishment of the Davidic throne and kingdom, invariably *identify* the glorious Kingdom of God, the blessed Theocratic rule, as manifested through the same, as e.g. Jer., chs. 33 and 36, Amos 9, etc. The reason for this lies in the firm and perpetual union.

Wines (*Com. on the Laws*, p. 506-7), to carry out his theory of an election by the people, in order to make out a parallel with American Republicanism, makes David to have been "elected by the voice of the people to that high dignity" (2 Sam., chs. 3, 4, 5, and 12), and that the anointing of Samuel was a sort of "prophetic anointing," which did not inaugurate him as king, or confer any authority upon him." "It was rather a prophecy in action, foreshadowing his future elevation to the throne." We contend from the historical account given, and the particular narrative of *the choosing* of David, that it was more than this: the anointing gave him *a right*, from the Chief Ruler, to the Kingdom and over the Kingdom, although the realization of the same was delayed for a time. God had thus *designated His choice*, and it was, in the nature of the case, *infallible.* The consent of the tribes, one after the other, was not merely a matter of prudence and

policy to bind them cordially to David, but resulted, as the history shows, in view of God having given him this right, evidenced by his anointing. The anointing *constituted* him the King, however delayed, and this kingship, in the divine line, continued the recognized one, although afterward the majority of the tribes revolted from the Davidic house. The *majority* did not change God's plan, etc.

Obs. 2. The King was under God's special care, and treason against the King was treason against God ; it was only when engaged in sin that God's care was removed and the people were exhorted to resist wickedness even in the chief. The diminishing of the Kingdom (as in the days of Jeroboam, which was not to be forever, seeing that no promises of perpetuity were given as to David), and the final overthrow of the Kingdom—indeed all the great, leading, vital affairs pertaining to it, are always represented as occurring under the direction and control of the mighty Theocratic Ruler, —He being fully and legitimately *identified* with its successes and reverses, exaltation and debasement, union and divisions, etc.

One reason why greater favor was shown to the tribes adhering to the kingly line chosen by God than to those tribes that revolted and sought out their own line, springs from the fact that the one party, with all their faults, kept closer to the Theocratic ordering than the other. Some works (as Baldwin's *Armageddon*), in their opposition to all monarchy, and desire to make out the Theocracy a Republic (which it is not, excepting in a few details), speak of the Davidic monarchy as if it were "sinful," and God hated it, etc. This is simply *to ignore* the historical statements, the covenant, the thousand promises, connected with it. God was only displeased with it, and punished it, whenever it forgot its Theocratical position and subordination. Any other view is a perversion of fact.

Obs. 3. This Theocratic union is shown also in the fact that not only all the Theocratic laws and arrangements, previously made, *remained* in full force, and the King obligated himself to see them enforced, but in important matters pertaining to the nation the King was to consult with, and obey the imparted instructions of, the Chief Ruler. The numbering of the people (2 Sam. 24 and 1 Chron. 21) by David *without* divine permission, being an infringement of Theocratic order, an act of insubordination to his Superior, was correspondingly severely punished.

Celsus, Voltaire, and a host of unbelievers, with assumed righteous indignation, insist that David having alone sinned in numbering the people, it was unjust that the innocent people should have suffered the punishment due to him. So also it is said, that taking Uriah's wife, the innocent husband perished, and David enjoyed his spoil. But let it be noticed : 1. The end is *not yet :* the future destiny of those innocent ones will, in the coming Kingdom, make ample amends for their misfortune. 2. How largely the future station, rank, kingship, and priesthood of David may be affected by it, we know not—a just balance will be struck. 3. David's sins are specifically denounced, and he heartily repented of them. 4. He suffered severely in person because of them. 5. One of the sins—the former—was an insult to his Sovereign Ruler, and the punishment was designed to exhibit its magnitude. 6. David was preserved, notwithstanding his sins, because of his relation as Theocratic King and the destined forerunner of a future glorious Theocratic King in his line. 7. That the reasons for Theocratic clemency and severity are not given in detail, and that it ill becomes us to sit in judgment upon them. 8. The non-concealment of David's guilt (so different from human biography) and its result, stamps the record with truthfulness, and gives hope and comfort to repenting sinners.

Obs. 4. The identity of the Theocratic Kingdom with the Davidic is taken for granted in the New Test. as an indisputable fact. This will appear, as our argument progresses ; for some preliminaries must first be

considered in their historical connection. The announcing angel states the fact (Luke 1 : 32, 33), and Zacharias intimates it (v. 68–74).

The reader will observe two features connected with this subject. The Theocracy did not remain in Saul's line, and it was not in the line of the kings over the revolted tribes, for the special union and the promises connected with it are found *only* in the Davidic line. This is a sufficient reply to Newman (*His. of Heb. Monarchy*, p. 50), who accuses Samuel of treason in deposing Saul and choosing David, *totally overlooking* the Theocratic form of government, and that Samuel was acting under the *special* orders of the Supreme Ruler of the nation. The question is sometimes asked, *why* was Saul thus chosen, when God foreknew his speedy fall and the selection of David in his place? The question is not answered by saying that "Saul's self-will caused him to forget his Theocratic position" when he presumed to sacrifice himself and disobey divine commands, the significance of which (*The Anc. His. of the East*, vol. 1, p. 132) was that "it aimed at establishing the monarchy of Israel on the same basis as heathen kingdoms," making the Theocratic ordering subservient to the caprice of the subordinate ruler. All this is true, but God foreknew all this, and still selected Saul. Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 177) says: "Since they demand a king *without* a divine intimation, God gives them a king, even as they wish, *not after* His own heart (1 Sam. 13 : 14), *but after* the heart of the people, not one that belonged to the tribe of Judah, but one who was higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward (10 : 23)." But God did directly choose him, and not the people, and the proof is found in 1 Sam. 9 : 15-27 and 10 : 1-26; for Samuel expressly says: "See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen." Newman (*His. Heb. Monarchy*) says: "It is highly doubtful whether Saul was chosen either by God or by Samuel," for he thinks the Israelites chose him for his stature and beauty, and then Samuel reconciled himself to a necessity, and declared—a pious fraud—that God also chose him; thus perverting the history, and that Saul was not seen by the people until after the lot. Historical statements, however, must always bend before destructive criticism, which has the happy talent of *knowing precisely* how things ought to have been done. The reason, as given by various writers (e.g. Farbairn's *Typology*, p. 96), seems to be this: the Kingship was of a derived and vicegerent nature to be perpetuated, "and to render the Divine Purpose in this respect manifest to all who had eyes to see and ears to hear, the Lord allowed the choice first to fall on one who—as the representative of the people's earthly wisdom and prowess—was little disposed to rule in humble subordination to the will and authority of heaven, and was therefore supplanted by another, who should act as God's representative, and bear distinctively the name of 'His servant.'" In other words, God designed to show in this first king, and impress it by a signal experience that He alone was the Supreme King, and the government, under the kings, should continue a Theocracy. The lesson was *purposely* chosen before the Davidic line was introduced, but practically it was too soon forgotten. It was illustrated, too, in the case of one whom men admired (owing to stature and beauty).

PROPOSITION 32. *This Theocratic Kingdom, thus incorporated with the Davidic, is removed when the Davidic Kingdom is overthrown.*

The spirit of prophecy, which expresses *the opinion of God* in this matter, is emphatic and clear. Thus e.g. take Ps. 89, and the Davidic throne, which it is asserted the Messiah, "the Holy One of Israel," shall occupy, is represented as completely removed, the throne and crown cast down, God himself having withdrawn in his wrath at the nation's sinfulness. Numerous predictions, to avoid repetition, will be given hereafter.

Obs. 1. The Proposition is evidenced, (1) by the continued overthrow of what God called His throne and Kingdom (Ezek. 21 : 25–27, Hos. 3 : 4, 5, etc.); (2) by the Prophets not recognizing any other Theocratic Kingdom than the one thus connected; (3) by the restoration from Babylon, building of the temple, etc., being never likened to this Kingdom, for although blessings were vouchsafed to the nation from God through His general divine Sovereignty, yet God did *not act* as their King, which is seen, e.g. in the Jews being still "servants" and others had "dominion over them" (Neh. 9 : 36, 37), being placed under tribute, (Ezra 4 : 13 and 7 : 24); (4) by the simple fact that neither in the temple rebuilt nor in any subsequent political position of the Jews, was God directly accessible as Ruler, to be consulted, etc.; (5) by the Jews themselves, in their future political and religious status, never supposing, after the overthrow of the Davidic Kingdom, that it or the Theocracy connected with it was restored, but constantly and ardently looked for its re-establishment; (6) by the withdrawal of God, more and more decided, so that even for centuries the voice of prophecy was silent. In brief, all the circumstances indicated, that the distinctive features which manifested a Theocracy, were withdrawn, and the religious, the ceremonial, indispensably necessary for the moral preparation and culture of man, was alone continued. The nation was undergoing divine punishment for its *non-appreciation of Theocratic privileges.*

Some writers, evidently through inadvertency, misuse the word "Theocracy," when they speak of the "re-establishment of the Theocracy" at the return of Ezra to Jerusalem B. C. 457, distinguishing it from "a free and independent Theocracy" by designating it "a dependent" one. This is to make a partial restoration of the nation and religious rites a Theocracy, when Ezra and the nation were subjects to the sway of Babylon, etc. The least reflection shows the misuse of the term, and especially to make it "dependent," without restoration (as we shall show) of David's throne, etc.

Obs. 2. The highest position, politically, occupied by the nation afterward under the brilliant reign of the Maccabean Princes, was never

regarded as a return to the Davidic or Theocratic rule. The Asmoneans were not in the Davidic line, and God was not the Theocratic King as once before.

The Theocracy, the Kingdom of God, being withdrawn is the reason why (comp. Obs. 4 below) Daniel's prophecies, which give an epitome of the world's history down to the re-establishment of this Theocracy under the Messiah, make no mention (as they consistently could not) of a Kingdom of God on earth running contemporaneously (as many would have us to believe against fact) with the Gentile empires delineated by the Prophet. God's Spirit does not contradict itself.

Obs. 3. The highest religious position afterward arrived at, when the Temple was restored with magnificence, did not meet the Theocratic features. The second Temple, among other deficiencies, possessed not the manifestation of the Divine Presence of the great King in the Holy of Holies, and gave not forth, as the first Temple, the responses of an earthly Ruler. With all the veneration attached to it by the Jews, they never regarded its erection and their worship there, as the enjoyment of *a restored* Theocratic government. They still lamented *the loss* of the once enjoyed precious boon.

Warburton (*Div. Leg.*, B. 5, S. 5) labors to show that the Theocracy existed down to the Coming of the Christ. A more recent writer (Wines, *Com. on the Laws*, p. 495, etc.) indorses this *unhistorical* view, and says: "It (Theocracy) was democratical till the time of Saul, monarchical from his accession to the throne till the captivity, and aristocratically after the restoration of the Jews to their own country; but through all these revolutions it retained the Theocratic feature." This is *a serious* mistake, utterly opposed to his own definitions (which we have freely given, Props. 25, 26. etc.) of a Theocracy, which he leaves for a lower one of his own framing. It utterly ignores the Scripture testimony; it vitiates the predictions of a restoration; it makes it impossible to understand the covenant and prophecies; and it presents us a Theocracy with its life taken out, its essential meaning removed, its throne and Kingdom overthrown. Alas! that men of ability are so misleading.

Obs. 4. The reader, although perhaps premature in our line of argument, will notice that this feature has its decided influence in shaping the peculiar and striking manner in which the Bible is written and placed together. Unbelief has made itself merry at the early historical narrative of the Jewish nation when contrasted with the mighty empires of the world, at the sudden breaking off of the same, its non-resumption (in the Bible) to present the splendid achievements of the Maccabees, etc. But under all this lies a profound reason. The mighty empires of the world are as nothing to God when compared to His initiatory Theocratic ordering. Small as the latter is when contrasted with Kingdoms that embraced immense territories and a multitude of nations; weak as the subordinate Theocratic kings were when compared with an Alexander or Cyrus or Cæsar, yet in the estimation of Deity, there was in this nucleus, this earnest of government, something that *outweighed* the grandeur of all earthly Kingdoms. *This was the Theocracy.* God shows *due respect* to His own ordering, and hence confines Himself *almost* exclusively to the history of the Jewish nation. Other Kingdoms are, indeed, mentioned, but only to show their relationship to the Jewish nation and to pronounce their doom, or the final result when the Theocracy shall be triumphantly re-established. This gives the Bible its remarkable cast of expression and its historical connection. Thus e.g. there is a regular tracing of the rise of the nation, the establishment of the Theocracy, and then comes the regular

history of the Theocracy to its downfall or rather withdrawal. Everything which led to it, that was connected with it, that led to its abandonment, is given as a matter of interest. Briefly, but boldly, the outlines, the essentials, for a correct apprehension, are presented down to the last King. Then follows the account of the Captivity ; of a partial restoration ; of the return not meeting the requirements of a restored Theocracy ; of God's fulfilling His Word in punishing ; of prophets who predict *the re-establishment* of the Theocracy ; of a long silence of centuries, a sufficiency of prediction having been given and the history of the nation being unworthy of record ; of what occurred at the coming of the Messiah, and the mention of continued punishment, of a few predictions confirmatory of the Old Test., but no attempt to verify them, for in the unbroken silence, the dignity of prophecy is exhanced by the fulfilment being taken for granted as something needing no proof, being ever present in history.

PROPOSITION 33. *The Prophets, some even before the Captivity, foreseeing the overthrow of the Kingdom, both foretell its downfall and its final restoration.*

Thus, e.g., Isaiah, Hosea, Joel, Amos, and Micah deliberately predict the withdrawal of God's protection as Ruler on account of the rebellious spirit of the nation, the abolishment of the Kingdom, and the destruction of the very place of the Ruler's special manifestation. But they also announce, just as distinctly, that at some period in the future there shall be *a complete restoration of the same Kingdom* under David's son, and a restoration, too, pre-eminently glorious.

Obs. 1. This, from what preceded and will follow, needs no special proof. Such passages as Amos 9 : 11, Luke 1 : 32, 33, Ezek. 37 : 21, 22, Jer. 33 : 14, etc., it is admitted by all men, do *in their plain grammatical sense* distinctively teach such downfall and restoration. This is denied by no one ; but we are informed by eminent and pious men, that this is not the sense (excepting only as it pertains to downfall) intended by God. Aside from the inconsistency of charging God with employing a sense—the one, too, in common usage between men—that *fairly* expresses this idea and fosters corresponding hopes, we hold with the Primitive Church, and shall prove as we proceed, that it is *the only sense which consistently* maintains God's covenant, oath, promises, and election of the nation.

Obs. 2. Let the reader but pause and consider : God *has had* a veritable Kingdom here on earth ; He was the earthly Ruler of the nation exhibited in and through this Kingdom ; now is it conceivable that He, owing to unbelief and sin of the nation, will give up this Kingdom *forever*—that He will permit Himself *to be defeated* in the establishment of such an open, outward, manifested Theocracy? Men, the multitude, say such is the fact, but we do not read the Bible as asserting the same, for this would be dishonoring to God, making Him to undertake a work that He is unable to accomplish, and this would make the Prophets predict falsely, making them plainly to prophecy what shall never come to pass. (Comp. Prop. 201.)

Obs. 3. It has been generally acknowledged (no matter how afterward explained or spiritualized) that the basis of prophetical teaching is this Kingdom constantly and uniformly connected with the National and Religio-Political constitution of the people of Israel. Why, then, dare to *reverse* this, without the most explicit and direct command from God? The change that is made by the many in these prophetical utterances, as will be shown, is based purely on inference. Solemnly, sadly is the

protest given : Should we not, in *so weighty* a matter, have far more than merely inferential proof? If *the grammatical meaning* of the Word is to be changed, should not God Himself *plainly tell* us of the change, and not leave it to uninspired men, centuries after the canon is completed, to inform us of it?

Obs. 4. When the elements of disunion, disruption, etc., appeared in the Davidic Kingdom, then also a change took place in the Prophetic voice. This has been noticed by Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 228, etc.) and others; it is only necessary to add, that in view of the now foreseen and determined withdrawal of the Kingdom, much more is said, by way of encouragement under coming trial, respecting the period, when, under the promised Messiah, the Kingdom should be restored never more to end. This was a token of mercy to stimulate the faith and hope of the repentant, pious portion of the nation; for while God withdrew the Kingdom and attendant blessings, He did not, as He promised even by Moses, *utterly* forsake the nation.

PROPOSITION 34. *The Prophets describe this restored Kingdom, its extension, glory, etc., without distinguishing between the First and Second Advents.*

This peculiar feature has often been noticed by writers; and attention is called to it in this connection, because it is *of great moment* to understand this distinctive, significant method of prophecy.

Obs. 1. Learned men, feeling the force of this uniformity, have supposed, correctly, that some good reason produced it, and to assign one, tell us how prophetic vision glances from the lower to the higher hills, passing over the intermediate valleys, etc., thus presenting a beautiful and glowing picture of ecstatic vision. While there is truth in this description, it utterly fails to assign *any reason* for it, only presenting *the manner* in which it is done. The leading motive for such a non-discrimination of First and Second Advent will be found in *the offer* of this same Kingdom to the Jewish nation at the First Advent (comp. Props. 55–57, etc.), and, upon its rejection by the nation, in its postponement to the Sec. Advent. The proof for this will be abundantly forthcoming; at the present it is desirable that this characteristic of the prophets be constantly kept in mind, because it evinces *a predetermined* offer of the Kingdom, in view *of the election* of the nation, at the First Advent; and *the issue* also being foreknown (amazing knowledge! a postponing to the Sec. Advent), it *conditioned* the necessity of only speaking *of the Advent*, without directly specifying a First or a Second. This intermingling and blending of Advents, or rather, this non-discrimination of Advents, is purposely done, (1) to allow full latitude to the freedom of the nation; (2) to evince the foreknowledge, truthfulness, and faithfulness of God; (3) to test the faith of His people; (4) to throw the responsibility of Christ's rejection upon the nation; (5) to prepare the way for the engrafting of the Gentiles; (6) to avoid the despondency, etc., that must arise, if the long intervening period of time were presented.

It was extremely difficult for a Jew to reconcile the glorious predictions relating to the Messianic Kingdom with those pertaining to a suffering Messiah. This was so greatly felt that we read of the idea of two Messiahs being broached—a suffering one, followed by a triumphant one; others united both in the same person, but without attempting a reconciliation. The question might well be asked of unbelief, whether it is credible that the Prophets, so devoted to their alleged "Jewish prejudices" and "Jewish forms," could by their own wisdom have concocted such a humiliated, suffering Redeemer of the nation to bring it to glory by restoring its Theocratic relationship, when it seemed, to all human appearances, *antagonistic and fatal* to all such expectations?

Obs. 2. This peculiarity of the prophecies impresses the injunction given by numerous writers, viz.: to be careful in discriminating the

Scriptures that belong to different dispensations, e.g. that which pertains to the First Advent and the time following, and that which relates to the Sec. Advent and the age following it.

Obs. 3. Living at this period, so long after the First Advent, we are the better prepared, owing to fulfilments, to discriminate between the Scriptures, and make a correct application of them. God's sincerity in tendering the Kingdom to the Jewish nation is evidenced by the very manner in which the nation's rejection of the Messiah at the First Advent is delineated; it is rather implied than directly taught, and in such a way, that while now we see the guilt of the nation unmistakably presented, yet before the fulfilment it was—to avoid interfering with freedom of choice—more or less a mystery. To us, it is a mystery fully revealed.

It will be observed that, owing to the terrible period of punishment for the rejection of "the Christ," etc., no distinction of *First* and Second Advent is made, and a little reflection will show the great wisdom and mercy of God in not making it. Had it been made, its revelation would have had crushing force, and would have interfered with moral freedom. We regard this very feature, so delicately handled, as a decisive proof of divine inspiration.

Obs. 4. The manner in which the prophecies were fulfilled at the First Advent teaches us *how* we may expect the prophecies pertaining to the Second to be realized, viz.: in *the strict* grammatical sense contained in them.

Obs. 5. Another reason why the Prophets simply announce the Advent without discriminating is, that both Advents are *really necessary* for perfected Redemption—the one, we can now see, is preparatory for the other. Hence Bh. Horsley (*Works*, vol. 1, p. 83) and others have pointed out the fact that we can not properly interpret the ancient prophecies without referring to the two Advents; they stand related to each other, and in several places are spoken of without any intimation of the long centuries that shall intervene between them. Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 183) justly observes: "It is only by the facts and revelations of the New Test., that ancient prophecy has been found conclusively to require for its complete verification two disparate manifestations of the Godhead; the one in humiliation, the other in glory." But we must never forget that the Prophets unite the two *as essential* to the Salvation of man, and the experience of that Salvation, in the Kingdom of God restored in splendor. The two Advents are the two main instrumentalities for accomplishing Redemption; each one has *its appropriate sphere of action*, and "the glory" of the Second is the reward subsequent to obedience and suffering at the First.

Obs. 6. The Kingdom being rejected by the Jews at the First Advent, *an intercalary period* intervenes, and "the times of the Gentiles" are continued on to the Sec. Advent. This is the reason why in some of the prophecies, when direct reference is made to the First Advent, the intervening period to the Second is passed by, and attention is directed to the Second with its results, as e.g. Ps. 69, Isa. 53 connected with ch. 54, etc. The Divine Plan thus *unites* the two as incorporated with it, and teaches *how*, in the light of God's Word, this intercalary period ought to be

regarded, so far as God's Purpose is concerned—i.e. while exceeding precious to us who believe and who are adopted as the seed of Abraham, yet it is still a time of "*waiting*," and that it is, by no means, to be exalted into that disproportioned and exaggerated position that it holds in so many systems of Theology.

Obs. 7. The Kingdom is *nowhere* (although it is currently believed) directly asserted to be a resultant of the First Advent, but in the declarations of Christ and the apostles it is distinctly linked *with the Sec. Advent*, as e.g. Matt. 25 : 34, 2 Tim. 4 : 1, etc.

Obs. 8. This characteristic of not distinguishing between the two Advents, excepting as the events connected with one or the other now (in view of fulfilment) enables us to discriminate between them, has been often ridiculed by Unbelief as an evidence of weakness. We, on the other hand, find in it *a profound meaning* and an indication of *the highest wisdom and the greatest strength*. Indeed, when properly comprehended in its true relationship to the Jewish nation and the Theocracy, it forms *a strong proof* of inspiration, being *a phase beyond human conception and continuance*. Foreknowing the facts, it carefully avoids contradiction in the least particular; aware of the result, it gives due latitude to moral freedom; and conscious of a postponement resulting from the conduct of the Jewish nation, it still proclaims that God's Plan shall be ultimately accomplished. Divine Wisdom alone could devise such a wonderful way of predicting the future.

Obs. 9. Unbelief has not yet been able to explain the anomaly presented in these two Advents. The last (Second), which is spoken of in the most eulogistic terms, it may ascribe to human desire and consequent Oriental imagination, but it is completely at fault with the First Advent. For it cannot show how it is possible for Jews, with Jewish expectations and hopes (based on covenant promise), to describe *a Messiah* coming in humiliation, rejection, suffering, and death.

PROPOSITION 35. *The Prophets describe but one Kingdom.*

The language and whole tenor of the Word is so explicit that both Jews and Gentiles thus understand it. Whatever views may be entertained respecting the interpretation of the prophecies themselves, there is no writer, within our knowledge, who has ventured to suggest that *two* Kingdoms are denoted.

Obs. 1. There is *one* Kingdom under the Messiah, David's Son and Lord, in some way linked with the election of the Jewish nationality, which is *the great burden* of prophecy.

Obs. 2. This Kingdom, too, according to the grammatical sense, is one here *on the earth*, not somewhere else, as e.g. in the third heaven or the Universe. Take the most vivid descriptions, such as are contained in Isa. 60, or Dan. 7, etc., and they refer this Kingdom *exclusively to this earth*, which, of course, follows naturally *from the relation* that this Kingdom sustains to the Jewish nation and Davidic throne. Any other portraiture of it would be incongruous, and hostile to covenant and fact.

Obs. 3. If it is one Kingdom, and thus related, it must, of necessity, embrace the following features: (1) Notwithstanding the removal of the Kingdom and the severe tribulation of the nation, *the preservation* of the race must be announced, for otherwise the election would fail and the Kingdom, as predicted, could not be restored. This is done in the most positive manner, as e.g. Jer. 31 : 35–37, and 33 : 19–26, Isa. 54 : 9–10, etc. (comp. Prop. 122). (2) The *restoration* of the Jews, notwithstanding their sinfulness and punishment, ought to be distinctively presented, because David's Kingdom is based on it. This also is predicted, as e.g. Ezek. 36 : 22, 24, and ch. 37, Jer., chs. 31, 32, and 33, etc. (comp. Props. 111, 112, 113, and 114). (3) And as David's throne was in Jerusalem, and was adopted as God's throne, when His Son shall reign, *the city* ought to be specially honored in such a revelation of the Kingdom, seeing that it stands intimately related to it. The Prophets thus distinguish it in the future, as e.g. Jer. 3 : 17, Isa. 24 : 23, Joel 3 : 17, etc. (comp. Prop. 168, etc.). Indeed, all the particulars needed for *a full identification* of *the identical* Kingdom, *once* established but *now* overthrown, are thus given in *the most simple language*. Why, following the Origenistic method, change this language, and make David's throne and kingdom, Jewish restoration, Jerusalem, etc., mean something else than the words *plainly* convey, without a direct revelation from God that such a change is intended?

Obs. 4. The Prophets describing one Kingdom, here on the earth, at some time in the future under the Messiah, and associated with the Jewish

nation and the Davidic throne, it is *a gross violation* of all propriety to take these prophetic descriptions and arbitrarily apply them, as many do, by dividing them—one part to the earth, another to the third heaven; one portion to the present time, and another to the distant future. This separation and disintegration of things that *belong together*, and relate to the *same period of time* and to *the same locality*, being even exhibited in the same sentence, as e.g. Isa. 25 : 8, where the abolishing of death is put in the future, and the rest is applied, without warrant, to the church as now constituted.

The only ingenious defence that we have found for this impropriety is in Dr. Alexander's *Com. on Isaiah* (p. 38, Pref. to vol. 2), which hides this defect, of dividing and locating in diverse places and times the Millennial descriptions, under a generalizing rule, by which such prophecies are to be applied to the condition of the church, and which condition is "considered not in its elements, but as a whole; not in the way of chronological succession, but at one view; not so much in itself as in contrast with the temporary system that preceded it." In some respects true, it is unsound to apply this indiscriminately and obtain a correct interpretation; for (1) particulars and elements are also predicted, and are to be considered in order to form a proper estimate of the whole —they cannot be safely omitted. (2) The predictions, with few exceptions, do refer to a chronological period and succession, and it is only in so far as we can locate these that the prophecies themselves can be properly appreciated. Thus e.g. to discriminate what belongs to the period preceding the First Advent, what to that Advent, what to the Sec. Advent, what to intervening time, etc., these are all important chronological data, and without some (at least approximative) knowledge of the position in time occupied by the prophecy in fulfilment, we are at once involved in confusion. There is no prophecy given, but it stands chronologically related. So that while in Prophecy there is only a general, indefinite appeal to chronology (excepting Daniel and the Apoc.), as e.g. "in that day," "in that time," etc., yet this phraseology has a decided reference to time, a set time, to which we must give heed if desirous to understand. (3) The last clause of Alexander's canon overlooks some permanent things in the preceding system, held in abeyance until the time of restoration; and if true, lessens the force of the predictions themselves by directing attention to "the contrast" and not to the reality of the things portrayed. Some writers (as e.g. Alexander *On Isaiah*) have denounced as an "erroneous hypothesis" the rule laid down by Vitringa, "that every prophecy must be *specific*, and must have its fulfilment in *a certain period* of history." Now without adopting some of Vitringa's interpretations based on this rule, and without asserting that *all* prophecies are delivered in chronological order (which cannot be sustained), we still hold that such a canon has the strongest possible reasons for its support. The denial of the rule materially aids the spiritualizing of prophecy. But if we allow that the prophecies are to be generalized, and that they have no particular reference to certain eras in the history of the church and the world (as e.g. those pertaining to the First or Sec. Advent, etc.), *then* we are at once sent adrift in an ocean of vague, unsatisfactory interpretation. From the decided and *specific fulfilment* of prophecy in the past, it is proper to hold that the remainder *will also thus* be verified, and this in itself, aside from other and weighty reasons (such as making the Divine Plan indefinite, weakening the proof of God's foreknowledge, frittering away the precise language of the prophets, etc.), is amply sufficient to cause us to reject so arbitrary a conclusion as the above.

Obs. 5. In the doctrine of the Kingdom we make much of the proper comparison and union of Prophecy, and especially lay stress on the sameness of language, ideas, etc., existing between Isaiah and the Apocalypse (as e.g. comp. Isa. 60 with Rev., chs. 21 and 22.). Our opponents, feeling the force of this, endeavor to rid themselves of the identity of these predictions based upon their similarity—which strongly prove the one Kingdom to which we hold—by asserting that they are prophecies referring to dissimilar things and times. Let it be candidly said, that any system of interpretation which will drive good men to ignore one of the plainest and most valuable guides in the interpretation of prophecy, is most certainly defective.

Some commentators (e.g. Alexander *On Isa.*, vol. 1, Pref., p. 56), object to the efforts of others in attempting to illustrate and interpret some of the predictions of the Prophets by the aid of the Apocalypse, and ground their objection on the alleged fact of the latter being "an independent prophecy." But how it becomes "independent" they fail to tell us. The truth is, that it is not such, for it is given by the *same* Spirit of Truth that gave the rest, and it has reference to the *same* Redemption, *same* ultimate end and glory, described in numerous other prophecies. It is *a continuation and amplification* of some of the predictions of Isaiah and others, and hence it is eminently proper for an expositor to avail himself of later Revelations, if, on any points, they may throw light on preceding ones. Prophecy is designed to reveal the Divine Purpose, to indicate and vindicate its *unity of design*, and therefore, instead of being "independent," one of another, all the predictions of God's Word relating to the Redemptive process, and the history of His people, are *mutually dependent* upon each other. If an Interpreter neglects this connection, confining himself to one prophet or book without considering what others have to say, he at once makes himself unreliable and an unsafe guide. The excellence of Dr. Alexander consists in his having *often* violated his own theory.

Obs. 6. Even in David's and Solomon's time this Kingdom was, in view of the foreseen rebellion of the nation, predicted as *a future restored* one under one of David's descendants; and this was based on the peculiar covenanted relationship of the nation and then existing Davidic dynasty, as e.g. Ps. 89 : 20–52, Ps. 132 : 11–18, etc. This, as previously intimated, was done intentionally, and, among other reasons, to show us convincingly that God *foreknew* the defection of the nation, and in His Plan *provided* for it. If these predictions had all been given after the overthrow of the Kingdom, we would not have *as strong* a proof of their inspiration as we now possess. Thus, e.g. would it be *in accordance* with human nature for David, when receiving a Theocratic favored Kingdom, to predict, during his lifetime, such an one as was destined to an overthrow, to a lengthy forsaking of God, etc.? No! men are disposed to laud and magnify their possessions, and predict perpetuity in their behalf. The predictions are in opposition to the prejudices and desires of human nature.

PROPOSITION 36. *The Prophets, with one voice, describe this one Kingdom, thus restored, in terms expressive of the most glorious additions.*

They predict, from the Psalmist down to Malachi, a restoration of *the identical overthrown* Kingdom, linked with the most astounding events, which shall produce a blessedness and glory *unexampled* in the history of the world. Thus, e.g., the resurrection is united with this restoration, as in Dan. 12 : 2, Isa. 25 : 8 (the latter located by Paul, 1 Cor. 15 : "*then* shall be fulfilled the saying written," etc.), and the new creation is allied with it, as in Isa. 65 : 17, and 66 : 22.

Obs. 1. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that such remarkable events (as, e.g., the resurrection of the saints, the restitution or re-creation) *must accompany and be identified* with the re-establishment of this Kingdom. The Prophets *unite* them, and we are not at liberty to separate them ; any theory that does this, is certainly unworthy of credence.

Some feel the force of this sufficiently to try and evade it. Thus e.g. Pres. Edwards (*His. of Redemp.*) endeavors to make out a kind of "new heavens and new earth" *now* created, but fails in locating it properly, because the descriptions of the prophets are not *now* realized in the church or earth. The same is true of Swedenborgianism and others, which make the same kind of application to the present. So also with making out a present spiritual resurrection, etc. The only way in which such applications can possibly be made is to forsake the grammatical sense and impose a spiritual or mystical to suit the line of interpretation.

Obs. 2. Since the overthrow of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, these predicted events have *not* taken place as delineated, and, therefore, the predicted, covenanted Kingdom has *not yet* appeared (although the multitude, by forsaking the grammatical, and cleaving to the mystical sense, hold to the contrary).

Obs. 3. It is *the same* Kingdom overthrown that receives those additions, and *not another* Kingdom that obtains them ; hence, no *professed* Kingdom, however loudly proclaimed and learnedly presented, should, lacking these, be accepted by us.

Obs. 4. Those additions are so great in their nature, so striking in their characteristics, so manifesting the interference of the Supernatural, that no one can possibly mistake *when* this Kingdom is restored.

Obs. 5. After the downfall of the Davidic Kingdom, the Prophets predict this Kingdom as future. They employ general terms with an

allusion to some definite, fixed time, as "*in that day*," etc. The only direct allusions to its nearness are contained in the statements that certain events must intervene, and that certain periods of time, then enshrouded in mystery, must elapse previous to its restoration. The prophetical periods themselves were at first necessarily obscure, because many of the events from which they were to be dated were also in the future. But while thus careful in reference to time to conceal it for wise reasons, the same motives did not exist in reference to events, so that the latter are given in lengthy and detailed accounts.

Some may think that the definitive seventy weeks of Daniel form an exception. But this prophecy says nothing (except by implication) of the setting up of the Kingdom; it therefore falls in with the rest, seeing that it only refers to the First Advent, the destruction of the city, and to the desolation which is to follow, even down to the consummation. From other prophecies, however, like Zech. 14, etc., we learn that at the fearful consummation of the end, the Sec. Advent and Kingdom will come. A mystery is thrown around the exact period of desolation, even if (like Baxter, etc.) we divide the last week from the remainder and insert the Times of the Gentiles as intervening, we must, to ascertain explicit knowledge of the Kingdom, refer to other predictions and attach them.

Obs. 6. The Prophets, too, describe this Kingdom as erected, and these additions as made, *not* by a Saviour coming in humiliation and suffering, *but* by a Redeemer coming in glory with all His saints, as e.g. Zech. 14 : 5, Rev. 19 : 11–16, etc.

Obs. 7. This causes then the singular prophetical procedure, viz. : only a few of the Prophets refer to the First Advent and its mournful particulars, as if conscious (which is strongly intimated) of the rejection of the Messiah and the long-continued downfall of the Kingdom; and, hence, enlarged and vivid descriptions of this restored Kingdom are confined to another and distinctive Advent (which from the New Test. account is designated the Second), which portraiture of the Kingdom has, to this time, *not yet* been realized. The Sec. Advent, with its glorious additions, its happiness and blessedness, was a more eminently desirable theme of the Spirit than the First, with its mournful consequences. Exceedingly precious as the First is, the Second exceeds it in glory, and, therefore, the latter is pre-eminently "*the blessed hope.*"

Obs. 8. The results of the First Advent, the accurate fulfilment down to the present day, the personal appropriation of the truths relating to it, impress us with a deep and abiding sense of *the reality* of that foreknowledge of the future which promises so much connected with a Second coming of *the same* Jesus.

PROPOSITION 37. *The Kingdom, thus predicted and promised, was not in existence when the Forerunner of Jesus appeared.*

Many books positively assert that the covenanted Kingdom of God *continuously* existed, subject only to some changes. Eminent men (whom we shall largely quote) declare the same, and make the church (after the overthrow of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom) its continuation. They, however, have not adduced *a single direct passage* of Scripture in support of their theory; and *the facts*, as already stated, all clearly prove the contrary. They have mistaken the original Divine Sovereignty lodged in the Creator for the Kingdom of promise, i.e., for the special reign of God over a nation, which *alone* is the covenanted Kingdom; or else, led by a preconceived development theory, they are forced to seek out and engraft such a Kingdom, and elevate the church into the same.

Obs. 1. The Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom *is the Kingdom of God;* this has been proven. Now this Kingdom was *fallen*, and it *continued* thus down to John the Baptist.

Obs. 2. The church, which was continued after the fall of the Davidic Kingdom, is nowhere directly designated the Kingdom of God. While under the care of the Divine Sovereignty, *it is not*, and, according to covenant, *it cannot be*, this Kingdom.

Obs. 3. The Prophets, *in* this church, instead of pointing out *an existing* Kingdom, invariably represent it as *fallen*, and its *restoration as future.*

Obs. 4. This same Kingdom was promised in its *restored form* to a certain descendant of David. He was to be its *Restorer.* Now it is folly to hold, that the Kingdom existed just *before* His appearance. His Advent and the Kingdom are inseparably linked together, so that the offspring of David, the long promised Son, must *first appear, and then* the Kingdom. This is the order laid down by all the Prophets. The Kingdom is promised to the Son of Man, and He must first come as man.

Obs. 5. The greatest looseness and latitude of opinion exist among able writers. In Prop. 20, Obs. 4, notice was taken how Thompson assumes the existence of a Kingdom, and that the Jews (against all historical fact) believed themselves to be in it. The Jews had no knowledge of *a then* existing Kingdom, for they looked, longed and prayed for the Davidic restored under the Messiah. Many writers imitate Thompson, and even exceed him, for they have a continuous Kingdom of God from Paradise down to the present

day, making no distinction whatever. Others are a little more moderate, as e.g. Prof. Hengstenberg (*The Jews and the Ch. Church*), who locate "the very beginning of the Kingdom of God" in the times of Abraham, i.e. *long before* the Theocracy was established. Of course, such a writer continues it on regardless of the Kingdom's distinctive features and the utterances of prophecy.

The writer has often been pained at the recklessness of statement on this subject. Many excellent authors, not distinguishing what really constitutes a Theocracy (viz. : God's condescending to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler, etc.), make the Theocracy or Kingdom existing down to the fall of Jerusalem, and then coolly transfer it over to the Christian Church. No solid advancement can be made in Theology until such *utterly unfounded* positions are relinquished.

Obs. 6. Auberlen (*The Proph. of Daniel*) has presented no profounder thought for the proper conception of the prophecies of Daniel, than that which carefully discriminates in this matter, saying : "According to what the book (Dan.) says of itself, it intends to represent something infinitely deeper and more sublime, namely, the relation of the *two fundamental* powers of universal history, the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, from the time when the Kingdom of God *ceases to exist* as a separate state, till the time when it shall be *re-established as such* in glory." Daniel gives us an epitome of the time, chronologically, during which the Kingdom *does not exist* down to the period of its *re-establishment*, thus supplying important links in the prophetical delineation of the Divine Purpose. It is scarcely necessary to add that it includes, at least, the period down to John the Baptist.

Even if we were to take the usual interpretation given, by our opponents, to Daniel (e.g. chs. 2 and 7) respecting the setting up of Messiah's Kingdom, viz. : at the First Advent, it would sustain the position of our Proposition. The prediction of establishing the Kingdom at a particular, specified era is sufficient evidence that for some time, at least, previously it must not have been in existence. The prophecies indicate the Divine Sovereignty controlling all things, even while the Kingdom of God did not exist on earth as promised.

Obs. 7. Let the reader consider, what is too much overlooked, that this Kingdom is one of promise and here on the earth, and hence does not refer to the divine nature of the Father or of Christ considered in itself, separate and apart from *the expressed covenanted relationship* (comp. Props. 80 and 81). For, as Dr. Storrs (*Diss. on Kingdom*) has well remarked, that government solely arising from, or inherent in, the Divine Nature "could not be the subject of promise or expectation." God's Sovereignty, necessarily and eternally inherent in Him and pervading all things, is never promised, only as connected and abiding with David's seed in this Kingdom. This is confirmed by what is said in Hebrews respecting the human nature of Christ (comp. Props. 82–84).

Obs. 8. The only Kingdom of God, *distinctively announced as such*, is that one in which, as we have shown, God Himself condescends to act in the capacity of an earthly King, exhibiting directly the functions of such a King in legislative, executive, and judicial action. After the overthrow of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, *none such* existed on earth, but a sad, mournful vacancy transpired.

Obs. 9. This Kingdom was not preached to the people immediately before John the Baptist came. Luke (16 : 16) says that Jesus declared: "The law and the prophets were until John; *since that time* the Kingdom of God is preached." In whatever way this is explained (see Judge Jones's *Notes*, p. 110, etc., and Com. on Matt. 11 : 12, 13), it certainly implies a period of time preceding when the Kingdom was *not directly offered* for acceptance. The legitimate inference follows, that it was *not* in existence. It was, indeed, predicted, promised, believed in, and expected, but it was *not* authoritatively offered for present acceptance and realization, as was done by John and those following him.

Obs. 10. That the Kingdom did not thus exist, is very apparent from the language of John himself (Matt. 3 : 2): "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven *is at hand*," implying, forcibly, that for some time it had *not* been near, seeing that it *now* drew nigh.

Obs. 11. This teaches us in what light to consider the notion entertained by numerous eminent writers (as e.g. Hengstenberg in *The Jews and the Ch. Church*), viz.: that the Christian Church, as the Kingdom of God, is simply *a continuance* of an existing Kingdom of God in the Jewish nation. It is *fundamentally* erroneous, and *most seriously* affects the interpretation of Scripture. (Comp. Props. on the Church.)

Obs. 12. Many able theologians folly indorse our Proposition as a self-evident fact. Thus e.g. Van Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*) makes the Kingdom of God something "*new*," not a mere uninterrupted continuation, "for it has first come nigh in the fulness of time (Matt. 4 : 17); it did not before exist on earth." While guarding against one extreme (i.e. to make out the Ch. Church a continuation of the Kingdom), he falls, however, into *another* when he asserts that "it did not *before* exist on earth," which is pointedly contradicted by *the previous* establishment of the Theocracy, that was, *par excellence*, the Kingdom of God, by its *withdrawal and promised restoration.*

PROPOSITION 38. *John the Baptist preached that this Kingdom, predicted by the Prophets, was "nigh at hand."*

This Kingdom was to be offered to the Jewish nation, and John's mission was to prepare the nation for its acceptance. However men may explain the Kingdom itself, the fact stated is not disputed.

Obs. 1. But right here, at the very beginning of the New Test. narrative, pious and good men, under a mistaken view of the Kingdom to which John's preaching does not correspond, endeavor *to lessen* the knowledge and the importance of John. This is done by misapplying a passage of Scripture, so that the idea is boldly advanced that John's teaching, in comparison with what is now taught, is of *comparative little value.* One commentator even informs us that the lowest teacher in the church—a Sunday-school teacher is mentioned—stands higher than John. So long as men can degrade *a heaven-appointed* preacher of the Kingdom to so low a scale in knowledge and standing, it *is vain* to expect them to give us a consistent and scriptural view of the Kingdom of God.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to vindicate the standing of the first N. Test. preacher from the disparaging views announced by Barnes (the commentat or alluded to), Scott, Clarke, Nast, and others, and found in almost every Life of Christ. It is a gross mistake to make (as Farrar, *Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 294) "the humblest child of the New Covenant more richly endowed than the greatest prophet of the Old." Lange, Matt. 11 : 7-15, gives several interpretations, all more or less defective. Dr. Schaff, foot-note to Lange's *Com.*, Matt. 3 : 1, unable to follow the wild interpretations usually presented, justly makes the comparison one of "standpoint and official station," but hampered by the idea of its being still in some way related to the present church weakens its force. Jones, *Notes on Scripture* (p. 65), gives the best comment and interpretation that we have seen consistent with fact and the analogy of Scripture. Hengstenberg (*Christol.*, B. 3, S. 460) defends the higher character, etc., of John. The passage referred to, supposed to teach the low standard of John in comparison with believers of this dispensation, is found in Matt. 11 : 11 and Luke 7 : 28 : "Verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; *notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of heaven is greater than he.*" Our Saviour, undoubtedly, refers to the Kingdom of heaven as it will be established *at His Second Advent*, as our Propositions tend to show, for the church is *only preparative* to that still future, coming Kingdom, in which the least that inherits is greater in official standing, more highly honored, than John was in his official position. Leaving what follows to indicate the truthfulness of this application of a perverted passage, it may be only added: it certainly requires great assurance for any one, teacher or not, to assert, from the language of Jesus, that he is, or that his fellows are, *superior* to John, in view of John's character, inspiration, and mission. Admitting fully the blessings, privileges, and increased knowledge of some things that we now enjoy, yet a little reflection over the constant attendance of the Holy Spirit, the sublimity of that authoritative preaching by which he commanded all to repent, the consciousness of His being a Forerunner of the Messiah, the spotless character maintained, the faithfulness unto death, should cause persons to suspect, at once, that reference is made to those who *actually inherit* the Kingdom; who have *actually become*, and realize their honor and glory as kings and priests; who will *then* be greater than John in every respect, while John, also, in that

Kingdom will occupy a *still higher position* than the one sustained at the First Advent. (Comp. following Propositions.) Fairbairn (*Typology*, p. 48) accords with the present general view that "the most eminent in spiritual light and privilege before were still decidedly inferior even to the less distinguished members of the Messiah's Kingdom" (i.e. according to his view of the Kingdom, the present Church). But feeling a certain incongruity in such an application (which so *unjustly* contrasts, an inspired man with uninspired), he gives us the following note which speaks for itself: "Matt. 11 : 11, where it is said respecting John the Baptist 'notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of heaven, is greater than he.' The older English versions retain the comparative, and rendered 'he that is *less* in the Kingdom of heaven' (Wycliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, the Geneva); and so also Winer, Greek Gr., § 36, 3, 'he who occupies some lower place in the Kingdom of heaven.' Lightfoot, Hengstenberg, and many others approve of this *milder* sense, as it may be called; but Alford in his recent Com. adheres still to the stronger 'the least;' and so does Steir in his 'Reden Jesu,' who in illustrating the thought, goes so far as to say, 'a mere child that knows the catechism, and can say the Lord's prayer, both knows and possesses more than the Old Test. can give, and so far stands higher and nearer to God than John the Baptist.' One cannot but feel that this is putting something like *a strain* on our Lord's declaration." Fairbairn indeed relaxes "the strain" somewhat, but continues it.

Obs. 2. Others, again, in the way of eulogizing John as a preacher of the coming Kingdom, exalt him beyond what the language and facts will bear. Thus e.g. Judge Jones (*Notes*) correctly rejecting the interpretation of Barnes, etc., adds: "None greater than he will ever appear till all things shall be restored, and the Kingdom of God shall come." The language of Jesus, however, only says that none greater had arisen to that time, and we have no authority to continue the comparison down to the Sec. Advent. The apostles were also preachers of this Kingdom, also specially called, specially inspired, etc., and are specially honored as the founders of the Ch. Church. So also Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, p. 37) informs us that in John "prophetism attains its point of culmination." But this is opposed to fact: others prophesied after John, as e.g. Paul in Thess., Jesus in lengthy and remarkable predictions, and John the Revelator giving us the words of Jesus in the Apocalypse. John predicted but little in comparison with those who followed him.

Obs. 3. John preached "*the gospel of the Kingdom*," just as Jesus, the twelve, and the seventy afterward preached it. Attention is simply directed to this, because some assert that there is no preaching of the Gospel unless a crucified Redeemer is proclaimed. But we have here and previous to the death of Jesus the gospel of the Kingdom proclaimed to the nation.

Obs. 4. Some able writers (as e.g. Bernard, *Bampton Lectures*, "The Progress of Doctrine," Lec. 2) take the position that "The Gospel, considered as fact, was begun at the Incarnation and completed at the Resurrection; but the Gospel, considered as Doctrine, began from the first preaching of Jesus, and was completed in the dispensation of the Spirit." This is, however, too circumscriptive; for the Gospel was announced previously to the preaching of Jesus by John, and was contained in the Old Test. The facts pertaining to the Gospel extend beyond the resurrection, even to Christ's present exaltation, through this intermediate period down to the Second Advent. To make the Gospel perfect, faith must accept as facts (owing to certainty and assurance of fulfilment) things that are future. The Gospel could be no Gospel to the Gentiles until their calling

and adoption was divinely assumed and demonstrated, i.e. in an official manner. The Gospel, when employed as a general term to embrace all that relates to Salvation, cannot be thus circumscribed; in particulars (as e.g. relating to call of Gentiles, to the Person or Life of Jesus, etc.) it may be limited.

PROPOSITION 39. *John the Baptist was not ignorant of the Kingdom that he preached.*

The prevailing view, indorsed by a multitude of eminent theologians, is that John was *ignorant of*, i.e., did not understand the nature of, the Kingdom he proclaimed. Numerous works proceed to tell us how "*low*" and "*carnal*" John's ideas were, without perceiving *the fatal flaw* introduced; without realizing that they are actually sapping the very foundations of inspiration, and giving to infidelity its strongest weapons against the divine origin of Christianity.

The ablest writers, under the preconceived view that a subsequent change was substituted in the idea of the Kingdom, do gross injustice to John the Baptist. Thus e.g. Ebrard (*Gospel History*, p. 283) makes John totally ignorant of the Kingdom and of "the formation of a compact 'Kingdom of Christ'"—and "he received no revelation from God on this matter, but *was left* to his own conclusions,"—also making John less "in insight" than any member of the present church. A multitude of quotations, expressing the same idea, could readily be gathered.

Obs. 1. Any theory of the Kingdom which makes the first great preacher of the Kingdom—a preacher *specially* prepared, sent, and inspired—ignorant of the leading subject that he was delegated, specifically commissioned to announce, is not only open to the gravest suspicion, but *ought to be rejected* as unworthy of God.

Obs. 2. What was John's conception of the Messiah's Kingdom? Let those who consider John to be mistaken inform us, and let the reader judge for himself whether it is not *the very idea* of the Kingdom embraced in *the grammatical sense* of the prophets (Prop. 21), and in a restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom. Thus e.g. Neander (*Life of Christ*, ch. 2, s. 40) truthfully admits that "he expects this Kingdom to be visible," "existing in communion with the divine life, *with the Messiah as its visible King;* so that, what had not been the case before, *the idea of the Theocracy and its manifestation should precisely correspond to each other*," and "his expectations of *a visible realization of the Theocracy shows him as yet upon Old Test. ground.*" That is, John expected *the restoration of the Theocracy* in an exalted manner under the Messiah, *just* as the prophets *plainly* predicted. Was he mistaken in this conception? Many say that he was, simply because such a conception was not realized at the First Advent, and down to the present day no such Kingdom has existed, and, therefore, take it *for granted*, that he misapprehended the nature of the Kingdom; that the church must be the Kingdom intended; that the prophecies pertaining to the restored Theocracy must be spiritualized to suit the present church, etc., thus *overlooking* the fact, clearly given, that *for certain reasons* (which will hereafter be given in detail) *the very*

Kingdom preached and anticipated by John *was postponed.* Instead of allowing God's Word to speak, and having faith in it that it will yet be fulfilled *as written,* this *lack* of faith, based on a supposed never to be realized fulfilment, is made the measure of John's preaching and of God's Divine Purpose. *Is it wise or prudent?*

So weak and insignificant is John's preaching, so Jewish in its nature and intent, in the estimation of many, that it is passed by without comment, or even notice, in books where we naturally, from the subject discussed, seek to find it, as illustrated, e.g. in Pres. Edwards's *His. of Redemption.* Books giving a history of Christ, and including that of John the Baptist, are very careful not to touch the preaching of the Kingdom, or to inform us what Kingdom he proclaimed, but waive the whole matter by telling us, in general phrases, that John endeavored to prepare the people for the coming Messiah, as exemplified, e.g. in Fleetwood's *Life of Christ.* Commentators, with lack of fairness and candor, pass by the real facts (as they will be shown in following Propositions) of John's preaching of the Kingdom, and present such a modernized version of the language, as if that accurately represented John's belief, that they impose upon the ignorant and unwary reader, as shown, e.g. in Barnes's *Notes* on Matt. 3 : 2. Thus the Baptist suffers from neglect, from the slights of believers, and from the inserting a meaning into his language that he never for a moment entertained.

Obs. 3. If John is *specially called* to preach this Kingdom, and yet labors under delusion, gross error respecting its nature, we ask, Whom, then, can we trust? Let the reader ponder these facts: that this John was consecrated to the ministerial office from the womb (Luke 1 : 15); that for this purpose he was brought forth beyond the ordinary course of nature (Luke 1 : 18); that he was under such Divine guidance as (Luke 1 : 15, etc.) to be "*filled with the Holy Ghost*"; constituted "*the prophet of the Highest*"; "*to give knowledge of salvation*"; and (John. 1 : 7) to be "*a witness of the light*";—and *then is it credible,* even supposable, that *such* a Prophet and Witness, thus filled with the Spirit, should *grossly blunder* in declaring *the leading subject* of his preaching, the Kingdom of heaven? Yet such is the opinion of multitudes, learned and unlearned, while infidels laugh and sneer at this practically acknowledged *lowering of a divinely commissioned* preacher of the Kingdom. Surely, if this is so, viz., that he misapprehended the Kingdom, *then upon what* does his credibility as a prophet depend? If mistaken in *the most vital* part of his mission, why was he not in error concerning the rest? Now, against all such dishonoring theories, we take the ground, sustained both by Scripture and the Primitive Church view, that he was *not mistaken* in his preaching; that he *knew full well* what Kingdom he was to tender to the Jewish nation, far better than the multitude which denies its correctness; and that if such a Kingdom, as he believed in and proclaimed, was not realized, we must *allow the Scriptures themselves* to assign the reasons for such a delay. This, indeed, requires *faith,* but it is a faith abundantly sustained by facts.

Obs. 4. There is something inconsistent in Neander and others opposing the idea of the Kingdom embraced in the preaching of John and the disciples, as being *an imperfect conception* of its nature, etc., and yet in their development theory, when the world is renewed, they have, to all intents and purposes, virtually *the same* notion expressed. Thus e.g. Neander: "In fine, the end of this development appears to be (though not, indeed, simply as its natural result) a complete realization of the Divine Kingdom which Christ established in its outward manifestation, fully

answering to its idea; a perfect *world dominion* of Christ and of His organs, a world purified and transformed, to become *the seat of His universal Empire.*" Why, then, so strenuously reject and oppose John's idea of the Kingdom, an outward visible Kingdom, resulting in a world dominion, etc., if their own attached notion, in place of it, is ultimately at its consummation to bring this to pass?

Obs. 5. The reader will find, in looking over authors, interpreters, etc., that many of them, whilst having much to say about John's preaching repentance, omit, as a tender subject beset with difficulties, *all allusions* to his preaching the Kingdom, although repentance is only described as a means for attaining to the Kingdom. The greater is sacrificed to the lesser, or else, with their church-kingdom theory prejudging the case, and not knowing how to reconcile John's preaching with his special call, etc., they simply let it alone. But other expositors and writers approach the subject frankly, and candidly tell us what were the views of John, confirming Neander's opinion (Obs. 2). Thus e.g. Meyer (*Com.* Matt. 3 : 2) acknowledges that he did, in his idea of the Messianic Kingdom, embrace "*the political element.*" The author of *Ecce Homo* admits that he "*meant that the Theocracy was to be restored.*" Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 124) says, "After all, John the Baptist was still *a Jew;* he looked for the brilliant and august inauguration of the Kingdom which he had proclaimed with so much fervor and devotedness," etc., i.e. a Jewish Kingdom, such as the grammatical sense of the prophecies conveyed. Such testimonies could be multiplied, but these are sufficient. Others refer to this matter in a half-apologetic tone, a lamely explanatory manner, that only makes the defect the more glaring. Thus e.g. Olshausen (*Com.* Matt. 2 : 3) says: "If now we ask in what sense John the Baptist may have understood the Kingdom, it is most probable that in his relation to the law, he conceived of it with the generality and indeterminateness of the Old Test., but without incorporating with the idea anything false. We may concede *a certain affinity* between John's notions of the Messiah's Kingdom and those that prevailed among the people." This extract speaks for itself and needs no comment, seeing that the "indeterminateness" is with Olshausen and not with John or the Old Test. Van Oosterzee, (*Theol. N. Test.*, s. 7), while apparently avoiding the main point (i.e. the Kingdom preached by John), refers to his *preaching* in this way: "Nevertheless, compared with the teaching of the Lord and His apostles, is the testimony of John the Baptist *relatively poor*, and not *essentially raised above* the standpoint of the Old Test." We gratefully and heartily accept of the standpoint assigned to John, and *will prove* from Scripture (not assertion or assumption) that John's testimony and conception was *the truth*, confirmed by *covenant and the oath* of the Almighty, and therefore *relatively and inexpressibly rich.*

Obs. 6. Those, of course, who assume that the weakest believer who now attempts to preach the Kingdom of God is far greater than John (Prop. 38, Obs. 1) have no hesitancy in rejecting John's views of the Kingdom. John, being less than the least in this dispensation (e.g. Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 163), it follows that every believer can tell us *far better* what the Kingdom is than John was able, although specially called to preach it. If this is so, how comes it that the great and learned theologians of this

dispensation present us so many definitions and meanings, several kinds of kingdoms, etc., and that there is such a lack of *uniformity* of belief among them? If all are *greater* preachers than John, if they have *more* knowledge and *clearer* conceptions, why, then, do we not find them expressed? (comp. Prop. 3). Fairness to John requires that we should accept of his preaching until it is *proven* to be erroneous; simple assertion, however repeated by the learned, does not condemn him.

As an illustration how recent Roman Catholic writers treat the subject, ignoring its difficulties pertaining to their Church-Kingdom view, we present the two following: Dr. Alzog (*Univ. Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 147), speaking of John, says: "He, unlike them (i.e. other prophets), did not put off to an indefinite future the amelioration which he promised, but proclaimed that the Kingdom of God was *already* among men, and that the least in the Kingdom of heaven (i.e. the Church) was greater than he." Dr. Rutter (*Life of Jesus*, p. 99), after telling us that John said, "Do penance, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand," pronounces the Kingdom to be "that inward and spiritual reign which begins here on earth by faith showing its charity and good works, and which will attain its utmost completion in heaven by the perfection of charity; a reign which consists in this, that Almighty God, having, through Jesus Christ, destroyed the empire of the devil over the hearts of men, sovereignly reigns there in this life by knowledge and love, and in the next life by the sights and enjoyment of the divine essence, which constitutes our external happiness." Comp. Props. 19, 20, 21, 22, 37, 41, etc., and also 90 to 109. The same view is held by a multitude of Protestants, although such a Kingdom has no resemblance whatever to *the covenanted and oath-bound* one.

PROPOSITION 40. *The hearers of John believed that he preached to them the Kingdom predicted by the Prophets, and in the sense held by themselves.*

This follows from the preceding Propositions, and is also admitted by many eminent writers.

Obs. 1. The Jewish belief in *a restored* Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom has been noticed (Prop. 20), as supported by the grammatical sense of the prophecies (Prop. 21), and the election of the nation (Prop. 24), etc. The preaching of John, giving *no* explanation of the Kingdom, indicative that the Kingdom is something well known (Prop. 19), and the employment of current phraseology without change of meaning (Props. 22 and 23), etc.—all proves *the correctness* of our position.

Obs. 2. The grammatical sense was the *only one* then used *in relation to* the Kingdom, producing unity of belief in *a restored* Davidic Kingdom.

Even the Rabbins, who had already largely perverted Scripture by allegorical and mystical interpretations, still clung with unswerving faith to the plain grammatical sense when it related to the Kingdom. The testimony on this point is overwhelming; as much of it is presented under various Propositions, it need not be repeated.

Obs. 3. The unity of belief in the same restored Kingdom is evidenced by John's preaching of the Kingdom raising up *no disputation* concerning it. Had he preached the modern view, it would inevitably have excited disputes and appeals to the prophets.

Obs. 4. The exclusiveness (Prop. 29) of the Jewish nation, the prophecies describing but one Kingdom (Prop. 35), etc., forbid the idea that there was *an antagonism* of belief between the preacher and the hearer. There might be a difference of opinion respecting the imposed condition of repentance, but there could be none concerning the Kingdom so far as related to its essential nature.

Obs. 5. This fact of *a unison of view* respecting the Kingdom alone satisfactorily accounts for the exceeding brevity with which it is mentioned. It is taken for granted that no difference of opinion existed.

Obs. 6. The unity of agreement also accounts for so little descriptive of the Kingdom being given in detail in the New Test. It was fully known and described in the prophets; now to have entered into a detailed statement and particularized *the restored Davidic Kingdom*, would *unnecessarily* have excited the open hostility of the jealous and persecuting Roman Empire.

Cimarus and others have made this feature an objection to John the Baptist and Jesus, viz. : that devoted to the Jewish ideal of a Kingdom, the restored Davidic, they virtually became conspirators against the authority of the Cæsars. This is nothing new, for it was this accusation that influenced Pilate to give up Jesus to crucifixion, and led to the just superscription of the cross. The whole matter rests upon the priority of claims, the justness of conquest, the authority of God, the manner of introducing the Kingdom, etc. Foreseeing, as we shall show, the result, *the greatest prudence* was exercised in this matter to avoid unnecessary persecution, and when it was finally known that the Kingdom was postponed to the Second Advent, to be introduced by the power of Jesus Christ, *then*, in view of the prophecies which foretold their continued existence down to the Advent, believers were taught that the existing governments were ordained or appointed of God—not that they were sacred (as claimed), but allowed as a necessary requirement, etc.

Obs. 7. This unity of agreement is also seen in John doing his preaching in the wilderness—that is, east from Jerusalem in the open country, away from the large cities. He and his hearers, both believing in *a restored Davidic Kingdom*, and he endeavoring by repentance to prepare the nation for its coming, those large gatherings of Jews and the preaching of such a Kingdom would necessarily have excited inquiry and the pressure of Roman power. Hence (especially in view of the foreseen rejection) *the utmost caution*, consistent with John's mission, is observed.

If the modern prevailing view of the Kingdom is the correct one, no reason can be assigned for John's avoidance of the centres of influence, as e.g. Jerusalem.

Obs. 8. The agreement of opinion is seen in the disciples of John, who, as far as known, held to the coming of the restored Davidic Kingdom under the Messiah.

Obs. 9. John and his hearers certainly had no other views than those entertained by following preachers of the Kingdom, as e.g. the apostles; see Acts 1 : 6.

Obs. 10. The agreement of opinion is frankly admitted by many of our opponents, whom we have quoted, and whom we shall hereafter quote, as e.g. Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*), Neander (*Life of Christ*, etc.), and others.

Obs. 11. It is in view of such agreement of opinion that *Ecce Homo* declares (p. 13, etc.) that John tried to renew the old Covenant by promising "the restoration of the ancient Theocracy," adding, "he had renewed the old Theocratic Covenant with the nation. But not all the nation was fit to remain in such a covenant," etc.

PROPOSITION 41. *The Kingdom was not established under John's ministry.*

It could not be, because *no restored Theocracy*, such as the prophets predicted, the covenant demanded, and he preached, followed. This is seen by *the failure* of John's mission, which was designed to prepare, if possible, consistently with moral freedom, the nation for the Kingdom.

Obs. 1. John was not conscious of a Kingdom being established, as is noticeable in the message that he sent, shortly before his death, from prison to Jesus.

Consider the position of John in prison, and imagine the thoughts that must have arisen in his mind while confined for several months in the fortress. He had preached the coming of the Kingdom conditioned on repentance; he had seen and announced the Messiah, through whom, as he fondly anticipated, the Kingdom was to be established. Just before his imprisonment he had expressed the hope that the Messiah would be received, and hence looked for a speedy visible Messianic Kingdom. Now it is supposed (e.g. Neander's *Life of Christ*, S. 135) that doubts arose in John's mind respecting the Messiah on account of the delay. But this could not *possibly be*, owing to John's specific mission, his testimony to Jesus, his having seen the attesting divine manifestation, and his having heard the confirming voice from heaven. John had *no doubts* concerning the Messiahship of Jesus. How, then, interpret the action of sending his disciples to Jesus? The explanation follows naturally from the hopes entertained by him, and the condition in which he was placed. Being imprisoned, the hope of a speedy establishment of the Kingdom (for had he not seen the Messiah?) implanted the hope of a speedy release from his prison; for *then*, under the reign of the Messiah as predicted by the prophets, he would necessarily experience deliverance from his enemies (as Zacharias believed, Luke 1 : 74). Such thoughts must, from the very nature of his belief, hope, and situation, have passed through his mind. To satisfy his mind respecting release, whether the Kingdom would be soon established, he sends two of his disciples (Matt. 11 : 2, 3), with, in his estimation, a *test* question: "art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" Now if we but reflect that (As Olshausen, *Com. loci* has well remarked, comp. Whitby *loci.*) "the Coming One" or "'He that Cometh,' has a fixed doctrinal signification, viz.: the Messiah" (denoting the One who should restore the Davidic Kingdom)—this was a most delicate way of asking *why* the Kingdom was not established, *why* there was a delay in its restoration. John proclaimed Him as "the Coming One," and thus reminds Jesus of the fact by the question; but, in view of the non-appearance of the Kingdom and of his confinement in consequence, also in the latter clause indirectly urges Jesus to make no delay, invites Him to hasten and manifest His Messianic mission. There is no necessity to draw from the narrative the idea of John's wavering in his Messianic faith (as unbelief has it), or of his being momentarily grievously tempted (as Olshausen), or that he misapprehended the nature of the Kingdom (as Ebrard, note to Olshausen), (comp. Whitby and Scott *loci.*) etc., but rather as Kendrick (note to Olshausen, *loci*) "that John stumbled rather at our Saviour's *slowness* in assuming to Himself that temporal dominion which doubtless formed a part of his view of the function of the Messiah," or as Lange (*Com. loci*), that he desired "himself to witness the manifestation of that Kingdom of heaven which he had announced," and which, as a resultant, would bring deliverance. John thus expresses his hope in the Kingdom, virtually saying: If, as I believe, Thou art the Messiah, *why not* establish the Kingdom and impart freedom; it was an appeal. Now notice Chirst's admirable reply: Well knowing that the King-

dom *would be postponed* on account of the nation's unworthiness, He does not reject John's Messianic hopes, but simply confirms His Messianic character by an appeal to His works—thus confirming John's faith in Himself as the Messiah without intimating *when* the Messianic expectations would be realized. Renan (*Life of Christ*, p. 189) says, that when John's disciples returned to him from Jesus, "we are led to believe that, in spite of his consideration for Jesus, John did not consider that he was to realize the divine promises." This is an utterly unfair and unjust influence. We have seen why Jesus could not be more specific in answering John—the postponement of the Kingdom is the reason—but this did not forbid Him from confirming John's faith in Himself as the Messiah, and, by consequence, that John should himself realize (at some time) the Messianic promises. The language indicates it.

Obs. 2. That no Kingdom was established is evident from *the continued* style of preaching the Kingdom *after* John's imprisonment and death, for Jesus, the disciples, and the seventy announced it, not as *actually present*, but as still future.

Obs. 3. The imprisonment and death of John itself is indicative of our position, for it shows that, instead of a Kingdom, suffering is allotted; the Forerunner is rejected, and the Kingdom cannot be obtained without blood shed in its behalf. A *martyred* Forerunner is an appropriate foreground to *a crucified* King, and reminds us how dearly this very Kingdom is purchased.

Leathes (*The Religion of Christ, Bampton Lectures* for 1874), while misapprehending and spiritualizing the Kingdom that John preached, yet fully admits: "He certainly died without seeing the Advent of that Kingdom which he had proclaimed as near." We cannot see how any one who holds the Ch. Church that was established on the day of Pentecost to be this Kingdom, can logically hold any other view. Hence many writers occupy Leathes' position, and concede our Proposition. Our opponents involve themselves in the most glaring inconsistencies and contradictions by not adhering in strictness to their own Church-Kingdom theory. Thus e.g. Barnes and others (even including such as Nast, etc.) make the Ch. Church to be the Kingdom established on the day of Pentecost after the death of Jesus, but then again and again they tell us that the Gospel with its resultant spiritual reign is this Kingdom, and that this Gospel was preached and result gained in John's time (thus making this Kingdom not to exist and then again to exist); and then, without seeing the absurdity of the proceeding, when commenting on Matt. 11 : 11, they make out that John is *not* in the Kingdom of heaven, but that the least one in it (i.e. the Church) is superior to John, owing to privilege, etc., after having declared in other places that John *was in* it and caused his hearers to press into it. Alas! what confusion arises, when men forsake the plain sense of covenant and prophecy.

Obs. 4. This satisfactorily answers the question, *why* John continued his ministry *after* the public appearance of Christ. The solution is found in John baptizing not only in view of a Messiah to come, but of a Kingdom to come. The Kingdom, and meetness for it, was the burden of his preaching, and the foundation motive for urging repentance. Now if the Kingdom had appeared, as some writers contend, as soon as Jesus was baptized by John or even earlier, *then* John's mission would have ended; but as the Kingdom was not manifested, John could continue his own ministry without change. Jesus only commenced (Matt. 4 : 17) His preaching when John was imprisoned.

The testimony of Killen (*The Ancient Church*, p. 11), that the Jews "anxiously awaited the appearance of a Messiah," is that of every historian. But with this and as a resultant, inseparably united, was the idea of the Messianic Kingdom. Hence the preaching was continued as preparatory to the Kingdom. This, also, throws light on the baptism of Jesus, a difficult subject, because Jesus needed not repentance. Some (Farrar) make

it to "prefigure the laver of regeneration;" others (Shenkel), a vicarious or representative act; others (Bernard), an act of humility, or (Barnes) an example sanctioning divine institutions, or (Lange) to remove ceremonial uncleanness, etc. This baptism was designed to indicate that the person receiving it was prepared or qualified for the Kingdom, yielding himself to the supreme will of God, hence David's Son could properly receive it.

Obs. 5. The non-establishment of the Kingdom is shown in the fact that the disciples of John, instructed by himself, and their adherents after John's death, even after the death of Jesus, formed a sect who still waited for the coming of the Messiah (Gieseler, *Ch. His.* 1: 69, Lange's *Com.*, p. 69, etc.). This can only be accounted for on the ground that, not seeing the Kingdom established as preached by John, and unacquainted with or failing to appreciate its postponement to the Sec. Advent of the crucified Jesus, they still looked for the manifestation of the Kingdom, and, of course, then for the Messiah to restore it.

Obs. 6. The brevity of John's ministry is readily accounted for; brief as it was, it was *sufficiently long* to indicate *the unfitness* of the nation for the Kingdom (comp. Lange, *Com.*, Matt. 3 : 1–12, p. 68, 2d col.). Different writers inform us that it was very successful and give us glowing accounts how the multitude "pressed into" the Kingdom; but we have the *decided testimony* of the Lord Himself that, whatever degree of success attended John's efforts in the beginning, his mission to the nation was acceptable only *to the few*; the representative men of the nation were not gained, they did not repent (Matt. 11 : 18).

As this is an important point, and misconception here will lead to misinterpretation, a few words may be added. The passage adduced to prove the success of John's ministry is Matt. 11 : 12, and Luke 16 : 16. We refer, by way of illustration, to Barnes' *Com. loci*, to show how comments are made. On this verse, he tells us of the multitudes who "rush" and "press" for the Kingdom, and this state of things "has continued," etc., and yet, when commenting on verse 18 of the same chapter, forgetting what he had just penned, he *then* informs us that "this generation" "were not pleased with him," etc. The reader is referred to the admirable comment of Judge Jones (*Notes on the Scriptures, loci*) on this passage, in which he consistently proves (take Luke 16 : 16 in connection as interpreter) that it teaches that men *pressed against, resisted* the Kingdom, treated it with violent opposition, although urged upon them. His criticism of the text corresponds with the context, and makes it to harmonize with the facts as they truly existed (so also Lightfoot, Schneckenburger, and others). Those, however, who retain a different rendering, to make it consistent with fact, interpret it (as H. Dana Ward, *Proph. Times*, Ap. 1874, p. 36), "every (wise) man presseth toward it," or (as J. G. W., *Proph. Times*, vol. 11, No. 5, p. 72), "From the days of John the Baptizer until now, the Kingdom of heaven suffereth violence" (permits a violation of ritualism), "and the violent" (the earnest penitents) "take it by force" (striving to enter into the strait gate, etc.). These, and others (comp. Lange's *Com. loci*, Scott, etc.) are more or less forced, while Jones's interpretation is natural and *accordant with fact*. That no national or wide extended repentance was produced is evident from the deputation (John 1 : 19–27) and subsequent events. The extravagant eulogies of "a holy violence," and the making by some (Lange, etc.), John and Jesus to be "the violent," are simply glosses; the violent—by conspiring to put the Messiah to death—took, as we shall show in detail, the Kingdom *away from* the nation.

Obs. 7. Some writers, in their eagerness to make out a preparation for the First Advent (which existed, and is temperately (e.g. Schaff, *His. Apos. Church*) described by others), tell us much of the preparation of the Jewish nation for the same. But this is shown to be *utterly unworthy of credence*, in view of *the failure* of John's mission, *the rejection and death* of the

Messiah, and *the resultant judgments* of God. (Comp. character of Jews as given by Jesus, Josephus, Harwood, Mosheim, Horne, etc.).

Often have we been pained and surprised to find careful and able writers fall into extravagances in this direction. Thus e.g. Dr. Luthardt (*Bremen Lectures*, Lec. 8, p. 128) says: "John the Baptist's mission was to be bridesman. He led the bride to the bridegroom, to be united with Him in marriage, to be made one with Him. This is the end of the history of Israel," etc. All that we have to say of this perversion of the marriage figure, as used in Scripture, is this: John found a very unwilling bride, and in his efforts came to his death, and Jesus also died; instead of a marriage there was *gloom and death*; the marriage was postponed. Men may—this is their apology—think to honor Christ by showing a successful mission in John, but they do it *at the expense of truth*; and Jesus needs no fictitious praise. Many illustrations of this could be given, but this will suffice. However, in this connection it may be well to mention another mistake that is prevalent. Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 115) speaks of John's baptism "as an initiation into the Kingdom." This is nowhere asserted; and it is opposed by all *the facts* that we have already presented, and by others that will follow. It was a baptism of repentance to *qualify for* the Kingdom, and not to admit, or initiate *into* the Kingdom, as is seen e.g. by the force of Acts 1 : 6, (the apostles even not being cognizant of such a Kingdom).

PROPOSITION 42. *Jesus Christ, in His early ministry, preached that the Kingdom of God was nigh at hand.*

When John's ministry ended by his imprisonment, it is said (Matt. 4 : 17): "*From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.*" (Comp. Mark 1 : 14, 15, Luke 4 : 23, and 8 : 1.)

The design of this Proposition is simply to direct the attention of the reader to the fact that Jesus preached the Kingdom of God in the same manner that John the Baptist did, for there would be an inconsistency in the Forerunner preaching *one* Kingdom and the Principal quite *another*. Therefore, the meaning and intent of the nighness—also proclaimed by John, Jesus, the twelve, and the seventy—will be left for full consideration under Propositions 55 to 68 inclusive, when we shall be better prepared, by the preliminaries passed over, to appreciate its deep and intensely interesting signification.

Obs. 1. Jesus adopts the same style that John did, urges the same condition of repentance, uses the phraseology common with the Jews, and introduces the subject of the Kingdom, without any explanation, as one well known and understood. The efforts made by well-intentioned men to give this preaching of Jesus a "*modern*" aspect and coloring is not only a failure, being opposed by stubborn facts and the immediate results in His hearers, but it actually places the Messiah in a position *irreconcilable* with that of a perfect Divine Teacher. We therefore hold, with the Primitive Church, until decided scriptural proof is offered to the contrary, that Jesus offered to the Jews *the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom* in its Civil and Religious combination, *just as predicted* by the prophets.

Obs. 2. How Jesus was understood by His hearers, we leave one of our opponents—to whose interest it would be to conceal or cover it—to describe. Thus Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 323): "At the time of Christ, and previously, the current opinion of the people in Palestine, and indeed of most of the Pharisees and lawyers, was, that He (the Messiah) would be *a temporal Deliverer and a King of the Jews*, and, indeed, *a Universal Monarch*, who would reign over all nations. Thus they interpreted the passages, Ps. 2 : 2, 6, 8, Jer. 23 : 5, 6, Zech. 9 : 4, seq. Hence those who, during the life-time of Jesus, acknowledged Him to be the Messiah, wished to proclaim Him King, John 6 : 15, coll.; Matt. 21 : 8, 9. *The apostles themselves held this opinion* until after the resurrection of Christ, Matt. 20 : 20, 21, Luke 24 : 21, Acts 1 : 6. And Jesus Himself, during His life upon earth, proceeded very guardedly, in order to lead them gradually from this deep-rooted prejudice, and not *to take it away* at once." Who can justly be regarded as the author of this "deep-rooted prejudice"? Certainly He who placed it in *the plain grammatical sense* of the Old Test., who left the Jewish nation with it for many long centuries as their faith and their hope, and who, while having twelve men in training to be preachers of this

Kingdom for over three years, did not remove it, as Knapp confesses. The question is, Was it a "*prejudice*" *or the truth?*

Knapp himself falls into the accommodation theory, which (Sec. 90, 2) he justly condemns, and thus violates the very principle of interpretation (literal) adopted by Christ and the apostles in quoting from the Old Test., and which (S. 90, 3) he approves; illustrating, that it is much more easy to lay down canons for interpretation than to follow them. We have merely *the assertion* of Knapp and others, that the hope of a Theocratic restoration—which they frankly acknowledge (not seeing how *necessarily* fatal it is to their own theory) was *not* removed by the public preaching and private instructions of Jesus—is a "deep-rooted prejudice." It seems passing strange that without positive proof, eminent theologians, following the lead of the Alexandrian and monkish opinion afterward developed, should *hastily, rashly* rush to such a conclusion—a conclusion that *violates* covenant, oath, plain promises, the purity of John's and Christ's teaching. True, such lack of faith is predicted, but still it is strange that it should be found even in men who, in many other respects, are able defenders of God's Word. Alas! that there should be an unwillingness to candidly examine whether, after all, such a "prejudice" is not clearly taught in the Old Test., and as distinctively perpetuated under the preaching of the Messiah Himself, and whether there may not be *valid reasons*, found in the conduct of the nation itself, *why* this "prejudice" remained unrealized. When Fuller (*Strictures on Robinson's Sentiments*, Let. 2) says of the disciples, "Their foolish minds were so dazzled with the false ideas of a temporal Kingdom that they were blinded to the true end of Christ's coming and to all that the prophets declared concerning it," we, on the other hand, think that it is Fuller's mind that is "so dazzled with the false ideas of a" spiritual "kingdom" that it is "blinded," etc.

Obs. 3. Pressense has (in *The Redeemer*) a chapter entitled "The Plan of Jesus Christ," which contains an *inconsistent and misleading Plan*, telling us, e.g. that it was part of the plan of Jesus *to abolish the Theocracy* (just as if it then existed, comp. Props. 32, 33), because a Theocracy is useless (!?), etc., and the proof alleged for such fundamentally sweeping assertions is the phrase "my Kingdom is not of this world" (just as if the Theocracy was not a Divine but a world appointment, comp. Prop. 25, Obs. 6). As we shall examine this proof (comp. Props. 109 and 110) in another connection, it is sufficient to ask now, *Why* were the preachers of the Kingdom down to the ascension (Acts 1 : 6) entirely unacquainted with Pressense's plan? *Why* does Jesus then express regret at leaving "the house (Davidic) desolate," and point to His future coming, when the desolation should be removed? *Why* does the entire tenor of His preaching evince that He never, for a moment, hesitated in identifying His Kingdom that He proclaimed with that of the Prophets, understood by the Jews in the Theocratic sense, as e.g. Matt. 16 : 27 and 25 : 34, comp with Dan. 7 : 18, 27; Luke 13 : 28, 29, Matt. 8 : 11, comp. with Mic. 7 : 20; Luke 22 : 29, 30, Matt. 19 : 28, comp. with Mic. 4 : 6–8, Ezek. 37 : 21, 22, etc.? When such talented writers misapprehend the precious nature of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, and *disparage* its Divine appointment, what idea can the multitude form of the same?

Obs. 4. Dr. Auberlen (*Div. Rev.*) has boldly and truthfully declared that Jesus, the Prophets, and the apostles were *express Chiliasts*. They all, receiving the grammatical sense and expressing themselves in it, taught and looked *for a restoration of the fallen down* Davidic Kingdom under the Messiah. (The proof on this point is cumulative and irresistible, as will be shown in the course of our argument—the design at present being merely to introduce some preparatory matter before considering the covenants upon which *all* rests.) Hence Renan (*Life of Christ*) frequently refers (so

Strauss, Baur, etc.) to this Chiliastic feature, saying, e.g. (p. 140) that "Millenarianism gave the impulsion."

Renan, too, like many of the orthodox, overlooking the postponement of the Kingdom *so plainly taught*, ignoring the existence of the Scriptures that refer to it, and consequently not realizing the close relationship existing between the rejection of Jesus by the representative men of the Jewish nation and His corresponding change in addressing the Jews, makes sad work with the Kingdom preached. He makes it just as varied as the belief does which he is attacking, telling us that Jesus understood it "in different senses." At one time it is "simply the reign of the poor and disinterested;" at another it is "the literal accomplishment of the apocalyptic visions of Daniel and Enoch;" sometimes it is "the Kingdom of souls," etc. After saying, "the fundamental idea of Jesus was, from the first day, the establishment of the Kingdom of God," we have from Renan's pen about as many definitions of "the Kingdom of God" as, on the other side, Barnes gives (Prop. 3) in his *Notes*. This is derogatory to Christ, and will be found, by a candid comparison of Scripture, to be utterly unfounded.

Obs. 5. Because the Kingdom (Theocratic) has not yet appeared as preached, we are not authorized to conclude (as Renan, etc.) that Christ *changed* His plan; because the Jews rejected Him, we are not at liberty to infer that their Davidic house will remain *forever* desolate. In this matter we must confine ourselves (Prop. 9) to the Record, and see *why* the Kingdom did not come, *what* influence this rejection had upon the Kingdom, and *what* Jesus Himself declared concerning it, and *then, only then,* frame our conclusions accordingly. The simple, unvarnished narrative, as firmly held by the Primitive churches, tells us that the Kingdom preached as nigh *was postponed* to the Sec. Advent.

But this excites the scorn of Unbelievers, who, in virtue of this allusion to his Sec. Advent, charge Jesus with preaching "dreams." Those extravagant upholders of Christ as a preacher of "the Religion of Humanity" still make (as Renan) Him proclaim (*Life of Jesus*, p. 248) "the expectation of an empty apocalypse," "a false, cold, impossible idea of a pompous advent," etc. The case is prejudged; the impossible steps in, and nothing is left to faith. This is precisely in the line of Bible prediction, that such "scoffers" shall be educated to such a standard of unbelief and irreverence for Christ's preaching and Christ's claims to the one Kingdom linked with, and postponed to, his Sec. Appearing (2 *Tim.* 4 : 1, etc.), and that they shall, by the spread of their unbelieving sentiments, influence the multitude, so that at the Second Advent, kings, nobles, great and mighty men, a vast concourse of people shall be arrayed against Him (Apoc. 19, Zech. 14, Joel 3, etc.). But it is not merely the infidel who speaks disparagingly of Christ's preaching; many a believer, who loves Christ and would shrink from being classed with unbelievers, so far coincides with infidelity in the fundamental part of preaching the Kingdom, that he *lamely apologizes* in behalf of Christ (when He needs none), and endeavors to conceal the alleged defects under a weak accommodation theory, saying that Christ accommodated Himself to the ignorance and prejudices of the Jews. A system that must resort to such *an abject line* of reasoning, making Jesus to say one thing while really meaning another, keeping others (as e.g. apostles down to the ascension, Acts 1 : 6) in "error and prejudice," while all the time intending the reverse, is certainly—no matter who advocates it—*sorely defective and entirely untrustworthy.* It lacks *the truth*, or it would not place the blessed Messiah in such an unenviable attitude. How much more logical and consistent the Primitive Church.

Obs. 6. Neander and others misapprehend the intent of the Sermon on the Mount, when they make it designed to contradict the Messianic expectations of the Jews in *a restored* Davidic throne and Kingdom. For (1) it contains not a word or thought *against* such a hope; (2) it *confirms* the Jews in such expectations by using their phraseology without intimating the least change of meaning; (3) those very persons admit that it did *not* change the opinions of the disciples and apostles; (4) they mistake the

preparatives of the Kingdom *for* the Kingdom itself; (5) the exact *reverse* is the truth, as seen in the allusions concerning the promise of inheriting the earth, of securing the Kingdom, of fulfilling the prophets, of Jerusalem being "the city of the great King," of praying for the Kingdom to come, etc., all of which had the decided tendency—as shown by the result—*of confirming the hearers in Jewish expectations.* The foundation thought of the Kingdom is the keynote to its interpretation, and if this is misconceived the entire discourse suffers.

Obs. 7. Jesus preached "*the gospel of the Kingdom*" (Matt. 4 : 23 and 9 : 35, etc.), and for this, He tells us, He was sent (Luke 4 : 43). Therefore we cannot receive as well grounded a principle enunciated by Hagenbach (*His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 45), that "The office of the Saviour was not to propound doctrines, or to set forth doctrinal formulas, but to manifest Himself, and to reveal His unity with the Father. His person was a fact, and not an idea," etc. Cheerfully admitting that Jesus was thus to manifest Himself as an essential part of His mission, He at the same time was commissioned *to propound doctrine*, and, above all, *the doctrine of the Kingdom.* Without such doctrine it would have been impossible to exhibit Himself *as the Messiah*, for doctrine and the Messiahship are *inseparably* connected.

It is painful to notice how many works, which ought to contain it, omit this distinctive preaching, as e.g. Luther's *Smaller Catechism* (Pub. for Gen. Synod, 1840) asks (p. 54) the question, "What were *the chief subjects* of Christ's preaching to the people?" and answers by giving six things, but fails to mention *the principal* subject of all, the preaching of the Kingdom. The reader can readily find hundreds of similar illustrations.

Obs. 8. Even some who fully admit the re-establishment of the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom in the future under the Messiah, have Christ to preach, for the time being, another, viz. : a spiritual Kingdom. Thus e.g. J. L. Lord (*Israel's Judicial Blindness*) informs us, "That Christ *first* offered to the Jewish nation, not the Davidic and temporal Kingdom which they had expected, but His spiritual Kingdom only, upon conditions which were as repugnant to their ceremonial self-righteousness as it was to their infatuated worldly hopes and expectations." Strange that men cannot, at once, see the *illogical and inconsistent* position in which this places Jesus. As our argument will meet this view in detail under various following Propositions, it will only be necessary to say, *Why* does Jesus then employ the Jewish phraseology, and *confirm* the Jews and even His own disciples in their Jewish expectations? *Why* are the Jews condemned for not seeing and acknowledging a Kingdom, which is not, *in any shape or form*, contained in the Davidic Covenant? *Why*, if such a spiritual Kingdom was "first offered," did not John the Baptist, the disciples, and the seventy, *tender* it to the people? *Why*, if this spiritual Kingdom is the superior and more exalted idea, make *the consummation* bring forth the realization of Jewish hopes in the final glorious restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom? *Why*, if the spiritual Kingdom is "the professing church," preach that it was something to come, when the church has always existed? These, and similar questions that must be answered, indicate the untenableness of such a position.

Leathes (*The Relig. of the Christ, Bampton Lec.* for 1874) spiritualizes the title Christ (comp. Prop. 205), and, therefore, also the Kingdom (thus vitiating much that is most admirable

in his work), and (p. 192) says: "John had not ventured to define what he meant by the Kingdom of heaven" (simply because it needed no definition, Props. 19-22); "but no sooner does Jesus open His mouth than He says, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven.'" And this, he claims, is a defining of the Kingdom different from what was previously understood, i.e. it spiritualizes and renders invisible what before was deemed temporal and visible here on the earth. But ponder the language of Jesus, and you will find no definition of the Kingdom in it, but simply a declaration and encouragement of worthiness—how attained—*for the Kingdom*. It only tells us who are fit for it, and who will ultimately receive it. The disciples, who were of these "poor in spirit," had not *the faintest idea* (Acts 1 : 6) that such a definition was intended; and we certainly deem them, in view of special instruction and privileges, better qualified to know this than moderns are who interpret all Scripture by a Church-Kingdom theory.

Obs. 9. The indulgence of the reader is desired while, in this connection, a few points are forestalled. Three things must evidently have weighed upon the mind of Jesus, and thus shaped His style of preaching the Kingdom.

1. The fact of the existence of the Roman Government over the Jewish nation, and its jealousy of power. His mission was to the Jews, and He was commissioned to tender the Kingdom to the nation (e.g. Props. 55, 57, etc.), and the Kingdom, according to the Davidic covenant required a Son of David *to restore the throne and Kingdom of David*. This was taught by the Prophets, and believed by the Jews. It was the general, universal belief that when the Messiah came to establish the Kingdom, *He would overthrow Gentile domination* (as He will do at the Sec. Advent, Props. 163 and 164), and thus deliver the Jewish nation from its enemies. In addressing the Jews, it was *unnecessary* to proclaim this Kingdom boldly and freely in the emphatic words of the Prophets, because (1) the Kingdom denoted was *already well known*, as the subject-matter of covenant and promise, to every Jew; and (2) because, foreseeing His rejection by the Jews, *advantage* would inevitably be taken (comp. Prop. 40, Obs. 6, note 1) of it to accuse Him as *a conspirator* against the Roman Power. With all the wisdom and prudence exercised by Him, this, nevertheless, was done, and He was crucified under the charge of being "*the King of the Jews*," thus implying opposition to Cæsar.[1]

2. Knowing, as Jesus did, that the offer of the Kingdom must be made (Prop. 55, etc.), that the tender would be rejected (Prop. 57, etc.), and that the Kingdom itself would be postponed (Props. 58–68), it would, in view of these foreknown circumstances, have been *unwise and impolitic* to have presented the subject of the Kingdom in any other way than that in which it was done. *Sufficiently clear* to test the repentance and faith of the nation, *sufficiently distinct* for those who receive the Word of God without human additions, and *sufficiently precise* to encourage the hope of His people in His Messiahship—*more* would have been *inexpedient*. What was needed in addition He gave to us through John (in Apoc.), and this also in a form that it might not *unnecessarily* excite opposition. Christ's preaching is influenced by *foreknown results*.

3. Foreknowing how the Kingdom would eventually, at His Sec. Advent (Props. 66, 74, 83, 87, etc.), be established, He could accordingly shape and adapt His language, introducing other matter that necessarily preceded the same. While a restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom (and as a result the restoration of the Jewish nation to eminence and power) is contemplated, yet, because of the defection of the nation and its

long continued punishment, *purposes of mercy* toward the Gentiles were entertained and mentioned, promises to be realized ultimately in the Kingdom were given, encouragements and cautions were presented, etc. This introduced new details, which can only be properly apprehended when taken *in their connection with the whole.*

[1] This is a sufficient reply to those who ask why the New Test. is not more specific in mentioning the Davidic throne and Kingdom (although in several places pointedly referred to), for all knew the Kingdom intended. This, too, may be a reason why Jesus wrote nothing, lest His writings should be employed, as His reported words were, against Him. The peculiar surroundings required, in the nature of the case, *great caution* in proclaiming the Kingdom ; and hence language was adopted toward the Jewish nation *sufficiently precise and determinate* for it, having the prophets to understand. And this prudence was continued by the apostles afterward (as e.g. in linking the Kingdom with the Second Advent, with Supernatural power, etc.), to prevent the Romans from taking unnecessary alarm and persecuting believers. For history informs us how readily the Roman emperors could thus be aroused. Eusebius (*Eccl. His.*, B. 3, ch. 19, 20 ; comp. Gibbon's *Rome*, ch. 16, vol· 2, p. 21) states that the descendants of David were ordered to be slain, and the alleged relatives of the Lord were apprehended and brought before Domitian, who was alarmed or suspicious, but as they professed not to believe in a present temporal kingdom, but in a divine one to come at " the end of the world," i.e. at the Sec. Advent, they were dismissed. (In this account, several things are noticeable, making allowance for additions : (1) Why should Domitian desire the death of the relatives of Jesus or fear Christ (as we are told), if it was not for the Primitive belief that Christ would come and re-establish the Davidic throne and kingdom ? (2) that the only Kingdom these relatives were conscious of was not the church as one, but the Kingdom at the end of the age, raised up by the coming Son of David ; (3) that, truthfully they made it Divine, not such a temporal kingdom as the Roman, but one established by Supernatural power and under its control. Eusebius may have colored it a little, but as it does not favor his Church-Kingdom theory, and has much of the Primitive cast in it, we may in the main receive it.) The Primitive Church writers (as we shall show hereafter) constantly appealed to the prophecies of a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, and expressed their faith in the same, but as they carefully showed that this was to be affected by Jesus, who had been crucified and buried, it seemed to be *foolishness* in the sight of worldly rulers—something that should cause them no uneasiness, especially as all believers disclaimed the least idea of raising up such a Kingdom, but *waited* for Christ's appearing. How advantage was taken of this very belief in a few cases, history also records. Another feature, too, which is not generally noticed, crops out in this direction, viz. : that this very belief is a cause of the brevity of ancient remarks on the subject. The Jews were not desirous to give it great prominence and publicity, because it would naturally excite the suspicions of the emperors. The believers, for the same reason, are guarded. The Gentiles, opponents to both, were not inclined to publish and dilate upon it, because, by so doing, they might be called on by the government to substantiate the charge, and in view of its being based as it was, expose themselves to harm. Intimations, indeed, exist, which show that sneers and ridicule were cast upon the idea of *a crucified* Son of David coming back to establish a Kingdom. Boyle, Whately, Rogers, and others have noticed the peculiarity of the Bible in presenting an unsystematic distribution of its contents, thus calling for comparison, study, etc. In the reasons assigned for this, they altogether overlook the fact that if a strictly logical arrangement had been made, so distinctively would this idea of the Kingdom have become that the Roman Power and other nations would have been extremely hostile to it.

Another feature may be briefly adverted to : the meanest part taken by the representative men of the Jewish nation in the condemnation of Jesus was the taking advantage of Jesus having proclaimed Himself the Messiah, i.e. the Jewish King, and basing upon it the charge of conspiring against Cæsar. The meanness consists in this : that their own views of the prophecies, if they were fulfilled *as written*, demanded of the Messiah to oppose the then existing Gentile power in order to restore the Kingdom, so that to compass the death of Jesus they override their own deliberate convictions of the Messianic display of power, and stamp their conduct as outrageously hypocritical. On the other hand, our faith and hope is confirmed in the Kingdom preached by Jesus, in the assumption of Messianic Royalty, which, not discarding, was the ground of His execution. Faith and hope rejoices over the inscription : " *Jesus, the King of the Jews.*" If there was nothing substantial in this Royalty, the very Royalty to which He was entitled

as David's Son and Lord, *why* retain it down to the very last, and leave it still speaking, silently but impressively, over His dead body on the cross?

Obs. 10. This preaching of the Kingdom by Jesus was, then, an appeal *to faith;* it is *the same* to-day. It then called for *an acquaintance* with the covenants and prophets; it demands *the same* at present. But in the preaching of Jesus and of His apostles some things pertaining to the Kingdom are brought out more distinctively and with stronger appeals to faith. The necessity of moral purity is impressed; the superiority of the coming Kingdom over all earthly Kingdoms is declared; its restoration, not by human but divine power, is carefully asserted; its postponement to the Sec. Advent is taught; its exaltation and extension, its power and blessings are portrayed; the wonderful things related to it, such as the resurrection of the saints, Kingship and priesthood, glorification, renewal of the earth and Theocratic glory, are presented—and all this, a reiteration and extension of Old Test. predictions, calls for *continued faith.* The whole matter is purposely so arranged and ordered that *faith alone*—sustained by the fulfilments and a comparison of the Record—can discern the surpassingly strange but pre-eminently wise Purpose of God.

Another reason why Jesus Himself did not write (as the founders of other religious systems) is found in the preaching of this Kingdom. The subject-matter of His preaching is found in the Old Test., its foundation is in the covenant, and His mission is not to found a new Kingdom, but to offer that which is *already proposed,* and of which He is *the rightful Heir.* He is not come to write, but to fulfil that which *is written;* hence a systematic arrangement of Divinity, a Theological system or summary of Doctrine, would have been out of place. While He necessarily taught doctrine as pertaining to Himself and the Kingdom, His specific mission has its *dignity* enhanced by the position that He occupied. It is true that, after the postponement was fully decided by His death, etc., then special provision had to be made for this period, but this we find in the instructions afterward imparted through the apostles in the establishment of the Christian Church. Christ honors the prophetic record, honors the oath-confirmed covenant, and, by the fulfilment of His own birth, life, death, resurrection, ascension, words respecting the Jewish nation, Gentiles, Church etc., reconfirms in the most powerful manner—infinitely superior to mere writing—the testimony concerning Himself and the Kingdom.

Obs. 11. The *fundamental* idea, forming a bond of union between Jesus and the preceding Revealers of the Purpose of God, is the Kingdom of heaven. This He preached *first;* this He revealed *last* through John the Revelator; this was the *special subject* (Acts 1 : 3) between Him and the apostles after His resurrection; and hence by it He places Himself in contact with the Prophets, in unison with John the Baptist, in sympathy with His disciples, and stamps Himself as *the great Preacher of the Kingdom.* This suggests that *perfect unity* of Teaching must exist between all these; that no accommodation theory can interpose between His teaching and that of John's or the Prophets; and that the subject of the Kingdom, being so prominently set forth, must be (Props. 1 and 2) a most interesting topic to every intelligent believer and student.

Obs. 12. What Kingdom Jesus preached can readily be ascertained by noticing what Kingdom His disciples preached. For, as an honest Teacher, *He would not, He could not, send out men to preach a Kingdom different from the one proclaimed by Himself.*

Obs. 13. Men profess to be amazed that the Jews and disciples should be so ignorant as to expect in the Messiah "*a temporal deliverer,*" and

regard those who retain this Jewish idea as "fanatical," "unspiritual," etc. But *how*, if we receive God's *express promises*, the plain grammatical sense, can we believe otherwise? Temporal deliverance, in addition to great spiritual blessings, are linked together (e.g. Zech. 14) in numerous prophecies, and it would indicate *lack of faith* in God's honor and faithfulness to reject or ignore the same. We know that by the spiritualizing process Zechariah's declarations (Luke 1 : 71, 74), "saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us," "delivered out of the hand of our enemies," are made to denote exclusively spiritual enemies.* But this is not sustained by the predictions of the Word, seeing (as will be consecutively shown hereafter, e.g. Props. 111–115) that temporal deliverance is assigned to the restoration of the Jewish nation, and is to be in a special manner the work of the Messiah at His Second Coming. The prophets all uniformly predict the temporal depressed condition of the nation, and in *the same connection* a glorious temporal deliverance. Leaving the proof to come in its proper place, it is sufficient now to say that if the Theocracy is to be restored at all as covenanted and predicted, such a restoration must *necessarily* include temporal deliverance (how else can the throne and Kingdom be re-established), and hence the Messiah, in addition to other perfections, is also a temporal Deliverer. The sinfulness of the nation, the postponement of the Kingdom, etc., only throws the time of its manifestation to the period of the Second Advent.

---

* Able writers, however, preserve this temporal aspect, as e.g. Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com. on Luke*, p. 28) declares that the songs of Elizabeth, Mary, and Zechariah make the Messiah "the source of temporal as well as spiritual prosperity to Israel," their sentiments being "purely theocratic."

PROPOSITION 43. *The disciples sent forth by Jesus to preach this Kingdom were not ignorant of the meaning to be attached to the Kingdom.*

To say that they were ignorant of that which they were *specially* to preach is an evident absurdity; and if true (which it is not) would severely reflect upon the Divine Teacher and Commissioner. Their mission necessarily implying *a correct knowledge* of the Kingdom, is confirmatory of Christ's own preaching, for the preaching, of the Master and of those who are sent to preach *must correspond.*

Obs. 1. What Kingdom they all preached is so evident (e.g. from *Acts* 1 : 6, etc.), that our opponents save us the trouble of stating it by frankly admitting it (e.g. Prop. 42, Obs. 2). Jesus *instructed* them, Jesus *sent* them, Jesus *never contradicted* their views of the Kingdom,[1] Jesus *approved* of their preaching and rejoiced over it. This is amply sufficient, seeing that the Kingdom accurately corresponded with the one contained in *the grammatical sense* of the covenant and prophecies.

[1] It is only necessary to say that our opponents themselves produce Matt. 20 : 20, 21, Luke 24 : 21, and Acts 1 : 6 as evidence of the Jewish views of the apostles. Take these three illustrations, and, over against the unwarranted deductions of numerous writers, Jesus says not a word *against* their conception of the Kingdom; in fact, He fully admits the correctness of the same by alleging nothing against it. The request of the sons of Zebedee, based on the Jewish conception (Art. "Kingdom of God," *Ency. Relig. Knowl.*) of the Kingdom (Matt. 20 : 20, 21), is refused, not on the ground of their misconceiving the nature of the Kingdom or even that such stations are to be allotted in it, but because such positions as they asked for are to be given *to those* by the Father, who have evidenced *their fitness* by humility and service. So simple is this that a child cannot mistake it. Hence, how gratuitous and unjust are *the disparaging* remarks heaped by some commentators and writers upon these disciples. Some (Olshausen *loci*) express surprise that Jesus did not correct their view of the Kingdom, but actually employs the very language *to confirm* them in it. Precisely so; He could not do so, because they entertained *a more Scriptural idea* of the Kingdom than those who exhibit such amazement. Luke 24 : 21 teaches how these preachers understood their own message; so also Acts 1 : 6; and Jesus, instead of telling them that they were mistaken, merely, leaving the notion of the Kingdom untouched, points to the future, the times of fulfilment being in the Father's hands.

Obs. 2. If Jesus did not tell the Jews and His disciples that they were *in error* respecting the Kingdom, and this already is presumptive evidence that they were correct in anticipating the Kingdom to be a restoration of the Davidic Kingdom, *much more* is this true, when He sends men, whom *He knows* to hold such a view, to *preach* it. The ablest writers (we have given some, others will be quoted as the argument advances), of all shades of opinion, fully admit that the disciples preached the Jewish Kingdom, and candidly inform us that such was their belief down to the

period of the Ascension, Acts 1 : 6. (Those few, therefore, who try to ignore it, and pretend that a spiritual conception of the Kingdom, something like their own modernized notions of it, are *dishonest* to the Record, and the general testimony on the subject). We therefore contend that, after Jesus Himself preached this Kingdom, taught His disciples *publicly and privately*, considered them *qualified* to proclaim the Kingdom, and *sent* them forth also to preach it—after all this, it is *sheer presumption* to question their knowledge of it. It is folly to suppose that we know the nature of that Kingdom *better than they did, who were expressly commissioned to hold it forth as an inducement to repentance.* If they were in error on so important and fundamental a point, it is unreasonable to suppose that Jesus would *leave* them in error, send them forth to *disseminate error*, and thus allow them, commissioned by Himself, *to deceive* the people. It is *incredible*, and yet if we are to believe eminent and good men, Jesus actually sent forth His disciples to preach *erroneous doctrine!* No gloss, however artful, no apology however skilful, can cover up this ugly feature in this supposed case ; there it stands, boldly and defiantly presented by infidels, and prominently held forth even by many believers. Any theory, however plausible, esteemed, fortified by great names, which makes the first preachers of the Kingdom proclaim what they did not understand, preach what was an untruth—such a theory is *radically wrong*, and virtually, with all its profuse apologies, *makes Jesus Himself the sender forth of false preachers.* If the Kingdom is *not that* which they taught, what must we think of the instruction of Him who *commissioned* them? Thank God, the Word itself is *consistent*, and it *repels a charge* which human wisdom has foisted upon it in its blindness, in order to make out of the church the predicted Kingdom of God. Here is the difficulty : men judge these preachers under *a misconceived theory, and consequently with prejudice.*

Some keenly feel this difficulty in their Church-Kingdom theory, and thus—over against overwhelming proof—try to remove it. Gregory (*Four Gospels*, p. 120) declares that Jesus "corrected their (the twelve) false Jewish views of His priestly character, and of His Kingdom," and appeals for evidence to Matt. 16 : 13-20, and 20 : 28! The passages being largely incorporated by us, need no comment. Ebrard (*Gospel His.*) constantly takes it *for granted* that the covenanted and predicted Kingdom is spiritual, and that the disciples comprehended it. Thus e.g. p. 267, referring to the Ser. on the Mount (comp. Prop. 42, Obs. 6 and 8, note), he says : "Jesus availed Himself of this opportunity, after the selection of His disciples, to explain, *fully and distinctly, to them and to the people, what was the nature of the Kingdom.*" He calls it "the inaugural discourse of the new Kingdom" (p. 273), in which Jesus says : "Such and such is the nature of my Kingdom ; such its form ; such the proper state of mind ; and such are my demands," in order "*to afford the means of certainty*" to the hearers. This is solely Ebrard's imagining, for he *utterly fails* to show where the nature of the Kingdom is defined, and mistakes *the means and accessories for obtaining* the Kingdom *for* the Kingdom itself. It is painful and saddening when *such* men so seriously miss "the means of certainty." The preconceived Church-Kingdom theory explains it all. Some writers even make the appointment of the twelve to be equivalent to the founding of a new Kingdom, although they preached it as future. On the other hand, that the disciples knew the nature of the Kingdom and located its future, is well stated by Dr. Imbrie in "The Regeneration" (*Pre-Mill. Essays*, p. 153, etc.).

Obs. 3. It is freely admitted that there were many things that these disciples, when preaching the Kingdom, did not then know, but it was *not requisite* to know them for the simple reason that, *before the decided postponement of the Kingdom*, it was no part of their mission to preach

them. Thus e.g. they did not know that the Jewish nation would refuse to repent, that the representative men would conspire to put Jesus to death, that the Messiah would be crucified, that the Kingdom would be postponed to the Sec. Advent, that the Gentiles would be called, etc., and, more, all these things had *nothing to do with their commission.* They were not to preach the death of Jesus, or things then unknown to them; they were commissioned to preach *the Kingdom* conditioned by repentance—to offer it to the Jewish nation—and *thus far* they were instructed and had knowledge of *the truth.* This preaching of the Kingdom was (Props. 54 and 55) *necessary* at that time, while a knowledge of the other things was not only unnecessary, but would have, if imparted, *actually disqualified them* for their important mission. This exquisite arrangement of truth in the mission of the first preachers is, to our mind, *most forcible evidence of inspiration.*

Obs. 4. Miracles (Matt. 10 : 1, 8, Luke 10 : 17, etc.) attend their preaching of the Kingdom, which is *a most convincing attestation* of both the truthfulness of their proclamation, freed from error, and the intimate relationship that the Kingdom sustained to the Supernatural. Would Christ give the power of working miracles to persons who *confirmed* themselves and others in erroneous doctrine? Even Judas, at that time, however much he fell afterward, must have, in virtue of the mission bestowed upon him, known and proclaimed the truth concerning the Kingdom. Designed as the miracles (wrought by some, perhaps all) were to foreshadow (Prop. 7) the power to be experienced in the Kingdom itself, they were also, at the same time, a witness to *the veracity* of the preachers themselves. Such an attestation, Origen, Jerome, and all others, who desire us to believe that they were in error, have never yet been able to give us.

Obs. 5. What little satisfaction many commentaries give us when commenting on the preaching of John and the disciples. Work after work will not make the slightest mention of difficulty in the matter, and artfully speak of it as *a gradual developing* from darkness into light, just as if the style of their preaching was but a little removed from that of "the moderns." A host literally jump at the conclusion—proven to be false by *the continued belief* of these preachers to the ascension of Jesus—that they preached (without knowing it) the establishment of the church-kingdom. The large majority, without perceiving how fatally they sap the very foundations of confidence in the Truth, and invite unbelief to hold itself in merriment over the defect, pass the whole thing by with the comment—as if it amounted to nothing, or was scarcely worth noticing, or the most reasonable thing to expect—that these men were yet filled with "Jewish prejudices" and "Jewish forms," and the time had not yet arrived for the notion of a pure, spiritual Kingdom. Indeed, if this is so, as learned men tell us, *then* the first preachers of the Kingdom were very *unreliable* guides, being "*the blind leading the blind,*" and, what is worse, *divinely commissioned* to do this! Infidelity exults in such teaching, which effectually cripples the first preaching of the Kingdom and introduces a discordance and antagonism *fatal to the unity and integrity of the Word.*

Obs. 6. How unfairly this subject is treated may be found illustrated in various *Lives of Christ.* Some of these (e.g. Fleetwood's) make the

preaching of the twelve and the seventy exactly correspondent with their own *modern* ideas of the Kingdom. The same unfairness is true of *Histories of the Bible.* Thus e.g. Gleig (*His. of the Bible*, vol. 2, p. 223), after stating the views of the Jews in a restored Davidic Kingdom under the personal reign of the Messiah, tells us that it should not surprise us that the disciples continued in such a belief because "prejudices are usually deeply seated in proportion *to the absence of culture,*" thus actually *degrading* the disciples to ignorance and uncouthness to make out a case, forgetting that by so doing he *degrades the mission and instruction imparted by Jesus.* If they were lacking "culture," if they were under "deeply seated prejudices," if they were under a "delusion" (as Gleig well-meaningly says), how was it possible for Jesus, *honestly and consistently,* to send them forth to proclaim *their want* of "culture," their "prejudices," and their "delusion" to others, and confirm the same by miraculous signs! The same lack of candor is found in *Theologies.* Thus e.g. Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, s. 89, 99, 154, etc.) frankly tells us the Jewish view, and that the disciples entertained it, but then endeavors to break its force by insinuating, without adducing *the slightest historical or scriptural proof,* that the Kingdom was *also* understood in a spiritual sense, and that a purer and higher meaning was *gradually* placed upon the phraseology pertaining to the Kingdom. But this does not clear the preachers of the Kingdom; it does not vindicate their official position, for, according to his statement, others—who were not specially appointed as preachers of the Kingdom—had better, purer ideas, which, we are to infer, came down to us. This mode of reasoning only makes the matter worse, for in one place all the concessions needed are made; and in another, they are virtually recalled under the *unproved statement* that in connection with this idea of the restoration of the Davidic Kingdom they also must have held (*implied*) the notion of a moral or spiritual Kingdom. Such an important point as this, must have *more* than mere inference and unsupported supposition; and Knapp forgets, that the very men who, above all others, should have this pure, spiritual conception of the Kingdom (if it is the one intended) are the disciples, the preachers, whom *he confesses* to be in ignorance of it down to the ascension. These illustrations will suffice; the reader can readily find a multitude.

Neander (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 37) makes Zechariah's faith to express itself in a "worldly sense, or worldly turn, or shape," because he expected deliverance from enemies, etc. But let the reader notice that Zechariah was under *the direct influence* of the Spirit, and it follows that his utterances are to be received in preference to Neander's, especially seeing that they correspond with that of the prophets (who link with the Messianic Kingdom a deliverance of the Jewish nation from its enemies, as shown Props. 111-114). He delineates the disciples' ignorance, etc., very much as Knapp, and seeks refuge in his germ or development theory.

Obs. 7. Misled by some favorite theory, the plain facts of the disciples' preaching are unintentionally misstated, and, of course, others are improperly influenced. Thus e.g. Neander (*Life of Christ*, sec. 174) has taken *the unwarranted liberty* of saying, when referring to the mission of the disciples into Galilee, that they were to spread "the announcement that the Kingdom *had appeared,*" that "they were only to proclaim everywhere that the Kingdom of God, the object of all men's desire, *had come.*" Now if we turn to the Record, *it is impossible to find any such commission* given to the disciples; for instead of preaching that the Kingdom "*had ap-*

peared, and "*had come,*" they were *expressly* charged to say (Matt. 10 : 7) : "the Kingdom of heaven *is at hand,*" and (Luke 10 : 9) : "the Kingdom of God *is come nigh to you.*" If language has any force, this phraseology cannot, by any means, be made to be *the equivalent* of Dr. Neander's. So Olshausen even (*Com.* Matt. 3 : 2), hampered by his Church-Kingdom theory, makes the announcement "*is at hand*" to be an equivalent of "*is already present.*" Others, influenced in the same way, interpret the language in like manner. The difference to some may appear trivial, but as we proceed will be found *exceedingly weighty and essential* (Props. 55–61). How, in the nature of the case, could the first preachers of the Kingdom proclaim that a Kingdom "*had come,*" was "*already present,*" when they themselves (as both Neander and Olshausen admit in other places) were *not conscious of it* down to the ascension (Acts 1 : 6)? Forsaking the primitive view, *the ablest men* involve themselves in difficulties, and excite antagonism where *none exists.*

Obs. 8. It is a fact to be lamented, that while infidelity has made itself merry over the preaching of the disciples, calling it "mistaken," "deceived," "delusion," etc., the Apologists, unable themselves to receive this preaching, or to satisfactorily account for it, have done nothing to remove this stumbling-block out of the way. Some unbelievers in a kind of ironical manner (Dean Mansell *On Freethinking*) suggest, as the result, that as the whole proof of Christianity rests on the Prophecies, it is necessary in order to make out such a proof to avoid the literal and proper meaning, and introduce a mystical or allegorical interpretation ; for the past has proven that the apostles themselves misinterpreted the prophecies too literally or in a Jewish manner. This, of course, opens the flood gates *to every conceivable fancy,* and strikes a deep blow at *the vital part* of Christianity. Hence it is, that an oily class, smooth-tongued and eloquent over the virtues of Jesus and His devoted band, profess, all the time stabbing the reputation and character of these teachers, that they only desire to remove that blundering literal interpretation and plant religion more securely on a spiritual one, which will not recognize "the fables" of the early preaching. The grossest attacks and the most artful, centring on the early preaching, come from all sides, and a careful reader will *sadly* notice that in the replies of the defenders of Christianity, with but rare exceptions, there is found a willingness to receive these suggestions of unbelief, viz. : to discard the literal, grammatical sense of the prophecies, which it is *wrongfully supposed* led these disciples into their errors, and, therefore, to receive as an offset a spiritual one, which can transmute David's throne into the Father's throne, and change every other phrase to suit the situation. Alas ! the influence of such a method upon the minds of men without sufficient independence to think for themselves !

Obs. 9. Those, too, who so candidly concede "the Jewish cast" of the disciples' preaching are undecided as to the time when an entire change in their views of the Kingdom (as alleged) was wrought. While some place it even later (others asserting no change, but leaving it to development in the church) than the day of Pentecost, the majority of our opponents seem inclined to date it from the outpouring of the Spirit. For the credit of the Church-Kingdom theory, an effort must be made, in some way, to trace it back *to inspired men.* Now at this stage of the argument we only

say this: if the change in the doctrine of the Kingdom took place, as multitudes hold, and as e.g. Bernard (*Bampton Lectures*, "The Progress of Doctrine") infers, how comes it then that the early "consciousness" of the church does *not portray this change in the writings of that period? Why* does the church, founded by these disciples, assume the position that Jesus, the crucified one, is the Messiah (with a full understanding of the Jewish meaning of the name), so declared by His resurrection and exaltation, who remains in heaven during this intermediate period until the elect are gathered out and the time arrives, *at the Sec. Advent*, for the re-establishment of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom? *Why* is it that *none* of the Primitive churches *indicate* such a change of doctrine, and directly trace it to the apostles? Surely if the current notion on the subject is the correct one, this feature ought to be observed. Bernard and others do not meet *the real objections* against their view, for fully admitting that a change was introduced, this change was not one *in the belief* of the Kingdom, but only in *the manner and time* of its introduction, in the reception of *preliminary measures*, made now necessary by the postponement of the Kingdom and the organization of the Christian Church. This change does not *affect covenant promise, confirmed by oath*, while Bernard's violates covenant and explicit promise.

The student is reminded that persons cannot be too cautious in such wholesale deductions, made because of the introduction of certain changes which do not affect the nature of the Kingdom. Thus e.g. many stumble at the resurrection of Jesus, and cannot see how this is to be reconciled with the expectations of the restoration of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom; but they overlook the predicted fact (God foreseeing all, and thus ordering) that this is implied in *an immortal* Son of David thus restoring and reigning, and that this resurrection was expressly foretold as *a requisite* to fulfil the promises pertaining to the Kingdom. This disregard to the Kingdom preached, etc., leads to many strange and unscriptural statements. Thus e.g. Bernard (in the excellent Lectures referred to) says: "Peter presents the Gospel as the fulfilment of prophecy, and completion of the covenant made with the fathers." The truth is, that Peter only presents the Gospel to show *how prophecy will be fulfilled* (saving in the call of the Gentiles), and *how* the covenant *was* confirmed in Christ and *shall yet be* amply realized in the future. Again: "The Gospel has fought itself free, and severed itself from Judaism, not merely in its form *but in its essence*, proclaiming Salvation by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not by the works of the law." Admitting freely the grace brought through Jesus, through whom alone we expect to inherit, the sentence as it stands is misleading. The Gospel did not cut itself free, etc., until the influence of the Alexandrian school prevailed, as seen in the first and second centuries. True Judaism looked forward, having the covenants and promises, even to the sacrificial death of the Messiah, and the death of Jesus is no separation from but *a confirmation* of the Judaic essence, for the Salvation promised through this Messiah is *identical* with that proclaimed by Judaism. This will be shown hereafter.

PROPOSITION 44. *The preaching of the Kingdom, being in accordance with that of the predicted Kingdom, raised no controversy between the Jews and Jesus, or between the Jews and His disciples and apostles.*

We find no hint, not the slightest, that there was *the least disagreement* between the preachers of the kingdom and their hearers on the subject of the kingdom itself. We know what the views of the Jews were, and if there had been *any essential* difference in the presentation of a subject so dear and vital to Jewish faith—*fundamental to Messianic faith*—most certainly there would *be proof* to show it. The absence of it, in the nature of the case, substantiates our position.

Obs. 1. Let the reader place himself in that period of early preaching. The converts were nearly all Jews, embracing hundreds, and finally thousands, including even a large number of priests, Acts 6 : 7. Consider how *tenaciously* all these held to the predicted *restoration* of the Davidic Kingdom, and that during the entire period of preaching, from John down to apostolic days, no question, no difficulty arose concerning *the great subject* of the Kingdom, i.e. concerning its nature, its lack of identity with the anticipated one. *Why this?* Simply because *both parties* understood the Kingdom as covenanted and prophesied ; because the Kingdom preached corresponded with the views entertained by these Jews ; otherwise it would have awakened discussion, led to explanations and opposition. There being agreement, discussion and controversy could not follow, and hence we do not find them.

Obs. 2. A mutual understanding existed between the parties, and this was not interrupted so long as these preachers lived, for after the ascension of Jesus, instead of a *retractation* of previous preaching and opinions, instead of telling the Jews that they had misapprehended the nature of the Kingdom, and that only a *spiritual* one was the one intended by the Messiah (which, if our opponents are correct, honesty ought to have done), there continued *a perfect agreement* between preachers and converts, the basis of which was, *looking for this same Kingdom to be revealed at the Sec. Advent of the Messiah* (comp. Props. 70–76).

Obs. 3. Therefore, it is an unjust reflection upon these Jews and Jewish preachers to accuse them of ignorance, carnality, etc. To assert as Storrs' (*Diss. on the Kingd. of Heaven*), that these Jews "were shamefully ignorant" of the Messiah's reign, *recoils upon the preachers* who made and left them thus "ignorant." Yet this is the belief of many eminent men, forgetting that perhaps the "ignorance" may be in the gradually sub-

stituted change introduced after the death of these preachers. Even as late as Tertullian, when the proposed change had not as yet overwhelmed the Apostolic Theology, he pointedly says in his *Apology* (Sec. 21), in reference to this point: "Even now His Advent is expected by them (the Jews generally); *nor is there any other contention between them and us*, than that they believe the Advent has not yet occurred." The Kingdom was not disputed, but *the manner and time of occurrence under Jesus as the Messiah.*

Obs. 4. The Jews did not find fault with the Kingdom, but in *the King* as believed in by believing Jews and Gentiles. In their blindness, they refused to acknowledge the purity and holiness essential to entrance into the Kingdom; they rejected the repentance requisite for its establishment; they were angered at the well-merited rebukes aimed at their hypocrisy and sinfulness; they were fearful of losing their own authority and power, and therefore *they rejected the King*, and urged his crucifixion. After His death, it was too humbling to their pride to confess *a crucified Jesus as their Messiah;* it was too mortifying and condemnatory to their past action to acknowledge *a once dead and buried Jesus to be their King;* the difficulty was *not* in the Kingdom, *but* in the King, and in the confession and obedience that was required. This influenced the nation, the great mass of the people, but nevertheless many Jews, seeing the Scriptures fulfilled in this Messiah, and the Messianic evidences in His birth, life, miracles, words, death, etc., still clung to Him as the promised Messiah, the Restorer of the Davidic Kingdom as predicted; and this was done under the assurance (as we shall show in its place) that He would come *the Second Time* for this very purpose. Such is the plain teaching of the Record, and its testimony on this point is *decided and overwhelming*, as the reader will see for himself as we proceed.

It will not answer to cover this over under the plea of accommodation; for it only amounts to making numbers of persons preaching, in the most serious manner, to induce others to repentance and faith, a Kingdom of God in accordance with their own prejudices and that of their hearers, because Jesus saw that they were not prepared for the truth. And this *farce* (for it can be called nothing less) was designed and fostered by the pure Son of God! The statement needs no refutation; it contradicts itself. Therefore to plead that such an accommodation prevented a controversy arising, is simply to say that Christ *sacrificed truth and kept men in error* for the sake of a slight temporary gain, or that He *sacrificed His own honor and dignity* for the sake of conciliating erring men. No wonder that the Baur school and others are jubilant over *the fatal concessions* contained in the works of pious men, hailing and parading them as the self-evident indications of a shaky foundation. But, viewing the matter in its totality, the relation of this preaching to covenant, prophecy, the Jewish nation, God's Purpose of Salvation, etc., we *cordially accept* of this preaching and agreement—these alleged evidences of weakness—*as necessary and indispensable features* in the structure. The reasons will appear more fully.

Obs. 5. It may be well to say here, that as long as this happy correspondence continued numerous Jews were converted to Christianity (as history attests), but *just so soon* as this disagreement arose respecting the Kingdom, and the Jewish faith in their Kingdom was derided and scorned, conversions became less and less until they almost ceased.*

* And as a return was made to the Primitive Church doctrine, conversions increased until they form now again a very fair number.

Obs. 6. This agreement indicates, what has already been intimated, that no necessity existed to hold up the hope of a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom more prominently, because, as it all depended upon the coming again of Jesus the Christ, it was sufficient to direct attention to that Advent, linking the fulfilment of the prophecies with them, thus avoiding the jealousy, etc., of the Roman Power.

Obs. 7. This agreement has been noticed by numerous writers, and has called forth corresponding remarks, nearly always in disparaging expressions, so intended, but more or less connected with the truth. This will be seen by taking at random two writers. Thus e.g. Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 246) tells us that the early churches formed under this preaching "might be regarded as, and virtually were, *a Jewish party.*" Morgan (in *Moral Philosophy*) charges early Christianity with a leaning toward Judaism, that the disciples corrupted the New Test. to effect this, that we have a Jewish Gospel, and the first Christians were "nothing else but a political faction *among the Jews*, some of them receiving Jesus as the Messiah or the Restorer of the Kingdom, and others rejecting him under that character." Now, aside from the effort made to use this connection with Jewish views against Christianity, to make out a case of corruption, ignorance, etc., it is true that, while the ceremonial law of Judaism was rejected by many as non-essential, etc., there was a strong point of contact and continued agreement between Judaism and Christians *in Messianic expectations respecting the Kingdom*—the difference being that the former located the fulfilment of their hopes *at the First Advent* of the Messiah (thus rejecting Jesus as the Messiah), and the latter, theirs *at the Second Advent* of this Jesus who had been crucified. To deny this, or to conceal it, is simply exhibiting gross ignorance of facts, or dishonesty in suppressing truth (comp. Prop. 69).

PROPOSITION 45. *The phrases "Kingdom of heaven," "Kingdom of God," "Kingdom of Christ," etc., denote the same Kingdom.*

It has already been shown (Props. 20–23, etc.) how the Jews understood and employed these phrases, and how the first preachers adopted them.

Obs. 1. Now attention is called to the fact that they are used as synonymous in the New Test. What Matt. pronounces "the Kingdom of heaven," is said by Mark, Luke, and John to be "the Kingdom of God," as e.g. comp. Matt. 5 : 3, with Luke 6 : 20, and Matt. 13 : 11 with Mark 4 : 11. So also "the Kingdom of God" is designated Christ's Kingdom, as e.g. comp. Matt. 16 : 28 with Luke 9 : 27, Mark 9 : 1, etc.

So also "the Father's Kingdom" and Christ's are represented as identical. Comp. e.g. Matt. 13 : 41–43 with Eph. 5 : 5, and Matt. 26 : 29 with 2 Pet. 1 : 11, etc., and Prop. 83. In reference to the usage of those phrases, comp. Props. 22 and 23, and the note by Dr. Craven in Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 93.

Obs. 2. These phrases thus interchangeably employed to denote the one Kingdom (Prop. 35) were understood to mean the Davidic Kingdom restored, as e.g. Acts 1 : 6, Matt. 20 : 21, Acts 15 : 16, Luke 1 : 32, etc. (comp. Props. 19–23).

This has been so frankly admitted by our opponents (as e.g. Dr. Campbell, Knapp, Neander, etc.) that more need not be added, leaving our argument to bring in the additional proof. On every side do we find this testimony, given, too, without any thought of its bearing on the subject. Thus e.g. Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p.22) informs us that "waiting for the Consolation of Israel" is equivalent to Mark 15 : 43, "waiting for the Kingdom of God," and that among the Jews a prayer for the coming of the Messiah was, "may I see the Consolation of Israel." The Messiah and the Kingdom were united. We merely suggest that in addition to the meanings and derivation usually given to the phrase used by Matthew, "the Kingdom of heaven" (viz. : that the God of heaven gives it to the Christ, that through it the Father's will is manifested, that heavenly principles, etc., are exhibited, etc.), may there not, in the employment of the plural form, "heavenlies," be an allusion to the peculiar form of government (Theocratical) under chosen heavenly rulers (comp. Prop. 154). Dr. Meyer (*Com.* on Matt. 3 : 2) says : "It is called the Messianic Kingdom, not because the words 'of the heavens' express God, but because this Kingdom is conceived as descending from heaven and entering the world, Gal. 4 : 26." This idea may (comp. Rev. 19 : 11–16 and 21 : 2, etc.) indeed be included, but it does not exclude the old Jewish notion derived from Daniel, or the one just stated. It may include them all, making it the more expressive.

Obs. 3. In addition to the abundant testimony already adduced, that they were regarded as denoting the same Kingdom, and that the restored Theocracy, as existing under David, we add a few more. Nast (*Com. on Matt.* 11 : 1–6), allowing the Church-Kingdom theory as correct, frankly says : "Though John the Baptist, Zecharias, and those other Israelites who waited for 'the Consolation of Israel,' expected the Messiah to

establish a spiritual Kingdom, a reign of righteousness, they connected, *nevertheless*, with it, the idea of a visible, terrestrial Kingdom, that he would literally sit on David's throne, and extend His reign from the river to the ends of the earth." Doddrige (*Com.* Matt. 3 : 2), cordially adopting the Church-Kingdom idea as intended by the phrase, says : "It is plain that the Jews understood it of a temporal monarchy, which God would erect; the seat of which, they supposed, would be Jerusalem, which would become, instead of Rome, the capital of the world. And the expected Sovereign of this Kingdom they learned from Daniel to call 'the Son of Man'" (Were the Jews mistaken? Comp. Props. 19–23 and 31–35). Fairbairn (*Herm. Manual*, p. 41–43) tells us that the phrase, "points back to those prophecies of the Old Test., in which promise was made of a King and Kingdom, that should unite heaven and earth in another way than could be done by a merely human administration," etc., which we cordially receive as true, remarking, however, that the plain Theocratical meaning contained in the grammatical sense (which he carefully avoids), as held by the Jews, by the disciples and apostles, introduces just such a union of heaven and earth (as e.g. God in Jesus condescending to reign as earthly Ruler, etc.) as he advocates. Our entire argument thus far conclusively proves that all these phrases do not denote separate things (as e.g. intimated by Lange, *Com. Matt.*, p. 73), or are given (so Fleck, quoted by Lange) "in order to distinguish the Christian Kingdom of God more fully from the Jewish Theocracy," but the restored Theocracy, as covenanted and predicted under the Messiah. They were applied to a definite, well-known Kingdom, viz. : the Theocratic-Davidic.

But able writers, wedded to the spiritual Church-Kingdom theory, can see nothing in the phrase but another and differing Kingdom, viz. : the Church regarded as militant and triumphant. Thus, to illustrate how confidently they appeal to its simplicity in their teaching, we refer to Gregory (*Four Gospels*, p. 146), who, speaking of "the Kingdom of heaven," and that Matthew by its use intended to correct false Jewish views (when Acts 1 : 6, he still held them), confidently asserts : "The phrase clearly expresses the idea that it is a Kingdom distinct from all these kingdoms of this world after which the Jew had fashioned his idea of the Messiah's dominion. Its origin is in the heavens, where God dwells ; its throne, the seat of the King, is there ; its highest present and prospective glories are there. This simple phrase taught that the Kingdom of the Messiah was to be a spiritual and heavenly Kingdom, unlike the old Theocracy with its temple and throne in Jerusalem ; unlike the magnificent empire patterned after Rome, which the worldly Jew was dreaming of ; wholly unlike the temporal empire of the Papacy long after established." Here is a tissue of assumptions : (1) It ignores the fact that it was a Jewish phrase, adopted without explanation by Matthew, and that it could not possibly convey the idea assumed, being definitely used to designate the restored Davidic Kingdom and its extent, etc., as given by Daniel ; (2) it engrafts upon it a modern notion, which the Jews never entertained, being bound by the plain covenant and prophetical language which locates the Kingdom, not in heaven but on the earth ; (3) he assumes that the phrase is so clearly full of his doctrine that it ought to have taught the Jew such a view, when the facts are just the reverse, viz. : that its usage fortified them and the disciples (including Matthew) in believing that it unmistakably taught the restoration of the downfallen Theocracy, which was—as we have shown—a Kingdom of God and of heaven ; (4) its simplicity of teaching established and confirmed the almost universal Pre-Millenarianism of the early Church and its connected doctrine of the Kingdom—a position just directly opposite to that which Gregory finds in the "simple phrase," and which Shedd (*His. of Doc.*, p. 291) calls a peculiarity of the Jewish-Christian."

PROPOSITION 46. *The Kingdom anticipated by the Jews at the First Advent is based on the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants.*

This might be shown by numerous references, but it will be sufficiently conspicuous by adverting to the declarations found in only one chapter of the New Testament. Thus, e.g., Luke 1 : 32, 33, 55, 72, 73, where we have undoubted allusions to previously obtained covenants, in "the mercy *promised* to the fathers," in "*the holy covenant*" confirmed by oath "to our father Abraham," and in "the throne of his father David."

Obs. 1. In turning back to the fountain head from whence this doctrine, this faith in a Messianic Kingdom proceeds, we only reiterate what others have most aptly stated when we invite *for the covenants an absorbing interest in view of their living, fundamental connection with final Salvation in Christ's Kingdom.* Kurtz (*His. Old Cov.*, p. 175) has well expressed this "*a foundation on which the great Salvation is ultimately to appear.*" Thorp (*The Dest. of the Brit. Empire*, Pref., p. 8) justly observes: "*The Abrahamic Covenant is the foundation of all the dispensations of heaven, both to Jews and Gentiles.*"

This has been noticed by Brooks (*El. of Proph. Inter.*, ch. 2), Bickersteth (*Guide to Proph.*), Judge Jones (*Notes to the Scriptures*), besides a host of others, as Auberlen, Delitzsch, Lord, the Bonars, etc. Indeed, it is universally admitted, however explained afterward, that the covenants are the proper basis of future Revelation, and that they contain in an epitomized form *the substance* of God's Purpose in reference to man's Salvation, the Messiah's Kingdom and glory, and the perfected Redemption from the curse. Hence, men of all shades of opinion agreeing in this matter, it is essential for any one who desires to become *a real student* of God's Word to make himself familiar with these covenants, seeing, that, in the nature of the case, all things following must correspond fully with these previously given pledges and guides. While the covenants are necessarily *primary* in a proper conception of the Divine Plan relating to Redemption, presenting *a central idea*, the reader will observe that they are scripturally based and grammatically founded on *direct oath-bound* promises, and hence are to be distinguished from that vague, scholastic, mystical effort to make the covenants a central idea as given e.g. by John Cocceius (Hagenbach's *His. Doc.*, vol. 2, sec. 222 and 223), Pres. Edwards's (*His. Redempt.*), and others. This grasping after the covenants as a foundation thought relating to the Kingdom of Christ is characteristic of the German Reformed Theology (see Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, sec. 223, Amer. Ed. added, and Heppe on *Ger. Reform. Church* in Mercersburg *Review* for 1853), and is found in theologians of ability in various denominations. Unfortunately, however, many have *much to say* about a covenant made between the Father and Son in eternity—of which we have no record, and which opens a door for conjecture and unproven inferences—while they *ignore*, more or less, *those on record.*

Obs. 2. Let it be observed that in approaching the covenants we are not at liberty to *receive* one and *reject* another, nor are we authorized to take *just as much* as may suit our Theological views out of one and refuse

to believe in the rest. Here is where many Theological writings make *the fatal mistake:* they are willing to receive the Abrahamic covenant as a perpetual one, but not the Davidic, when *the same perpetuity is asserted of both;* they are agreed to receive *part* of the Abrahamic, or *part* of the Davidic covenant, but *not all that is written.* No wonder that *a diversity* is thus produced, and *an antagonism* to the Old Test. The Jews and the Primitive Church were far more logical and scriptural when they cordially received those covenants and believed in God's statements concerning them. The trouble at present is, that the church, with all her professions, has *too little faith.*

Obs. 3. Approaching the covenants and seeing how they form great central points around which successive revelations cluster—yea, the foundation stones upon which the Christological structure is erected—we are not surprised at the efforts made to undermine their force, either by separating the Old from the New Test. as antiquated, or by elevating the New far above the Old as only worthy of reception, or by a rejection of the Old as not authentic, etc. De Wette and others may apply their mythical interpretation to Abraham, etc.; Ammon and others may reject the Old Test. as having no special divine worth; Colenso and others may endeavor to set aside reliance upon the writings of Moses; Schleiermacher and others may place the Old in a position far inferior to the New in dignity, value, etc.—all this, and more, may be done, and *yet* in the simple covenant words, in their gradually unfolded purpose, in their continuous progress in and toward fulfilment, in their fundamental relationship to Messianic hopes, etc., we have *the most triumphant vindication* (comp. Prop. 16 and 198) of the equality and truthfulness of all Divine Revelation, and of the significance and fundamental importance of the covenants, and also a rebuke given to the foolishness of a *learned display* of unbelief.

If the reader follows the development of the covenant, he will be enabled to appreciate the value of the author's allegation in the *History of the Hebrew Monarchy*, that Moses forged God's covenant with Abraham for political purposes. The wish is father to the thought, for the very tenor of the covenants forbid such an idea, seeing that for fulfilment it implies a resurrection from the dead, etc.; in brief, such an intervention of the Supernatural, as is evidenced already by the past, that no man could incorporate for such a purpose. Hengstenberg, Marsh, Kurtz, Fritzsche, Hävernick, Jahn, and others, in vindicating the credibility of the Old Test. Scriptures, etc., have performed an excellent preparatory work.

Obs. 4. The Abrahamic and Davidic covenants were very prominently held by the early church, as can be readily seen by the general use made of them, illustrated, e.g. in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the writings of Irenæus, Justin, Tertullian, etc. So that Renan (*Apostles*, p. 116) remarks in reference to the practice of the Primitive Church: "The perusal of the Old Test., above all of the Psalms and the Prophets, was a constant habit of the sect"—a testimony *most honorable* to the church.

At the present day they are largely ignored, just as if we had no personal interest in them, and so imperfect is the comprehension of Scripture, that we have plenty of works which present us, as the two great covenants, "the Law and the Gospel."

PROPOSITION 47. *The Jews had the strongest possible assurance given to them that the Kingdom based on these covenants would be realized.*

Attention has already been directed (Prop. 18) to the fact that the prophecies pertaining to this Kingdom shall not, in their ultimate fulfilment, fail, i.e., they are unconditional. The reason for this is that they are evolved from covenants *confirmed by oath;* and hence, in view of their *absolute certainty* (no matter how postponed), God has given expression to language which *affirms beyond all doubt* that this Kingdom, sustaining a covenanted relationship, would at some time in the future be established; and this, too, *as covenanted* in connection with the national salvation of the Jewish nation. Thus, e.g., read Jer. 31 : 35–37, and 33 : 19–26; Isa. 54 : 9, 10, etc.

It has been remarked by various writers, that the covenant name of Jehovah or Jahveh, by which the unchangeableness of God is expressed, indicates the absolute certainty of ultimate fulfilment.

Obs. 1. Hence it follows : that the Jews were not so grossly ignorant as many Gentiles now think; that they were correct in their apprehensions concerning the Messiah's Kingdom being identified with the restored Davidic. *Language could not possibly make it any plainer or stronger.* The sun may refuse to shine, the moon and the stars may depart, the sea may no longer war with its waves, day and night may not alternate in their season, the ordinances of heaven and earth may be repealed (comp. e.g. Jer. 33 : 17–26, Isa. 54 : 9, Jer. 31 : 35, 36, Ps. 89 : 36, 37, etc.), but *the promises of God shall not fail in restoring the overthrown Davidic Kingdom;* God *will perform* the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and the Prophets, respecting the Jewish nation. Men may foolishly ridicule and sneer at these things because still unrealized, calling them "Jewish notions, fables, and prejudices," but God's word *stands pledged,* as solemnly and sacredly as word can be substantiated, for their fulfilment. It is idle, it is folly—yea more, it is sinful to censure the Jews for a belief *so clearly founded and so unmistakably encouraged.*

Obs. 2. Let the reader place himself in the period before the First Advent, with the Old Test. in his hands. Now *what* would be his belief in the Kingdom, with those covenants and prophecies, *confirmed* by oath and most expressive assurances? Surely it would be *identical* with that of the Jews themselves; it could not be otherwise, if there was *faith* in God's Word and God's oath. Can we believe that the First Advent of the Messiah obliterated this belief, destroyed the nature of the Kingdom, erased the grammatical sense of covenant and prophecy, and cancelled the oath of

the Unchangeable? Multitudes do this, but we *cannot, dare not* follow the multitude in this matter. God's assurances are too weighty, His Word is too pure, to allow of such *a destructive process.*

Obs. 3. The attitude of a portion of the modern Jews is to be regretted. Leavened with infidelity, they have lost all faith in the most precise and determinate utterances that can indicate the determination of God to verify His promises to the nation, and yet they profess to believe in this same God, in His veracity, etc. This is utterly inconsistent, and simply faithless, when their own scattered condition and continued preservation among the nations (as predicted) confirms the assurances of this God. If the covenants, and the prophecies based upon them, are *not worthy of credence* to a Jew, what is there then in the Old Test. *worthy of belief?* Their unbelief may reject the proffered blessings, but it cannot change the Purpose of God, for (Ps. 33 : 11) "*the counsel of the Lord standeth forever.*" Although the Jews are dispersed, under punishment for unbelief, yet there is something so distinguishing in their national relationship to the Divine Purpose that God, foreseeing all that has occurred in the past, still most graciously declares (Lev. 26 : 44), "Yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and *to break my covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God.*" Whether they believe it or not, mercy follows them for *the sake* of the covenant, and mercy will *yet verify* that covenant in the history of the nation, for "*their God*" has sworn it.

Obs. 4. A class of writers has arisen, who, professing to be very critical, tell us that Abraham's life, and indeed the whole Bible, must be subjected to "Historical Criticism." To this there could be no objection, if honestly conducted; but in the hands of this class, this phrase, stripped of its applied generalities and pretentious adjuncts, simply means to receive *just as much* as any one pleases to accept. By this process, Clarke (*Ten Religions*, p. 403) informs us that "not a little will be gained for the Jewish Scriptures by this position. If they lose the authority which attaches to the Word of God, they will gain the interest which belongs to the utterance of Man." These men, while professing admiration for Moses, the Prophets, etc., *virtually* convict them of false pretences, deception, etc. *Judas-like*, they kiss while in the act of betraying; *Joab-like*, they pretend friendship while stabbing.[1] To this class, the solemnly covenanted promises of God and the assurances respecting the Kingdom are all idle dreams; men who believe and trust in them are self-deceived and fanatical; history that corroborates prophetic announcements is merely a coincidence; the faith of ages, sustained by personal experience and Providence, is nothing but a mistaken belief.

[1] Let not the reader think that our expressions are too strong. We acknowledge to a degree of respect for Voltaire, Bolingbroke, Hume, Volney, etc., who, making Moses' claims pretentious and the Jewish religion a natural development, carried out their principles at least honestly in not professing a regard that they did not feel. But we have not much for that class of authors who, *under the garb* of friendship, esteem, and reverence, *stab, with deadly intent*, in the most courteous manner the truthfulness of the divine writers. What care we for the eulogies, e.g. of a Renan and others, when *the sum total of all is to destroy the divine teaching of the prophets, Jesus, and the apostles*, and bring everything down to a mere human level, and natural inspiration? And this *is called* "*historical criticism*"—a criticism which at the very outset stands prejudged against the

Supernatural, and will not allow that which is part of history itself to testify in its own favor by reference to a continuous Divine Purpose, a Unity of Design, a general Analogy, etc. The fact is, as will be shown hereafter, its position is most uncritical, in that it permits not the higher testimony of the Word to speak in its own behalf, but stands, sneeringly, picking flaws here and there, and from such presents the most sweeping deductions. Upright criticism, real honesty of heart and design, calls for a far different attitude. (Comp. Prop. 198.) Against such men might be placed, Bacon, Newton, Max Müller, etc. (who declare that the faith of Abraham, etc., was given by special revelation); but the truth is, that the Word of God does not need the testimony of learned and scientific men, for its best evidence it carries within itself corroborated by personal experience and history. This allusion to a prevailing sceptical tendency is made, to indicate how the promises of God are shorn of their strength by constituting them mere human assurances. Alas! if it were only confined to unbelievers! Many believers of the Word, savingly united to Christ by faith, who would shudder to adopt such a hopeless platform of unbelief, who actually receive these promises as divine, still by a fatal process so fritter them away or deny their intention or validity that they, too, with infidels, disbelieve in their ultimate fulfilment *as written*.

PROPOSITION 43. *The Kingdom being based on the covenants, the covenants must be carefully examined, and (Prop. 4) the literal language of the same must be maintained.*

The appointment, arrangement, disposition, or institution of a covenant relation, in whatever (as voluntary, a contract, etc.) light it may be regarded, presupposes two parties; the one who promises or imparts, and the other who will receive or attains. In all earthly transactions, when a promise, agreement, or contract is entered into by which one party gives a promise of value to another, it is *universally* the custom to explain such a relationship and its promises *by the well-known laws of language* contained in our grammars or in common usage. It would be regarded absurd and trifling to view them in any other light. (Comp. Prop. 4.)

Obs. 1. Why, then, should this universal rule be laid aside when coming to the covenants of the Bible? If it is important in any mere earthly relationship for the parties to *understand* each other, and such a comprehension is based on *the plain grammatical sense* of the language used, is it not equally, yea more, essential in *so weighty a case as this*; and to insure comprehension of the same is it not most reasonable to expect the same literal language? Indeed, when the covenants embrace *the vital interests* of a nation and *the destiny* of the race and the world, is it not *requisite* that they should be presented in such a form that the parties to whom they are given can *readily perceive their meaning*, without searching around for another and very different one to be engrafted upon them, or, without waiting for an Origen or Swedenborg to arise and spiritualize them into a proper conception?

It is saddening (it would be crushing to the few believing ones, if this lack of faith—its universality—had not been also predicted) to see how extensively the latter is done by good and great men, thereby darkening knowledge and obscuring the revealed purposes of God. On the other hand, let us firmly hold that the very nature of a covenant demands, that it should be so worded, so plainly expressed, that it conveys *a decisive meaning*, and not a hidden or mystical one that requires many centuries to revolve in order to develop. Otherwise it becomes deceptive and misleading, fostering a faith that can never be attained, and leading to hopes that can never be realized—which, if unworthy in an earthly transaction between man and man, is more discreditable when the Divine Being becomes a party. No! God never gave the covenants to deceive in their plain, grammatical sense! Men, indeed, say so; learned men declare it so; but this does not make it so—leaving the Word to speak for itself.

Obs. 2. This, however, does not imply, especially if the covenant is a voluntary one on the part of God and contains His merciful purposes of Salvation, that it may not be briefly expressed or concisely stated, and be afterward enlarged by way of additions, by explaining how it will be

performed, etc. All this may, indeed, be attached to it for prudential and wise reasons, and yet, *as far as given*, we are not at liberty to reject the plain meaning presented. And the less so if the additions afterward appended accurately coincide with the express language of the covenants.

Obs. 3. Our Proposition is confirmed by the indisputable fact that God has stamped the grammatical sense as the correct one by *literally fulfilling* a portion of the covenants. Take e.g. the promised "seed." He has come from Abraham, through the line of David, in a manner recognizable (implied by the terms) and indicative of His power to redeem and bless. *A sufficiency* is found in the history of the past to show that these covenants contain *a real, substantial, verified grammatical meaning*. Hence we are not allowed to change it for something else.

If all the rest contained in these covenants has not yet been thus literally confirmed by fulfilment, we should not hastily limit the Almighty in His dispensational proceedings by rejecting the remainder, or by attaching another meaning to it to suit present circumstances. No! *with Abrahamic faith* clinging to His revealed intention, at some time, to fulfil them as He has done a part, let us calmly ask, *Why* has it not all been thus fulfilled? When this question is *scripturally* answered, and the reasons assigned, which God Himself gives, then, *then* we shall not only be satisfied to let its plain meaning stand, but *rejoice* in its precious significance.

Obs. 4. The promises in the covenants are *not typical*, as many argue (impelled to it by not seeing a present fulfilment, and by a disbelief in a future fulfilment), for a typical character is *opposed* to the very nature of a covenant. It would in a great measure make the real truth unrecognizable until the appearance of the antitype, and the result would be to enshroud the covenants themselves in conjecture and mystery, which is opposed to the simple fact that God appeals to the covenants as to promises *well comprehended*. The *partial fulfilment* of them clearly shows that they are not to be regarded as typical.

As this is a point of great importance, having a marked influence upon the interpretation of much Scripture, a few remarks ought to be appended. Many excellent writers, as Fairbairn and others, make e.g. the inheritance promised to the Patriarchs a typical one, and the proof texts assigned for this are the passages which speak of the saints inheriting the earth, of Abraham being "heir of the world," etc. But this is a begging of the question, for these passages in no shape or form intimate *a typical* nature of the inheritance but, on the contrary, *the reality* of the promise; for, as we shall show hereafter (Props. 142, 131, 137, 141, etc.) this Scripture teaches *an exact fulfilment* of covenant promise, unless they themselves are also made typical (as e.g. inheriting the earth to mean inheriting third heaven, etc.). That no type is intended may be briefly stated thus: Jesus Christ, according to the Prophets, as David's Son and Theocratic King inherits not only David's throne and kingdom but also the territory, but in connection with this, in virtue of His Divine-Human character and the original design contemplated, His dominion, based on His rightful inheritance, is to extend over the whole earth. To show the contrary, Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 266) introduces a very inapt and unfortunate inferential proof. For he tells us that the inheritance can only be explained "with what it typically represented, in the same way that Christ is called Abraham's seed," viz.: as "the ultimate child of promise." Here comes in the fatal mistake that he and others make in supposing that covenant promises are typical, impelling them, as an illustration of the same, to infer *the typical nature of* "*the seed.*" We may well ask, in reply, Was not Christ Abraham's *natural* seed, and if so, did "seed" stand for a type? Certainly not, for there is *a literal fulfilment of promise*. *Precisely so*, with the inheritance; it is better to wait and see what God yet intends to do, before we explain away His own words by a typical process. For if we adopt this modernized principle, so prevailing, where is then a promise in the covenants to which can be ascribed *certainty* of meaning? Rejecting the plain one that the letter contains, or more conveniently converting it into a type, the

promise may then represent what the ingenuity of man ascribes to it, and conjecture follows. Men may derisively call our view, an adhering to the "husk," "shell," or "rind" and congratulate themselves in having "the developed germ" or "matured fruit," but amid the unproven varieties of "fruit," from Origen to Swedenborg, we are content to abide by the former, as certainly God-given. The truth is, that these writers all come to the Word with an unproven hypothesis, viz.: that the church, as now constituted, is the covenanted Messianic Kingdom, and hence all Scripture, including the precise and determinate language of the covenants, *must be* interpreted to correspond with a prejudged case. Learning and ability must champion a fundamental misconception.

PROPOSITION 49. *The covenants being in Revelation, the foundation of the Kingdom, must first be received and appreciated.*

Let us then briefly pass them under review, and notice their contents; this will clearly indicate their fundamental nature.

God promised salvation to Adam and Eve. The Bible gives us the sad history, that, while some through faith sought for deliverance, gradually unbelief and sin enveloped and enshrouded the race. One man and his family were selected by the Almighty to escape the general destruction, that through him the race might be propagated, the promise might be extended and ultimately fulfilled. Again, corruption prevailed (Joshua 24 : 2, 14 etc.) to such an extent that a new development was necessary to prepare and perpetuate the way of salvation. A descendant of Shem and Noah, possessing peculiar characteristics, was selected as the preeminently chosen one to whom in a more special and particular manner was committed the assurances of a preparatory development and final attainment of Salvation. In him the Divine Purpose becomes more specific, detailed, contracted, definite, and certain. *Specific*, in distinguishing and separating him from others of the race; *detailed*, in indicating more of the particulars connected with the purpose of salvation; *contracted*, in making the Messiah to come directly in his line, to be his "seed;" *definite*, in entering into covenant relation with him, as his God; and *certain*, in confirming this covenant relationship by an oath. This, then, is the period, beyond all others, which, descending from the general to the particular, lays, as Kurtz (*His. Old Cov.*, p. 175, comp. Prop. 46, Obs. 1) aptly remarks: "a *foundation* on which the great Salvation is ultimately to appear;" or, as Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 471) observes: "We have learned to recognize the covenant of God with Abraham as *the foundation* of the entire revelation of Salvation." Abraham is this chosen instrument, and through his promised seed complete redemption is to be obtained. Certainly then the Abrahamic history becomes one of *absorbing interest*, in view of its fundamental and living connection with final Salvation. It deserves and demands our most earnest and closest attention, for to it all other things, in the development, must sustain a close and abiding relation. We cannot overestimate the importance of this, as Isa. 51 : 1, 2 teaches. Even the incarnation, life, etc., of Christ grow out of the deep significancy, and in behalf of the fulfilment, of the covenant made with Abraham.

I. THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

Obs. 1. The covenant (see good remarks on the meaning of the word "covenant" by Barnes, Notes on Heb. 8 : 8, and 9 : 16) made with Abraham is found in Gen. 12 : 1–3, 7; 13 : 14–17; 15 : 4–21; 17 : 4–16; 22 : 15–18. The things promised by God are the following: 1. That Abraham's name shall be great. 2. That a great nation should come from him. 3. He should be a blessing so great that in him shall all families of the earth be blessed. 4. To him personally ("to thee") and to his seed should be given Palestine forever to inherit. 5. The multitude of his seed should be as the dust of the earth. 6. That whoever blessed him should be blessed, and whosoever cursed him should be cursed. 7. He should be the father of many nations. 8. Kings should proceed from him. 9. The covenant shall be perpetual, "an everlasting covenant." 10. The land of Canaan shall be "an everlasting possession." 11. God will be a God to

him and to his seed. 12. His seed shall possess the gate of his enemies. 13. In his seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

God added, in order to bring about these promises, predictions, dispensational and providential arrangements, and while in the course of time there has been a partial, inchoate fulfilment, sufficient to authenticate their divine origin and ultimate realization, yet a mere cursory glance at them, and then at history, shows that they have not, to this time, been verified as given. This partial and limited fulfilment has afforded a fund of amusement to unbelief, and it sneeringly points to it as evidence of failure, of Oriental exaggeration, etc. In view, however, of the dispositions already made, the continued progress of the Divine Purpose toward its realization, the constant preservation of Abraham's descendants, to whom nationally the covenants were given, the raising up of a seed unto Abraham, etc., it would *be foolishness* to say that they, as recorded, *never will* be accomplished. To answer unbelief, by endeavoring to make out a fulfilment by spiritualizing the promises, by substituting *something else* in their place, is only another form of unbelief in the precise words of the covenants.

Obs. 2. Out of the blessings enumerated, several are selected, as illustrative, which have not yet been experienced. Thus e.g. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob[1] have Palestine "from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates" promised to them *personally*, and *also* to their seed. The repetition of the precise language admits of no other construction. "*To thee and to thy seed* will I give this land;" "*To thee* will I give it;" "to give *thee* this land to inherit;" "I will give it *unto thee, and to thy seed after* thee, the land wherein *thou* art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession;" "unto *thee and to thy seed* will I give all these countries;" "the land whereon *thou* liest, *to thee* will I give it *and to thy seed;*" "the land which I gave *to Abraham and Isaac, to thee* will I give it, *and to thy seed after* thee will I give the land." *How* the Patriarchs understood this is evident by referring to what Isaac said to Jacob when he sent him away to Laban (Gen. 28 : 1–4): "God Almighty bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people; and give thee the blessing of Abraham, *to thee and to thy seed with thee*, that *thou* mayest inherit the land, wherein *thou* art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham." Can language be more definite? Does God so carefully reiterate *the personal inheriting* (and as carefully discriminate from such inheriting a present temporary sojourn in the land), of the land by the Patriarchs, and yet mean something very different from what the words properly denote? Many, alas, tell us yes! but we respond, No! Never![2]

[1] The reason why the covenant was repeated to Isaac and Jacob was owing to the fact that they formed the chosen posterity to the exclusion of others in the Abrahamic line, and with Jacob that exclusion ceased, for as Dr. Kurtz (*His. Old Cov.*, vol. 2, p. 33) aptly expresses it: "Now at length the way of grace entirely coincided with that of nature." In other words, all the seed of Jacob were called, and the blessing offered to each one of them.

[2] Those who deny that the Patriarchs shall *personally* inherit the land, base their objection on two points; viz.: (1) that it was fulfilled either in themselves sojourning there, or else in their posterity inhabiting the land; and (2) that such an inheriting, as we contend for, demands a resurrection of them. Let us now carefully consider these, in the light of Scripture.

(1) Whatever may be said respecting *the temporary* possession of Canaan (either as preparatory or initiatory or inchoate,) or whatever may be asserted respecting the descendants being meant "as yet in his loins," etc., one thing is most positively stated in the Bible, viz.: that this promise was *not* fulfilled in the Patriarchs, in any of the forms alleged by unbelief. The Spirit, foreseeing this very objection, provided against it, lest our faith should stumble. Thus Stephen, *full* of the Holy Ghost, tells us (Acts 7 : 5)

that "He (God) gave him (Abraham) *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.*" This (also because accordant with the well-known Jewish views) should be decisive, especially when confirmed by Paul (Heb. 9 : 8, 9, and 11 : 13–40), who expressly informs us that the Patriarchs sojourned in "the land of promise," which they were to receive as "an inheritance," "*pilgrims and strangers,*" and that "they died in faith, *not having received the promises,* but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were *pilgrims and strangers* on the earth." How, with *such* evidence before us, can we attribute to only their posterity what is directly asserted *of themselves personally?* Those modernized views were not known to Stephen and Paul (and others, as e.g. Luke 1 : 68–73 ; Mic. 7 : 20, etc.). Hence it follows that in God's own time this will be abundantly *brought to pass,* so that it only becomes us to observe *how and when,* as revealed in the Word. God will perform this for them, as the Jews held, as the Primitive Church believed, and as taught by every Millenarian writer down to the present day.* The deep reasons which underlie this promise and its relationship to the Kingdom will appear in succeeding pages.

Evidently that which misleads the multitude in this matter is the statement of the apostle (Heb. 11 : 16), that "they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly." Commentators, as Barnes, Bloomfield, etc., overlooking entirely *the Theocratic* relationship that this country (i.e. Palestine) is to occupy in the Kingdom of God, at once conclude that this "heavenly" country is the third heaven. They forget that this phraseology would not mislead a Hebrew, who was accustomed to designate the restored Davidic Kingdom a heavenly Kingdom, and the country enjoying its restoration and Theocratic blessings, a heavenly country. The expression does not mean "the third heaven" (Prop. 103), but something that pertains to, or partakes of, the heavenly, as heavenly vision, body, calling, etc. (To avoid repetition, comp. Props. 142–154.)

If no other means avail to destroy the express language of the Covenant, recourse is had to the typical theory (Prop. 48, Obs. 4). Thus, Pressense (*The Redeemer,* p. 74) says, respecting Gen. 17 : 8, "Without doubt it was designed to have an earthly fulfilment ; in fact this it received" (against the testimony of Stephen and Paul), "but the earthly fulfilment was secondary." That is, it was only "a symbol," symbolizing heavenly things ; and then he asks : "What interest attaches, speaking in a religious sense, to the fact that one family or one people should have in prospect a fair earthly heritage?" Alas ! when good men can speak so disparagingly of covenant promise. Has it not a deep religious signification in the light of man's being deprived by sin of "a fair earthly heritage?" The answer to Pressense is found in such Propositions as 120, 140, 142, 145, etc. Irving (*Life of Ed. Irving,* by Mrs. Oliphant, p. 338), in a letter to Dr. Chalmers, more comprehensively remarks : "I trust the Lord will give you time and leisure to consider the great hope of the church first given to Abraham ; that she shall be 'heir of the world.' Certainly, it is *the very substance* of Theology."

(2) Next we are informed that such a procedure must necessitate the resurrection of the Patriarchs. *Precisely so ;* and we feel assured from the faith manifested by Abraham

---

* When Abraham asked (Gen. 15 : 8) : "Lord God, whereby shall I know *that I shall* inherit it?" God condescended to a covenant sacrifice ; and his faith is tested (as in the case of Isaac, whom he was to offer, although the child of promise), by selecting and bringing the material for the sacrifice, by the length of time elapsing before the sacrifice is accepted, by the horror and darkness coming upon him, and by the notification of his own death *before* he should realize it. But his faith is sustained by the acceptance of the sacrifice, by the statement made respecting his descendants, and by the assurance thus given that God sustained a covenant relationship to him. There is something remarkable in all this, and now, in view of the past, we can readily see why the matter is so briefly related. This explains what Luther (*Table Talk,* s. 152) refers to : "No man, since the apostles' time, has rightly understood the legend of Abraham. The apostles themselves did not sufficiently extol or explain Abraham's faith, according to its worth and greatness. I much marvel that Moses so slightly remembers him." The fact is, that Moses says much, but we appreciate it too little. The writer has no doubt but that much could be added to our knowledge by receiving the suggestions of the record. Even names are, perhaps, suggestive. Without asserting its application, e.g. "Machpelah" has the meaning "double" (Stanley, *His. Jew. Church,* 1 Ser. Ap. 2), and may have, for aught we know, an allusion to the fact that Abraham had a double interest in the tract, first by gift from God and secondly by purchase.

in Isaac's resurrection from the dead (Heb. 11 : 17-19), had he sacrificed him, and in his looking forward to the day of Christ (John 8 : 56 ; Heb. 11 : 10, 11), for the fulfilment of these promises, that his hope was based *on a resurrection from the dead.* A resurrection is implied ; it is taken for granted, for the Patriarchs die, the promise is unrealized, and yet God *is faithful* in His promises. Now to indicate this, and the power of the resurrection, God gives us His "*Memorial,*" * which was to be "unto all generations" (Ex. 3 : 15), "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel : *The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob* hath sent me unto you ; *this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.*" What meaning was couched in this most sublime Memorial? This : I am the God who will remember and be faithful *to my covenant* with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and *to fulfil it I will raise* them from the dead. Now let the reader notice that this is not my interpretation of it, but that which is given by the greatest Teacher, Jesus Christ. For, when the Sadducees came to Him denying *the resurrection*, Jesus, well knowing how *the Jews held* that the Patriarchs would be raised from the dead to inherit the land, told them that Moses *taught a resurrection* when "he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." This Memorial was then given as proof (Luke 20 : 37) "*that the dead are raised,*" and not, as many would teach us, of the immortality of the Patriarchs and their condition in the intermediate state. Neither immortality, nor the intermediate state, was *the subject* of dispute ; the resurrection of the dead was denied, and the resurrection of the dead was defended.† Whatever might be induced inferentially, the *direct* subject-matter between Christ and the Sadducees was that of *the resurrection*, and the memorial itself is adduced as proof, *decisive*, that *such* a resurrection will occur. Why thus adduced? Simply because the covenant *necessitates* a resurrection ; without it the covenant *cannot* be fulfilled ; and God, in thus calling Himself their God and that He ever shall remain their God, *pledges Himself* to a strict performance of His promise, that they themselves, personally, shall inherit the land. And in His glorious Majesty, to whom all time is present, in His omnipotence and wisdom, to indicate the fixity and certainty of His divine purpose, He speaks of them—foreseeing their position and regarding it settled as a fact—not as dead men but living. In other words, He speaks only *as a God* can speak, making things that are not yet fulfilled, owing to their certainty, present and real. God looks at the time when Abraham's body will arise from the "marble covered with carpets embroidered in gold" (Stanley, *His. Jew. Church*, Ap. 2, 1 Ser.), when Isaac's dust shall spring to life, when Jacob's embalmed body, throwing aside its wrappings, shall be reanimated, and His faithful promise shall be realized, and with this before Him, as Omniscience alone can comprehend, He speaks. Let us reverently hear, and understand.

---

* A writer in an interesting art. (*Proph. Times*, vol. 2, p. 17) renders the word translated "memoral" into that of "manchild," as having a reference to the Messiah, the incarnation of Deity, and the retention of humanity forever. However ingenious, we prefer the rendering given in our versions, as our argument does not require its special consideration.

† It is painful to notice the lack of candor in many writers, and in some commentaries. Seeing that if they admit our position, it will tend to overthrow their spiritualistic views of covenant promise, they insist that immortality is alone taught. This they do (1) against the *express* Jewish usage of the words as indicative of a resurrection (comp. Mede's *Works*, Lightfoot's *Works*, Harmer's *Mis. Works*, etc.) ; (2) Jesus employing the memorial according to *such* usage ; (3) the Evangelists expressly asserting that it referred, not to immortality, but to the resurrection, as Matt. 22 : 31 "*as touching the resurrection of the dead,*" Mark 12 : 26 "*as touching the dead, that they rise,*" Luke 20 : 37, "*that the dead are raised ;*" (4) the fact that the Sadducees were *silenced* by the argument. It is strange, when the matter is so plainly stated, that prejudice can influence men to reject such testimony. One of the best Expositions of this interview is to be found in Judge Jones's *Notes on Scripture*, with which comp. Olshausen, Lange, Nast, etc. Dr. Schaff, in Lange's *Com.* Matt. 22 : 23-33, most aptly remarks : "The argument of Christ avails only for those who stand in personal covenant relations with the God of Abraham," etc. We acknowledge the force of this, and hence infer from it, as is elsewhere taught (comp. Prop. 119, etc.), that the resurrection of the righteous is something distinctive, pre-eminent, etc. Smith's Bib. Dic., and many others, admit that Ex. 3 : 6 fully implies and teaches a resurrection, but neglect to place it properly on the covenanted basis. More satisfactory is Auberlen (*Div. Rev.*, p. 141), and others like Seiss, Bickersteth, Bonar, etc.

Obs. 3. The reader, having carefully perused the preceding evidence, will understand the significance of Paul, before Agrippa (Acts 26 : 6–8), uniting "*the promise to the Fathers*" *with the resurrection of the dead.* The promise and the memorial were thus understood, as we explain, by the Jews, and it would be simply an outrage for Paul and others to use language—if another meaning was intended—which would confirm the Jews in their belief. A brief glance at Jewish belief may, in this connection, be serviceable. Mede (*Works*, B. 4, Ep. 43), Brooks (*El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 33), and other tell us how Rabbi Gamaliel, the Preceptor of Paul, silenced the Sadducees by bringing against them Deut. 11 : 21, "which land the Lord sware that He would give to your fathers," arguing "that as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had it not, and God cannot lie, *therefore they must be raised from the dead to inherit it.*" Wetstein (on Matt. 22 : 32) cites a Rabbinical writer, who thus argues the resurrection from the memorial. So Mede adduces Rabbi Simai (some later), urging the same from Ex. 6 : 4, that "the law asserts in this place the resurrection from the dead—to wit, when it said, And also I have established my covenant with them, to give them Canaan," etc., because the fathers were mentioned by name and the Jews then existing were not specified. The same is quoted by Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture*), as contained in the Talmud in Gemara, who also gives Manasseh Ben Israel (referred to by Warburton, B. 6, S. 3) as arguing the resurrection from the covenant promise.[1] Thus the Jewish view, entertained and continued, indicates to us unmistakably how the New Test. writers are to be understood, unless we condescend to adopt the miserable and degrading accommodation theory.

[1] For the views of the Jews at the time of Christ see e.g. Knapp, *Ch. Theol.*, sec. 151, 2 (2) p. 530, or Jones, *Notes on the Scriptures*, p. 284, note. While there was some difference of opinion as to who should be raised (some holding only to the righteous of the nation, others to all of the race, and others including some Gentiles with these), there was none respecting the Patriarchs. The hope was indulged of enjoying resurrection life with them in their covenanted inheritance. This is so clear, and admitted by a host of writers, Millenarian, Anti-Millenarian, etc., that it admits of no doubt. Allusions to this resurrection are made in *The Twelve Patriarchs* and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are specially mentioned ; also in some of the other Apocryphal books. Comp. an "Excursus" in Prof. Stuart's *Com. on Apoc.* The Samaritans only receive the Pentateuch, and yet they firmly hold to a resurrection, even quoting Deut. 32 : 39 "I kill, and I make alive," as affirming the same. The fact that Jesus passes by the later utterances of the Old Test., and selects one from the Pentateuch, shows that if the resurrection is not clearly enforced by it, He could not reprove the Sadducees on account of their ignorance, thus evidencing not only its force (as we affirm), but that the same was recognized fully by the Jews. If this were not so, His reasoning would be inconclusive and irrelevant, but being so, it is conclusive and irresistible. The student will observe that, in view of the fundamental need of the resurrection of Jesus in order to fulfil the covenant promises, it is taken for granted that it is necessarily implied by Moses, hence e.g. the puzzling (to many commentators) reference of Paul to Moses (Acts 26 : 22, 23) as teaching the resurrection of Jesus—Paul making such a direct resultant to bring about the fulfilment.

Obs. 4. To say that all this was fulfilled in the occupation of Palestine by the preparatory or initiatory possession of it by the descendants of Abraham, is not only *contradicted* by Scripture, but is a virtual *limiting* of the promise. Kurtz (*His. of Old Cov.*, vol. 1, p. 131) observes, what history attests, that the descendants *never* possessed the land promised to Abraham from the Nile to the Euphrates (comp. geographical boundary given by Hengstenberg, from Gen. 15 : 18, Ex. 23 : 31, and Deut. 11 : 22–

24). It is only by *a perversion of facts* that a fulfilment can be made out, although it is attempted under the reigns of David and Solomon. In view of this non-fulfilment, and the land being assigned "*for an everlasting or eternal possession*," some writers (e.g. Kurtz, *His. Old Cov.*, vol. 1, p. 214) base an argument upon it in favor of a future restoration of the Jews, but the same reasoning precisely, with the addition of a promise to the Patriarchs personally, demands the fulfilment of the promise by *a restoration of the Patriarchs to the land* thus geographically bounded.

Warner (*In the Levant*, p. 82) says: "The country the Hebrews occupied was small; they never conquered or occupied *the whole* of the Promised Land, which extended from the Mediterranean Sea to the Arabian plain, from Hamath to Sinai. Their territory in actual possession reached only from Dan to Beersheba. The coast they never subdued," etc. He refers to the brief period in the reigns of David and Solomon, when Damascus and the cities of the Philistines paid tribute, "but the Kingdom of Tyre, still in the possession of Hiram, marked the limit of Jewish sway in that direction." A large number of similar testimonies might be quoted (comp. e.g. Wines' *Com. on Laws*, B. 1, ch. 9, etc.), but the student does not require them in such a matter of fact. The past non-fulfilment insures the future fulfilment, as God *is faithful* in all His promises. God, foreseeing how the Jewish nation would relapse in idolatry, superstition, and extreme bigotry, permitted other nations, as the Phœnicians, etc., within the bounds of the promised land to survive and retain possession. In the recent Art. on "*Palestine*" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, the decided ground is taken that the land as promised to Abraham was *never* occupied, extending as it does from the Nile to the Euphrates, and this non-occupation is accounted for in view of the unfaithfulness of the nation. This is true as to the past, but the student must not be misled by this to a denial that it ever will be realized, because the promise to the Patriarchs is *unconditional*, and confirmed by oath and abundant reiterated promises; and the fulfilment is explained to take place under the promised "seed," who is David's Son, and will come again to bring in its realization. The unfaithfulness of some does not rob the faithful of their promised inheritance.

Obs. 5. In view of the Scriptural statements, eminent men, who are inclined to the prevailing modern doctrines, find themselves forced to make admissions corroborative of the correctness of our position. We append a few illustrations. Thus Thompson (*Theol. of Christ*, p. 186–7) justly takes the ground that (Matt. 22 : 30, etc.) the Sadducees denied a literal resurrection, that Jesus in His reply holds fast to the Jewish view of a literal resurrection, and that every utterance given is to confirm such a faith, but then leaves a loophole for escape in this sentence: "He went on to assert the Resurrection as set forth by Moses, in the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob would ever have a recognized identity in the Kingdom of God." Fairbairn (*Typol. of Scripture*) says much that is highly interesting and valuable—entire pages might be transcribed—but he vitiates the whole by making the promise of Canaan, etc., typical of something else. Barnes, Hody, Campbell, etc., that can only see the doctrine of a separate existence of the soul in the memorial, still assert that *somehow* it infers the resurrection, i.e. because the spirits are alive, the bodies will also be hereafter. Acknowledging the admission forced from them, we fail to see how the existence of spirit in any proves the resurrection of the body; and they have failed to show the connection.

Even McKnight, in that spiritualizing Essay (No. 5, p. 256, "On the Epistles"), which endeavors to make almost everything typical of something else, fully admits that "accordingly our Lord in reasoning with the Sadducees, affirmed, that the promise to give to Abraham and to his immediate descendants the everlasting possession of Canaan, was virtually *a promise to raise them from the dead.*" This reference to an implied resurrection he sustains by other Scripture, and by quoting the opinions of Jews, as e.g. 2 Mac.

7 : 9, 36. But the concessions are weakened by making Canaan a type of another world, thus vitiating the promises (making them to denote something not contained in the language), rejecting Christ's own inheritance, the faith of the Jews, etc. The points in the essay are fully met under various Propositions. It is now sufficient to say, that *the express* language, as e.g. "*the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed*," precludes the typical theory. This itself answers Pressense (*The Redeemer*, p. 74), and others. We must refer again to the remarkable performance of Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 293, etc.), who justly discriminates between the promise to the Patriarchs personally and the promise to their seed; shows by an appeal to the language, to Stephen, etc., that they had a personal interest in the land, which would be verified, although they died, by a resurrection; quotes Jewish authorities to indicate how they associated a resurrection with its fulfilment; goes even so far as to advance the coming of the seed, as fulfilled in "the most exact and literal sense," thus indicating that the promise "thou shalt inherit the land" will likewise be thus realized; in brief, he is forced to the same conclusions precisely that we arrived at, viz.: that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will be raised from the dead and inherit the renewed earth (which "renovated earth being the ultimate inheritance of the heirs of promise," he, at length and forcibly, defends). But he vitiates it (in order to avoid our Pre-Millenarian position, and to save his spiritualizing of other particulars) by making Canaan *a type* of this renewed earth. But it is *the literal Canaan* which they saw, walked and reclined on, that is promised; renewed indeed, but the same Canaan; delivered from the curse, and beautified and adorned. The Theocratic Kingdom, that is to be restored under the Messiah, as numerous predictions (as we shall show) declare, has its central location in Palestine; and the restoration of the Jewish nation, identified with it, is inseparably associated with "the land," "the city," etc., although at that time (Isa. 65 and 66) enjoying "new heavens and new earth." The land promised specially to the Patriarchs has set geographical bounds, and we keep to these as announced; for, as Fairbairn himself asserts (which is all-sufficient to sustain our position), this inheritance is to be "recovered, not made," being "the possession of this very earth, which we now inhabit, after it shall have been redeemed and glorified."

Obs. 6. We turn with a sense of relief from the class of writers who constantly change the promises of God into something that the language does not convey (i.e. make it typical, symbolical, spiritual, mystical), to another class who, with faith, accept of them *as they are written*, in their plain grammatical sense, just as the Jews and Primitive believers. As many of these will be mentioned in connection with other topics, we select but a single illustration. Dr. Candlish (*Lectures on Genesis*, Lec. 13) takes the position "that the hope of an inheritance for himself, individually, did actually form a part of the faith of Abraham;" that "nowhere does Abraham receive any promise whatever of future good, or of a future inheritance, *for himself*, if it be not in the announcement, '*I will give thee this land;*'" that Paul in Hebrews makes no reference to Abraham's posterity, but to himself as *an individual*, so far as inheriting the promise is concerned; that Abraham "sojourned in the land of promise," and although a stranger and pilgrim in it, yet "*it was the land of promise still;*" that "the place to which he was called to go out, was the very place which *he should afterward receive for an inheritance;*" that the fulfilment of the promise is *postponed until after his resurrection;* that God is his God in respect to both soul and body as when living, and as the covenant relation entered into was when Abraham was living, it must always be regarded in the light of Abraham *again living in the body;* that the inheritance is not typical but *real*, evidenced by the renewed earth, the inheriting of the earth, etc.; that this renovated earth with its blessings brings heaven down with its holy influences. This epitome sufficiently indicates the line of reasoning, identical with that of the Primitive Church (as Irenæus, Justin, etc.).

Obs. 7. Multitudes allow themselves to be influenced in spiritualizing these promises because "a city" is promised to Abraham, which is taken for granted to be the third heaven, etc. But the churches established by the apostles had no such idea, for they clearly apprehended that this promise of the city, of God being their God, and of not being ashamed to be such, etc., had reference *to the glorious Theocratic ordering in the future.* For they saw that this city of the great King, in which Abraham shall rejoice, is plainly promised to be here *on the earth* and not in the third heaven, etc. As this will come up hereafter in detail (e.g. Props. 142, 146, 152, etc.), it may be passed by with the remark that it certainly is strange, if the modernized notions of eminent men respecting this city are correct, that we do not find them existing in the earliest writings of the Chr. Church.

If the reader who (like Barnes, etc.) applies this "city" to heaven, insists, at this stage of our argument, upon a reply, it is amply sufficient to point out the simple fact that the future city of God is represented (Rev. 21 : 2, 10) as coming out of heaven upon this earth and *remaining* here. This, of course, fully harmonizes with our view, and with Abraham's promised inheritance. But we leave this for the present, asking the reader to compare Props. 169, 168, 148, 151, etc., for full particulars.

Obs. 8. God gave *an oath* for the faithful (Micah 7 : 20) performance of Covenant promises (Gen. 22 : 16, and 26 : 3), thus condescending to present the strongest possible assurance. Now God would not swear to an equivocal covenant, to a covenant which in its *plain grammatical sense* conveys the promises we have referred to, and yet means something very different. No one can deny this grammatical meaning, seeing that for many centuries it was the only one maintained, and that for several centuries in the Christian Church it was the one presented by the Fathers (Props. 76–78).

Even the very name of God assures the fulfilment of the covenant. The reader will find an interesting "Excursus" on this name in Bengel's *Gnomon*, Apoc. 1 : 8, in which it is contrasted with the names given in the Apoc. The name "He who is" was familiar to the Patriarchs, and this name, in view of the covenanted relationship, was changed into "I will be what I will be," upon which Bengel remarks: "That is, '*I will be*' to the Israelites the character *which*, by the very fact, '*I will be*' in regard to their fathers, both what I said to them I would be, and what it behooves Me to be to them; namely, by now at length fulfilling the promise which I formerly gave." There seems, too, aside from the reference to the coming one (comp. Prop. 127), an ascending scale in the name of God in reference to the Covenant, which writers have variously explained, but all have noticed. Thus, e.g. He is known as "the strong One," inspiring confidence; then as "God Almighty," confirming faith; then as "Jehovah," indicating that being Eternal, all things were dependent upon Him and He could fulfil all promises; then Jehovah-Sabaoth, the Eternal leader of the armies of heaven and earth, dependent upon His will and self-existence. "Jehovah" is the personal, self-revealing name (McCaul, Essay 5, p. 226, *Aids to Faith*); it is the name indicative of His relationship to Israel, of revealing Himself in history, and as He acts in it (Kurtz, *Sac. His.*, p. 26). Comp. Dr. Etheredge's *Targums*, Stuart's *Apoc.*, Kurtz's *Old Cov.*

Obs. 9. Some few writers, as Silliman in *The World's Jubilee*, "declare that the Abrahamic covenant and the institution at Mt. Sinai made provision, had the Hebrews rendered to them a perfect obedience, for their exemption from death." On the other hand, we find only provision made for a future resurrection; and in this we are confirmed by the announcement of Abraham's death at the covenant sacrifice, by the general analogy of the Word, and by the fact that the covenant itself contemplated that it

would only be through the seed Christ, at some future unannounced period, that it would be realized—that saints would be honored by a translation. The covenants, in their tenor, look to the future and not the present for realization; the latter being dependent upon *the coming of the promised seed and a Theocratic ordering.*

Let it be observed, that not only Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob acknowledged themselves "pilgrims and strangers" while in Canaan, but the same is true of their descendants in the land, even while under the Theocratic arrangement. This feature is misleading to some, who draw conclusions of a spiritual and third heaven nature not warranted by the fact. Let it be noticed, that if we take Heb. 11, 13, Ps. 39 : 12, and 119 : 19, 1 Chron. 29 : 15, it will be found that, owing to *the intervention* of death, the temporary sojourn in the land is *not* recognized as the one that the covenant contemplates, for the latter presents it as "an everlasting possession." Hence, as we have already shown (e.g. Prop. 25), the Theocracy even was only an earnest of the Theocracy reestablished in power and glory, with its promised perpetuity, etc.

Obs. 10. Infidelity has triumphantly asserted that in the Mosaic Record there is no reference to the resurrection and a future life, and this has been corroborated by the premature statements of some believers. But this is a grave mistake, and one *unmistakably refuted* by the Record itself. The central point in it—the foundation upon which the Mosaic superstructure rests—*necessitates a belief in the resurrection and a future life.* This we have shown, and this will more fully appear from what follows.

Simple candor requires that we allow Scripture to interpret itself, and if this is done there can be no question in this matter.. Clarke (*Ten Religions*, p. 250) only repeats what hundreds before him had asserted: "But it is perhaps more strange not to find any trace of the doctrine of a future life in Mosaism when this was so prominent among the Egyptians," and adds, "That in Moses there is 'nothing of the future life and judgment to come.'" Kant and others hence infer a lack of divinity. This can only be said by ignoring the covenants and the special promises based on them, which, in the nature of the case, positively demand a future life, seeing that death itself is announced *to precede* the fulfilment of these promises. It is simply folly to say that God promises certain things to the Patriarchs personally, and then tells them that they must experience death before they are realized, and *leave* the matter in this condition. God expects reason to assert itself, and faith in Himself *as God* to vindicate His truthfulness. Hence we are sorry to read such utterances as these: Stanley (*Hs. Jew. Ch.*, 1 ser. Lec. 7) says: "The future life was not denied or contradicted, but it was *overlooked, set aside, overshadowed* by the consciousness of the living, actual presence of God Himself." The truth is, that the consciousness of this presence of God inspired faith in the future life (John 8 : 56, Heb. 11 : 8-16). This is seen in the promises given being of such a nature, that, if ever fulfilled, a resurrection from the dead is indispensable; they are purposely given in such a manner as *to test faith* (i.e. by not explaining *how* they are to be accomplished, leaving that to the Promiser to perform); and now the presence of God, His covenant relationship, the attributes claimed by Him, His oath, are calculated to inspire, bring forth implicit confidence in their fulfilment, notwithstanding the intervention of death (as illustrated in the case of Isaac). The careful student will see that the Mosaic attitude vindicates, and presents to us, in a most striking manner, the Majesty of a God (requiring simple confidence in Himself), and the reason and faith of the Patriarchs. It is a matter of surprise that believers in making concessions to unbelievers overlook three facts: (1) That many things illustrative of personal faith and doctrine are omitted in the rapid outline given in the Old Test., and that, in view of this omission, to conclude ignorance in them, is to judge both harshly and unjustly; (2) that no passage is to be found which either directly teaches, or from which it can be legitimately inferred, e.g. that these ancient worthies had no hope of a future resurrection and life, i.e. the cry of despair, as found in books of unbelief, is not recognized in the Pentateuch; (3) that such omissions occur, is amply sustained by the statements of Jesus and the apostles concerning the personal faith and hope of ancient worthies; and the union of the Old and New Tests., given by *the same* Spirit, ought to prevent our degrading the knowledge of those who sustained an intimate relationship to God. Even incidental narrative ap-

pears to imply this hope, as e.g. the anxiety of Jacob and Joseph to have their bones carried to Canaan. While this may be explained by the desire, common to human nature, to be buried with our relatives, yet in view of the great distance between Egypt and Canaan, and especially of the covenanted relationship of these persons to Canaan, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they were deeply impressed with the idea—derived from covenant promise—that they personally had an interest in that land, and that, some day, they would be raised from the dead to enjoy its possession; and that by such a removal they expressed both their interest in the land and faith and hope in an ultimate acquisition of it according to promise. It was virtually *a silent but thrilling* appeal to God, when dead, for Him to remember and verify His promise. A number of intelligent writers take the same view of this matter, and they certainly have strong reasons for thus concluding. Thus, e.g. over against the *Ch. Union* (Sep. 26th, 1877), which asserts that the doctrine of a future life is not in the Pentateuch, and that this "is absolutely indisputable" (against the direct testimony of Jesus, John, and Paul to the contrary), we refer the reader to Fairbairn's *Typology* (vol. 1, Ap. C, pp. 369-390 on "The Doctrine of a Future State"), who gives the proof that such knowledge existed. The reader, of course, must allow that by the Advent of Jesus, His teaching and sacrifice, a clear light was thrown on subjects of this kind, because He, in whom their realization depends, was revealed. But this does not imply that a total ignorance existed before His coming; for when the *Union* says, "It is Christ, not Moses, or David, or Isaiah, who brought life and immortality to light; and if He brought it to light, it was in darkness before," this is one-sided: (1) ignoring the Old Test. statements and expressed faith (far more than alleged "dreams"); and (2) that the light brought by Jesus refers to the undoubted assurance that we have in Him of its fulfilment through His power, etc.

Obs. 11. But let us return to another promise. It is said that "the Seed" shall inherit the land; and we are told by many that this was fulfilled in the history of the Jews under Joshua, the Judges, and the Kings (comp. Obs. 4). What, however, are *the facts as given by the Holy Spirit?* Certainly, in the interpretation of covenant promise, Holy Writ should be allowed to be *its own interpreter*, that we may ascertain the meaning intended by God. Let God, then, and not man, explain: "Now (Gal. 3 : 16) to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, '*And to seeds*' *as of many, but as of one*, '*And to thy seed*,' *which is Christ.*" If language has any definite meaning, then, without doubt we have here the simple declaration that when God promised "*Unto thy seed will I give this land,*" He meant that the land of Canaan should *be inherited by a single Person—pre-eminently the Seed—descended from Abraham, even Jesus the Christ.* How this will be verified in David's Son, inheriting the throne and Kingdom of David will appear as we proceed.

This explanation of Paul's is discarded by multitudes, on the ground that it has not been fulfilled, and infidels, and even some professed believers, make themselves merry over the foolishness and blind faith that can accept of the same. We know full well that it has *not yet* been verified, but we know, too, that it took a long, long time before "the seed" came, and we know, from Scripture, *why* it did not take place at His First Advent, and we also know, from exceedingly precious promises given, that *it will occur* when He comes *the Second* time unto Salvation. God's ways are not our ways; and, therefore, instead of denying His faithfulness in performing, or His explanations of given promises, let us trust—Abraham-like—in *a covenant-keeping God*, who will yet completely fulfil them. In this connection: As the Seed, which is Christ, is to inherit the land, we only now point to the significancy with which this land is mentioned, and the relationship that it sustains to Christ. Thus e.g. proprietorship in the land of Canaan is expressly reserved to God Himself (Lev. 25 : 23): "The land shall not be sold forever; *for the land is mine;* ye are strangers and sojourners with Me"—i.e. mere occupants, not real owners. Hence when Jesus, the Son of God, "came" (John 1 : 11—and is not His Divinity implied, in view of Lev. 25 : 23?) "*to His own*" (land, so Barnes, etc., *loci*, or country, so Bloomfield, etc., or Judea, so Alford, Campbell, etc., or inheritance, so Lange and others), "and His own (people or nation) received Him not." This land is called

"*His Land*" (Joel 2 : 18), "*My land*" (Ezek. 38 : 16), "*Immanuel's land*" (Isa. 8 : 8); and being *a covenanted* inheritance of Abraham's and David's Seed, it is called "*Thine inheritance.*" Christ is designated "*an inheritor* of my mountains," and represented as *desiring* it for a habitation, a rest, to dwell in (Ps. 132 : 13, 14 ; Ps. 68 : 16, etc.). Surely, in the light of these, and numerous other references, we ought to be guarded lest, in our eagerness to vindicate God's purposes, we interpose our own views and opinions *in place* of God's. How often is the heart pained at the exceeding rashness of many, who either reject the language as "grossly carnal," or make it typical of something else, or spiritualize it into another meaning to suit a theory.

We add : In connection with the individual seed, reference is also made to the posterity of the Patriarchs, as in Gen. 17 : 7, 8 ; "in their generations," in the multiplication of the seed, Gen. 15 : 5, etc. But Christ is by way of pre-eminence "the Seed" through whom the remaining Seed obtain the promises, for "*all the promises of God are in Him, yea, and in Him, Amen.*" Why this is so will appear as we proceed. The promise specifically is to the one Seed, and through Him to others (comp. e.g. Fausset's *Com.* on Gal. 3 : 16).

Fairbairn (*Typol. of Scripture*) justly discards the views of Ainsworth and Bush (who make the promise read "to thee *even* to thy seed") as making Abraham and his offspring one, when they are separated (mentioned even as "after thee") into two parties. So also he rejects Gill's opinion (who made Abraham receive the title and his posterity the possession ; Abraham to sojourn in it and his posterity to dwell in it) as making the title no personal boon and his sojourning no inheritance. Again, he refutes Warburton's theory (who makes "Abraham and his posterity, put collectively, to signify the race of Abraham") as swallowing up the specific promises to the Patriarchs, by a generality, in the race, as a violation of the language which distinguishes the Seed from the Patriarchs, as opposed to Stephen's reference to Abraham, etc. He correctly argues for a "*promise personally given to the Patriarchs,*" and for distinguishing the Seed from them. Whatever views may be engrafted by him afterward upon these admissions, or however any one may seek to explain them, these are plain facts that must, in consistency, underlie a scriptural statement, and we feel under obligations to him for presenting them so clearly and forcibly. He (p. 357, vol. 1), referring to Hengstenberg and others, makes the singular "seed" expressive of a distinct line of offspring, and His view is embraced by numerous Millenarian writers, who, making Jesus by way of pre-eminence "the Seed," include in it all believers, being *one* with Him and inheriting *with* Him.

Obs. 12. The reader has seen where the line of argument is leading us, viz. : *to our inheriting the land with Abraham and the Christ, being co-heirs, co-inheritors of the same promises.* Indeed, let a concordance be taken, and let the passages be sought out which promise to the saints an inheriting of the land and the earth, and the student will be surprised at their number, unity and richness of expression, forming *a necessary sequence* to this very covenant relationship (comp. Props. 142, 146–152).

Obs. 13. The stumbling-block in the way of multitudes against receiving such promises is, that Christ came and there was no fulfilment, and *hence* only spiritual blessings are to be anticipated, etc. Our argument will fully meet this objection as we advance ; at present, attention is called to a singular prediction, deserving marked notice on account of the connection in which it stands. In Ps. 69, we have (1) the humiliation and affliction of Christ (for the Messianic character of the Ps. is indisputably settled by the New Test. writers) ; (2) direct reference to His betrayal and crucifixion ; (3) His deliverance and that of the prisoners (an allusion to those held by death or the grave, Prop. 126) ; and then *after this* (for the prophetic spirit does not see failure in Christ's death, but *a means* for accomplishment through the power of the resurrection) the result, not yet attained but covenanted and predicted, for which we should praise God, viz. : "*For God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah, that they may dwell there and have it in possession. The seed also of His*

servants shall inherit it; and they that love His name shall dwell therein" (comp. Ps. 22, Ps. 72, and the Mess. Psls. in general). Well may it be asked, Has *this followed* the Messiah's death? If not, since God *is faithful* to His promises, and the affliction, reproach, gall, vinegar, etc., mentioned was *all literally fulfilled*, we may confidently rest assured *that in God's own time the rest will likewise be accomplished.* What *little faith*, after great professions of the same, men exercise in God's Word! Let not man, with his limited ideas of fitness, judge God's proceedings; we see how he failed at the First Advent, deeming it incredible that God should thus humble Himself and *literally* fulfil His Word, for already multitudes are prejudging, *as unworthy of credence*, that which is to take place *at the Sec. Advent.*

Obs. 14. Our faith in this matter is the faith of the Primitive Church, so that we reverently and cordially say with Justin Martyr (*Dial. Trypho.*, ch. 119), "*along with Abraham we shall inherit the holy land, when we shall receive the inheritance for an endless eternity, being the children of Abraham through the like faith.*" * Indeed, with Irenæus (*Ag. Her.*, ch. 32), we may add: "*It is fitting* that the just, rising at the appearing of God, should in the renewed state *receive the promise of inheritance which God covenanted to the Fathers, and should reign in it;*" then following the argument respecting the covenant promises made to Abraham and arguing, as we have done, that Abraham received them not, he continues: "Thus, therefore, as God promised *to him* the inheritance of the earth, and he received *it not* during the whole time he lived in it, *it is necessary that he should receive it*, together with his seed, that is, with such of them as fear God and believe in Him—*in the resurrection of the just*"—and then showing that Christ and the Church are of the true seed and partakers of the same promises, he concludes: "Thus, therefore, those *who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham;* and the same are the children of Abraham. For God repeatedly promised *the inheritance of the land to Abraham and his seed;* and as neither Abraham nor his seed, that is, those who are justified by faith, have enjoyed any inheritance in it, they *will undoubtedly receive it at the resurrection of the just. For true and unchangeable is God;* wherefore also He said: '*Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.*'" Thus the early Church spoke in *strict accordance with unbounded faith in covenant promise.* The prevailing modern notions, which make the covenants mean something else, were then unknown; for all the churches established East and West, North and South, both Jewish and Gentile, *held to this inheritance* as we now receive it.

Contrast the belief of the modern Church with *the expressed* faith of the early Church, and what *a sad departure* from covenanted promises is witnessed. Direct attention to this difference, and you meet with the most strenuous and bitter opposition. Advocate a return to the "*old paths*," the primitive belief, so plainly pointed out in the grammatical sense, and multitudes are ready to deem you guilty of gross heresy. Present the scriptural reasons for the early faith, and many, many will absolutely refuse even to

---

* And in ch. 139 he says: "There shall be a future possession of the saints in *this same land.* And hence all men everywhere, whether bond or free, who believe in Christ, and recognize *the truth* in His own words and those of his prophets, know that they shall be *with Him in that land*, and inherit incorruptible and everlasting good." He makes a number of such references to the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant, making Jesus the promised Seed, with whom believers are co-heirs in the covenanted inheritance.

consider them. Nothing but the terrible persecution of the future following the translation of the first-fruits, awakening the Church from its *false* exegesis and application and dreams of prosperity, will cause a revulsion and a return to the scriptural ground, because the modern idea is too extensively advocated by eloquent, talented, pious men to be rooted out by other means.

Obs. 15. Having given an illustration of the Primitive faith, it may be interesting to the reader to contrast with it a specimen of the mode of interpretation by which these covenanted promises lost their literal aspect and had another sense engrafted upon them. We select one of the earliest. Origen, who opened the floodgates for fanciful interpretation, in his work *against Celsus* (B. 7, chs. 28, 29, 30), contends that the land promised to the righteous does not refer to Judea or any portion of the earth, *because the earth is cursed*, quoting Gen. 3 : 17, and, therefore, *not fit* for an inheritance. He argues as if *the redemption of the land* did not embrace *the removal* of the curse (Props. 142-148). He forgets the admissions found in other portions of his writings respecting the taking away of the curse; and he admits that Ps. 76 : 2, Ps. 48 : 12, and Ps. 37 : 9, 11, 22, 29, 34, refer to the saints' inheritance, and this admission (in view of the statement and connection of these passages) is all that is *necessary* to overwhelm his entire theory. But the beauty and propriety of his hypothesis prominently appears, when he draws a concurrent and sympathetic argument from his infidel opponent Celsus. For the latter (B. 7, ch. 28), quoting from Plato, describing the land of the blessed, says of it: "That land which is pure lies in the pure region of heaven." Origen, not to be outdone, heartily indorses Celsus. Reader, reflect; *what a contrast this later and heathen derived interpretation*, now, alas, so popular, sustains to the earlier and apostolic.

Origen may be called the father of the typical application, now such a general favorite with Protestant and Romish writers. Some, however, have applied it to this earth, and even to Palestine, but confined it to a possession by the present existing Church. We append an illustration of the latter. Thus (Mosheim's *Eccles. His*, vol. 2, p. 144, note 19, Murdock's Transl.), when the Cathari and Waldenses opposed the Crusades, undertaken to deliver Palestine from the Saracens, a Dominican, Fr. Moneta, employed this argument to refute them: "We read, Gen. 12 : 7, that God said *to Abraham: To thy seed will I give this land.* But *we* (the Christians of Europe) are the seed of Abraham; as says the apostle to the Galat. 3 : 29 : To *us*, therefore, has that land been given for a possession. Hence, it is the duty of the civil power to make efforts to put us in possession of that land; and it is the duty of the Church to exhort civil rulers to fulfil their duty."

Obs. 16. *Fairbairn* (*On Proph.*, p. 197), however he fails himself in logically carrying out the principle in several particulars (viz.: by converting them into types), is certainly correct in opposing Sherlock and Davison, who, both, *divide* the covenanted promises and prophecies based on them into two classes, one referring to temporal matters which do not concern us, and the other to spiritual things in which alone we are interested. Fairbairn justly remarks: "We take this to be a superficial view of the matter. The outward and the temporal did not exist by itself, but for the higher spiritual things connected with it, and as the necessary means for securing their attainment. *To separate* such things which God has bound *so closely together*, and draw a broad line of demarcation between them, is *false in principle*, and sure to lead to erroneous results." Well may it be asked, why separate them finally in "the age to come," where covenant and Theocratic ordering place them? Why not continue

to leave them together as the Spirit has bound them, and not, under a mistaken apprehension of exalting them, typify and spiritualize them away? This is the rock upon which many a well-meaning system of interpretation has beaten itself into *worthlessness.*

Obs. 17. Some writers attempt to get rid of the phrase "*everlasting possession,*" as if it denoted temporary possession. Thus e.g. Augustine (*City of God,* B. 16, s. 26) endeavors to cast a shade of suspicion on the word "everlasting," which may denote "either no end, or to the very end of the world." Suppose we even take the latter meaning (or that it denotes "possession in, or for, the ages"), it does not help the matter, for history shows that it has not been fulfilled either in the Patriarchs or in their descendants. Instead of such a possession, the Patriarchs and Jews had but a brief sojourn in it, the nation has long ago been driven away and the land has been in the possession (as predicted) of strangers for many centuries. It is the lament of the prophet (Isa. 63 : 18) that the nation "*possessed it but a little while.*" It is folly *to circumscribe* the promise to the past; for then it compresses it into the feeblest of proportions, or makes it an Oriental exaggeration. If it be alleged that the promise was conditional, we grant it (comp. Prop. 18), so far as the individuals composing the nation, and even for a time the nation itself, is concerned, but *not so far as the Purpose of God is concerned, which positively, and without any condition annexed,* promises this land to the Patriarchs personally (although death shall intervene), and to a Seed by way of pre-eminence, and then to a seed identified with Abraham by descent or adoption (as explained and enlarged in succeeding revelations), and then to the nation itself (when fully prepared by its course of discipline and the additions made through the resurrecting Messiah)—*all of which is yet to be accomplished as the Bible plainly asserts.* Otherwise, what will we do with Abraham himself and a multitude of his descendants, who were obedient, who performed the conditions annexed to individuality, and *never* thus possessed it? What shall we do with the prophetic announcements, that they shall *yet* obtain it? *Has God failed in His foreknowledge, wisdom, and power?* To evade this, by making the land typical of heaven, is *sheer faithlessness,* seeing that *the very land* "*laid waste*" *and* "*made desolate*" (which the third heaven never was), is the land spoken of—*the same land* whereon Jacob reclined and which Abraham was requested to survey.

Compare Kurtz's remarks on "the everlasting Covenant" in the *His. of the Old Cov.,* p. 128. In reference to the unconditionality of the covenant promise—its positive future fulfilment—the epitome of Moses in Deut. 32 is amply sufficient evidence in its favor, even so far as the nation is concerned.

Obs. 18. This lack of faith in the exact fulfilment of God's covenanted promises may well be left to infidels. Voltaire and others (recently reiterated) raise an objection to the inspiration of God's Word, because the promise of inheriting the land, given to Abraham *personally,* was not realized. They fail, just like many believers, to see that the fact of his not inheriting is plainly stated *in* the Scriptures, and that we are directed *to the future,* to the resurrection period, for its fulfilment. This feature is *unjustly* left out of the question, and the discussion carried on without reference to *the time designated, the ability and faithfulness of God to perform His promises.* It is ever thus with the Divine purposes; they

must be received *by faith*, otherwise God's designs will be enshrouded in darkness, and the crafty will be taken in a net. It is true to-day, that (Ps. 25 : 14) "*the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant*"—now to faith—then in happy realization.

Recent writers, like Clarke, etc., treat the faith and hopes of Abraham most unjustly, being utterly unable to look at the Bible *as a whole*, and observe the connection that one part sustains to the whole. Abraham's history is regarded isolated and torn from its relations, and upon this detachment, assumptions are readily founded to mislead others. One of the most unfair chapters of the Duke of Somerset's work (*Ch. Theol. and Mod. Skeptic.*, ch. 20) is the one entitled "Stephen," in which Stephen's speech is characterized (a rehash from Paulus, Baur, etc.) as "rambling over the migration of Abraham," as "lamentably feeble," as an ignoring of the proof relied on to vindicate Christianity ; and yet this was an "able disputant," who had not received the aid promised to be given before tribunals, etc. The speech of Stephen certainly "is full of incomprehensible anomalies" to a person possessing the Duke's love of ridiculing sacred things. Stephen's speech was *pre-eminently logical*, and the very thing demanded (showing that he was aided) under the circumstances. His hearers believed in the covenants, as *the foundation* of their religious and national hopes, and *hence* Stephen begins with the covenant, traces it, and endeavors to show its connection with Jesus as the Messiah. We have only the opening, for when he came to Jesus he was interrupted, and the address remained *unfinished*. The Jews, posted as they were in the Old Test., powerfully felt its force ; if the Duke does not, it is simply because he fails to notice the self-evident connection running through the whole, and that Stephen's aim was to show that this covenant in which the Jews trusted could *only be fulfilled* through this Jesus, whom they had crucified. The Duke might well have spared his sneers and attempted sarcasm, at the expense of *a martyr!*

Obs. 19. Unbelievers have expended their wit over the explanation of Paul (Gal. 3 : 16) respecting the use of the word "seed" in the singular number, pronouncing it a mere "quibble," or "Rabbinical interpretation." Those, too, who believe in the Word, but fail to recognize the distinctiveness of the promises, join, more or less, in the same. Jerome (Chandler, quoted by Barnes, *loci*) affirmed "that the apostle made use of a false argument, which, although it might appear well enough to the stupid Galatians, would not be approved by wise and learned men." Le Clerc supposes it to be a trick of argumentation. Borger (Bloomfield, *loci*) pronounces it an accommodation to Jewish Rabbis. Doddridge even calls it "bad Greek." Rosenmüller and others, against Paul's express language, think that the body of the believers, and not the Messiah, is meant. Paul needs *no apology* from men, for the soundness of his interpretation is apparent from the general tenor of the Word, which indicates that the Divine Purpose contemplates *one distinguished Personage*, in the specified Abrahamic line, through whom the promises should be realized, and that the apostle properly directs attention to the fact that *the very language* of the covenant, using the singular number (let it be customary or not), is *in accordance with, and significant of, God's predetermined design*. Hence, ridicule falls harmless, and apologetic explanations are of no force, coming from persons who would undertake to decide *how* God ought even to word His covenant language. We are ready to receive the language as given, finding it precise, significant of an important fact, and in full accord with the analogy of Scripture.

Luther (whom many follow), *Com. on Gal.* 3 : 16, remarks : "Now, the promises are made unto Him, not in all the Jews, or in many seeds, but in one seed, which is Christ. The Jews will not receive this interpretation of Paul ; for they say that the singular number is here put for the plural, one for many. But *we* gladly receive this meaning and interpretation of Paul, who oftentimes repeateth this word 'seed,' and expoundeth

this seed to be Christ; and this he doth with an apostolic spirit. Let the Jews deny it as much as they will; we, notwithstanding, have arguments strong enough, which Paul hath before rehearsed, which also confirm this thing, and they cannot deny them." (The student will observe that Luther's reference to the Jews denotes those who endeavor to break the reasoning which would apply it to Jesus, as the Messiah; various commentators and writers oppose Paul's statement because, as they allege, "the interpretation is found in Rabbinical writers, and the mode of interpretation here adopted is quite Jewish.") Fausset (*Com. loci*) makes this seed to be "the Christ," "and that which is inseparable from Him, the literal Israel, and the spiritual, His body, the Church," because the covenant promises can only be fulfilled to both through Him. This is correct, as a little reflection and comparison will show, for e.g. it is only through the power of the resurrection obtained through this Seed that His co-heirs obtain the inheritance with Him; and it is only at His Sec. Advent, and through His powerful interference in behalf of the Jewish nation, that it enters upon its glorious national existence. Hence, in view of *the Divine Purpose through this Seed*, there is eminent fitness and deep significancy in thus singling Him out and expressing it in the form given by Paul.

Obs. 20. The reader is reminded to keep in view how such promises, thus given and thus explained by the apostles, would strike the Jewish mind. The aim of the apostles was to show that "the Seed" was Jesus the Christ, and that *through this Jesus* the covenant promises given to Abraham *would, in due time, be realized.* There was no difference of opinion *concerning the covenants,* as to their actual meaning, but only in reference to Jesus being the Messiah, to the postponement of fulfilment to the Sec. Advent, etc. Hence, so long as the early Church received the covenants as the Jews themselves believed and taught (Obs. 3), they could the more easily find access to Jewish minds and hearts, but just so soon as the Church departed from this view of the covenants (making the land heaven, etc.), *then* the Jew was the more difficult to reach, seeing that the Old Test. language and promise, upon which he relied as plain and indisputable, was changed and transformed into something else. This substitution made it more troublesome to prove the Messiahship of Jesus, for he naturally and inevitably became more distrustful of a Messiah who was not to fulfil the covenant promises *as they were written.* The Origenistic interpretation, forced upon the covenants, made the Jew and his fathers virtually believers in "carnality and error," "gross misconceptions," which charges are *applaudingly repeated* by eminent men down to the present day. And then, these lament the unbelief and incredulity of the Jew, without seeing that, saving in the acknowledgment of Jesus as Messiah, *they are more in darkness* than the Jew whom they pity or despise.

Obs. 21. It must not be overlooked that inexpressibly precious spiritual blessings are inseparably connected with those pertaining to this inheritance of the land, the earth. This will fully appear when we come to these same promises enlarged and explained by additional revelation. Already they are contained in the expressions indicative of God in a special manner (Theocratic) becoming *their God,* becoming an "exceeding great reward," and becoming a source of enjoyment, honor, and glory. (Comp. e.g. Props. 197, 154–157, etc.)

Obs. 22. The remaining promises of the Abrahamic covenant, and the deep meaning conveyed in the few but precise words, will come up, more appropriately, under following Propositions. Briefly, let it be said, that

the witticisms offered at our faith are premature, for the time allotted for fulfilment *has, as Scripture itself testifies, not yet arrived.* When so much that is preliminary and provisionary has, as predicted, taken place and is now transpiring, it would *be foolishness* in us to yield up our faith. Let men review these promises and ridicule them; we *patiently wait for their fulfilment.* Thus e.g. when it is said that Abraham's name shall be great, men of intelligence and learning may exercise their wit in comparing him with an Arab sheik and extol in contrast the name of a Cæsar and Plato; we, acknowledging the greatness of Abraham's name already to the faithful, wait for the time when he shall arise from the tomb and inherit the promise—*then, indeed, will it be great* in honor, dignity, and power. When men ridicule the promise that a great nation shall proceed from him by contrasting the feebleness of the Jewish nation in the past with the powerful Gentile nations that have existed, we, with faith and hope, point *to the time,* still declared to be in the future, when this nation *shall truly be great* (comp. Props. 111–114). When the promise is that kings should proceed from him, unbelief laughs at the Kings of Judah and Israel compared with the conquerors of the earth; we wait patiently and hopefully for *the Kings, the manifestation yet to come* (comp. e.g. Prop. 154). Thus, with other promises that men deride,[1] just as if the past was intended for their fulfilment; just as if the Word itself declared not that their realization was still in the future; just as if the Scriptures did not firmly unite their accomplishment with the Sec. Advent of the covenanted Seed; just as if God were not now performing a preparatory work to insure its ultimate, triumphant fulfilment.

[1] Thus e.g., "And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" is declared a mere boast. For if referred to the Jewish nation, instead of being able to drive out their enemies from Canaan, they themselves were ultimately overcome and finally banished; if applied to Christ as the seed intended, it is said that the mighty existing confederations, counting their adherents by the million, and still forming a vast numerical majority, disprove the assertion. But we wait for its ultimate realization, both for the nation and the Christ, at the Sec. Advent, where inspired Scripture locates it. So "the multitude of seed," "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," and others are compared with the history of the past and the present, and conclusions drawn indicative of "Oriental exaggeration," "strong figure," etc. But, leaving the testimony of the Word to specify the time and order of fulfilment, we wait in unfaltering expectation for its complete accomplishment, which we show under various Propositions. Why do men tear these precious promises from their connection with a determined, and fully revealed, Divine Plan of procedure, and, considering them thus isolated and fragmentary, refuse the statements of Scripture concerning the manner and time of performance? Why not permit the very Book that contains them to present its own explanation of them?

Obs. 23. If the question be asked whether Abraham had a knowledge of the manner through which he would inherit the land, the answer is decisively—leaving the entire Record to testify—*in the affirmative.* A believer must feel convinced from what Jesus declared, John. 8 : 56 (comp. Heb. 11 : 8–16), that Abraham had far greater knowledge of the future than the Bible records. Without receiving the view (so Tholuck, etc.) that Abraham saw Jesus in His heavenly existence; without indorsing the notion (Olshausen, etc.) that Jesus was specially manifested to Abraham by a vision unrecorded; without confining ourselves to the idea (Barnes, etc.) of simple faith anticipating and thus beholding the day of Christ, we might perhaps adopt the view (of Bloomfield, etc.) of part faith and part

added revelation giving him this knowledge. For certainly it is most reasonable to think and believe that Abraham, the faithful, would not be less favored by special inspiration to behold the future day of Christ than Balaam (Numb. 24 : 17), especially when Paul teaches us in Hebrews that Abraham had views of the future which are not stated in his history. Being the one to whom the covenant is first given, there is propriety in imparting such added instruction, that he may foresee its final result and be thus confirmed in its meaning.

That Abraham believed that God, who gave life, could after death restore life, is evident in the case of Isaac (Heb. 11 : 19) ; that the Patriarchs held the promises respecting the land to relate to the future after death is seen in their regarding themselves merely as "sojourners and strangers," and not as inheritors and possessors ; that even their posterity entertained similar views is abundantly evident from the manner in which they regarded the promises, and themselves as still "sojourners and strangers" (e.g. 1 Chron. 29 : 15 ; Ps. 39 : 12 etc.), i.e., expectants and heirs of something permanent and enduring in the future. Moses clearly foresaw the future, as we show in a number of places, and men, having a third heaven inheritance in mind, greatly prejudge many expressions which, in their estimation, have *too earthly* a cast, forgetting that this very feature (so objectionable and regarded as temporary in nature) is *an essential* element in the scheme of Redemption, which includes the sin-cursed earth. It is true, that while these promises relating to the future are sufficiently precise and clear to reason and to faith in God, yet they are purposely kept somewhat in the background, owing to the Theocratic ordering (for being already in the land and having God for their earthly Ruler, they could well trust to Him the manner of fulfilment, which the mode of revelation was calculated to develop), until the Theocracy was overthrown. Then the utterances, already given by Moses, David, etc., became more and more distinct under Daniel and the Prophets.

Obs. 24. Men under the influence of the Origenistic interpretation, or of the Platonic or heathen notion of the future, and thus rejecting the plainly covenanted promises of an earthly inheritance, unnecessarily make an enigma where none exists, and find fault with Moses when the fault really is in themselves. Thus e.g. Clarke (*Ten Religions*, p. 417) says : "Concerning the future life, upon which the Egyptians had so much to say, Moses taught nothing. His rewards and punishments were inflicted in this world. Retribution, individual and national, took place here. As this could not have been from ignorance or accident, it must have had a purpose, it must have been intentional." Certainly it was "*intentional*," because in the direct line of the truth and of God's purpose in Salvation. Of course, with a third heaven, an outside world, theory prejudging Moses, it is impossible to find a reference to the future life, for the simple reason that Moses *connects the future life with an inheriting of the land and earth*, thus making his writings *to correspond fully and accurately* with the entire tenor of Scripture on the subject (as seen e.g. Props. 142, 131, 137, 141, 148–152, etc.). The fact is, that a dispassionate comparison of Moses with *the general analogy* of Scripture, and noticing that Moses *carefully rejects* the Egyptian theories and confines himself to *a specific Plan*, afterward carefully and consistently developed, is strong corroborative evidence of an inspiration, which, over against existing and prevailing notions entertained, could lay down a foundation in relation to this earth that (if accomplished) is *adapted to secure the blessedness of man and creation in deliverance from an imposed curse.*

Hence we see why Warburton failed in his "Legation of Moses." He undertook a labor which it was utterly impossible for him to accomplish, and he sank under it, because he misconceived the plain covenant promises. No man, unless he apprehends the

inheritance that Moses says God promised to the Patriarchs and the relation that believers sustain to it through coming resurrection power, can do justice to Moses or properly vindicate his unity with the after statements of prophets and apostles. Accept of the inheriting of the earth as believing Jew and Primitive Christian held, and then Moses stands forth a distinctive teacher in the same contemplated and carried on Divine Purpose of Redemption. We only add: The fulfilment of the covenants as given, at once sets aside a vast mass of mystical, spiritualistic, antagonistic theories of the inheritance, etc., as presented in thousands of works, and the result of fancy, vain imaginings, and adherence to wrong principles of interpretation. For, let it be noticed, the Theocracy pertains to this earth—it is God's Kingdom here on the earth, He ruling in it as the earthly Ruler—and hence the objection that Warburton and others urge (viz.: that Moses—and during the Theocratic period down to the captivity—presented only motives, rewards, etc., relating to a life on earth), has no force, because, in the very nature of the case, if the Kingdom inaugurated is indeed a Theocracy, it must *necessarily* present this very feature; for with the Theocracy the interests the rewards, of every believer are identified, and it pertains to the earth. The rewards and punishments relate to its government as established even in its initiatory or earnest form; and the future enjoyment of or banishment from the same, in its higher restored form under the Messiah, is sustained (1) by present obedience or disobedience; (2) by promising and threatening things which God alone can perform; (3) by basing the future on covenants that necessitate a resurrection for their fulfilment; (4) by asserting that if obedient the Kingdom will be perpetuated, but if disobedient it shall, as a punishment, be withdrawn, and when ultimately restored it shall be for the righteous; (5) by making the hopes of the individual and of the nation to centre in the Theocracy, which in its ultimate outcome embraces the future; (6) by exhibiting trust in their Ruler, in His attributes and ability to verify promise which embraced "an everlasting possession" personally here on earth. As we proceed in our argument, step by step, it will be clearly seen that the very idea of a real, actual Theocracy, with which the interests of the individual and the nation are identified, now and hereafter, requires just such language and limitations as Moses and others give; for the reign, rewards, etc., eternal in their nature (which are now under spiritualistic manipulations, applied to the third heaven), pertain to this very Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom re-established by "the Seed" here on the earth. When our opponents, however, assert in connection that a future life was unknown, they—as we have shown—go beyond the Divine Record. (Comp. Wines' *Com. on Heb. Laws.*) As we proceed in the argument, these will be brought out under various Propositions.

II. THE SINAITIC COVENANT, MADE WITH ISRAEL AT MOUNT SINAI.

Obs. 1. The Sinaitic Covenant is *an outgrowth* of the Abrahamic covenant, and embraces an offer to the Jews nationally of a complete verification of the blessings tendered under the original promises. This procedure of erecting a Theocracy indicates that it was contemplated in the covenant with Abraham, as preparatory to the future realization of the promises. Its provisionary and initiatory character has already (Prop. 25) been noticed, while its conditional nature (Prop. 26) is evident from the blessings and curses pronounced by Moses in Lev. and Deut., and also by the language of Paul in Hebrews, who, among other things illustrative of this, refers to God as saying: "Because they continued not in my covenant and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." This covenant, as the result shows, was designed both to test the nation and to separate a seed to whom, at some future time, the Kingdom could be safely intrusted. It was the inauguration of means by which *a suitable preparation* could be made *for the ultimate fulfilment* of the Abrahamic covenant. While it was the bond under which the Kingdom of God, as an earnest, was bestowed, it embraced many things which were only temporary and provisionary, looking forward to a period when the contained and contemplated blessings in the former covenant could be realized in the spirit and manner indicated.

So that, in the very nature of the case, the Mosaic covenant being also a legitimate, but yet inferior, resultant of the previous covenant, it must itself, when the *original* covenant is to be fully fulfilled, *give place to its superior*. How it does this will appear, e.g. in our next Proposition.

To indicate how able writers enforce the outgrowth of this covenant from the Abrahamic, we select as illustrations the following. Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 2, p. 146) correctly asserts: "Its (i.e. Sinaitic) object was not to disannul the covenant of promise, or to found a new title to gifts and blessings conferred. It was given rather as a handmaid to the covenant, to minister in an inferior but still necessary place, to the higher ends and purposes which the covenant itself has in view." So Sack (quoted by him, p. 145) says: "The matter of the law is altogether grounded upon the covenant of promise made with Abraham. . . . The law neither could nor would withdraw the exercise of faith from the covenant of promise, or render that superfluous, but merely formed an intermediate provision, until the fulfilment came."

Obs. 2. It is a gratification to find that Theologians, urged to it by Rationalistic attacks, are falling back on the old ground that the Mosaic covenant is a result of *the previous* Abrahamic one, thus preserving *the unity* of the Divine Purpose. The view, adopted by some, that it is a separate and distinct covenant, simply provisionary without *a direct and vital union* existing between it and others, is justly held by many able writers to be erroneous and misleading—a violation of Scripture statements. A recent author, Kurtz (*His. Old. Cov.*, vol. 3, p. 109), has some pertinent remarks on this point, saying that "the covenant at Sinai was precisely the same as that which had formerly been concluded at Mamre," that "the one was merely the renewal of the other," etc. Admiring the spirit which so accurately keeps in view *the connection* existing between the two covenants, we would more correctly say, that they are not the same (the proof is, that the promises contained in the Abrahamic covenant were *not* realized under the Mosaic covenant, thus e.g. Abraham did not inherit the land, etc.), but the Mosaic is *a legitimate outgrowth* from the former and designed to be *preparatory* to a realization of the Abrahamic. An important caution is necessary to be observed by the careful student; that is, constantly to keep in mind that God's Purpose to establish a Theocratic Kingdom *will not fail* because of its being conditionally set up at Mt. Sinai; that if the Jews rebel against their King and He gives them up to punishment, yet His promise to Abraham—which we see here already takes the form of an outward, external, *real Theocratic Kingdom*—will *ultimately* be carried into successful accomplishment. How this will be done, is the subject matter of several of the following Propositions.

Henderson, art. "*Dispensation*" in Ency. Relig. Knowl., is quoted as saying that the students of prophecy, who hold to a future Messianic Kingdom, make "the Mosaic covenant" "the root of many of the mistaken views of the future state of the Kingdom of Christ," and argues that its provisionary sacrifices, etc., show that it was to be superseded by the Christian Church, or the present dispensation, which is "spiritual, universal, perpetual." As our argument fully meets, in detail, his reasoning, we only now say: (1) That the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants are "*the roots*;" (2) that we hold, that much was *provisionary* under the Mosaic economy; (3) that the form of government itself, Theocratic, was only an earnest of that which should arise under David's Son and related rulers; (4) that the Church does not in any particular meet covenant promises, and is itself preparative, etc. The student can already see that Waldegrave and others are mistaken, that our doctrine originates in and is founded on (some say, "one passage") the Apocalypse, or that (as Prof. Sanborn) "the key-stone of the whole system" is in the Pre-Mill. Advent. It requires but a *little* knowledge of our views to see how deeply and solidly they are founded on the covenants and prophecies.

III. THE DAVIDIC COVENANT.

Obs. 1. Having already shown and proven (Props. 28, 31, 32) how the Theocratic element was incorporated with *the Davidic line*, which God (as the chief Ruler and so acknowledged) chose, attention is now called to the distinguishing covenant with David by which this union is made *forever inseparable;* and by which this union is to be *specially manifested* in the sight of, and for the blessings of, the world *through a descendant* of David's. The covenant is found in 2 Sam. 7 : 10–16 (1 Chron. 17 : 11-14), "*The Lord telleth thee that He will make thee a house. And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish His Kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of His Kingdom forever. I will be His Father and He shall be my Son. If he commit iniquity I will chasten Him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men.*[1] *But my mercy shall not depart away from Him, as I took it from Saul whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy Kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever.*"[2]

[1] Dr. Clarke (*Com. loci*), who cannot be accused of special sympathy with our views, renders this sentence : "In suffering for iniquity I will chasten Him (the Messiah) with the rod of men, and with the stripes due to the children of men." A multitude of our opponents make it to refer, in some way, to the Messiah, and sometimes give fanciful interpretations to this effect. Thus e.g. Augustine (see below, next Obs.) explains "the iniquity of Him" and the sin of the children Ps. 89 : 30-33, as referring to Christ's body, the Church, and quotes as proof Acts 9 : 4, that when Saul persecuted His believing people, Christ said, "Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" (It may be said that Ps. 89 : 30, 31 is not exactly parallel, because it refers not to the special seed but to the descendants of David in general (owing to the fact that the Kingdom is offered continuously (Prop. 26) to his descendants), and this is evidenced by the "nevertheless," etc., where God returns to the idea of the special seed, previously mentioned, through whom His promise would be verified). Those who refer it to Christ directly (as Tertullian, Lactantius, Beza, Calov, Pfeiffer, Buddeus, Patrick, etc.) or indirectly (as Hengstenberg and others), or in part to Him and in part to Solomon (as Breuz, Sack, etc.), or literally to Solomon and mystically to Christ (as Glass, etc.)—all find that in Jesus we must find the pre-eminent fulfilment.

[2] When we come to this Davidic covenant, this perpetuation of the Theocratic relationship with the house of David, how much we regret the lost books of Samuel, Gad, and Nathan on the life of David.

Obs. 2. Learned and able men, forsaking the Primitive view and overlooking *the perpetuity* of this covenant, gravely tell us that Solomon and other descendants were here denoted; but we vastly prefer to let God explain His own language and the meaning intended. Thus, e.g. Acts 2 : 30, "*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;*" and Paul, directly quoting this covenant (Heb. 1 : 5), applies it to Christ Jesus, asking, "*Unto which of the angels said He at any time.*" . . . "*I will be to Him a Father and He shall be to me a Son.*" The announcing angel (Luke 1 : 30-33) gives the same testimony that the covenant truly refers to Christ.

The concessions of our opponents are all that can be desired. We select, out of the mass, those of an ancient and a modern writer. Augustine ("City of God," B. 17, s. 8), unable to rid himself of the Primitive interpretation, applies the covenant of 2 Sam. 7 : 8-16 to Jesus, the Christ. It is interesting to notice that the man to whom the mod-

erns are so largely indebted for spiritualizing views, argues that this covenant is fulfilled in Christ, saying: "He who thinks that this grand promise was fulfilled in Solomon greatly errs," and adduces as proof that Solomon's house was not "faithful," being "full of strange women worshipping false gods, and the King himself, aforetime wise, seduced by them and cast down into the same idolatry; and let him (the reader) not dare to think that God either promised this falsely, or was unable to foreknow that Solomon and his house would become what they did." He then adds, that the Jews do not understand this to be fulfilled in Solomon, but look for another; that Solomon began to reign while David still lived, before he slept with his fathers, and hence is not the one designated in the promise: "When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers," etc. Augustine is undoubtedly correct in making Jesus the covenanted Son promised, but incorrect when he attempts to make out a present fulfilment of the promise. Again, Barnes (*Com.* Acts 2 : 30) makes 2 Sam. 7 : 11-16 the basis of such promise, and however inclined to drag in Solomon, is forced to say: "It is clear that the New Test. writers understood them as referring to the Messiah." He then says that the Jews thus believed, and that such was the belief of David, giving Ps. 2, 22, 69, 17 as proof, and that such a reference *must be received as scriptural.* So in his Notes on Heb. 1 : 5, he makes the reference taken from the covenant Messianic, that they were so applied in the time of Paul, and that Paul employs them according to prevailing usage. Indeed, if we admit that the apostles are inspired, no other *possible* interpretation can be given.

Obs. 3. How did David himself understand this covenant? This is best stated in his own language. Read e.g. Ps. 72, which describes a Son *infinitely superior* to Solomon; reflect over Ps. 132, and after noticing that "*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*" (which Peter, Acts 2 : 30, 31, *expressly refers* to Jesus); consider the numerous Messianic allusions in this and other Psalms (89th, 110th, 72d, 48th, 45th, 21st, 2d, etc.), so regarded and *explicitly quoted* in the New Test. by inspired men; ponder the fact that David calls Him "*my Lord,*" "*higher than the kings of the earth,*" and gives Him a position, power, dominion, immortality, and perpetuity, that *no mortal* King can possibly attain to, and most certainly we are not wrong in believing that David himself, according to the tenor of the covenant "*thy Kingdom shall be established forever before thee,*" expected to be in this Kingdom of his Son and Lord both to witness and experience its blessedness (so Storrs, *Diss. on Kingdom*, and many others).

There is something wonderful in all this: while seeing and acknowledging that his throne and Kingdom are fully and distinctively incorporated as part of the Kingdom of God, that it shall belong to a Son of his own both by divine right and inheritance, he also perceives and describes that his throne and Kingdom thus occupied, is only, *in virtue of its Theocratic relationship*, the groundwork of a universality of dominion, it undergoing some peculiar changes to make it harmonize with the evident rulership of immortals. He notices also the connection that this promised Seed of his has with the older promises. For, we have first simply the seed of the woman; next that He shall be Abraham's seed; next that He shall inherit the land and bless all nations; next, that He shall be a mighty King; and next that He shall be David's Son and Lord, sitting on David's throne and from thence exerting a world-wide dominion. Many a reference is made to this *connecting series*, and it would be highly interesting to trace them, but we have only space for one, which immediately follows the giving of the covenant. David (2 Sam. 7 : 19, comp. 1 Chron. 17 : 17) goes to God and expresses his amazement, gratitude, and praise; and, among other things, declares: "And is this the manner (marg. read., law) of the Man, O God," which Dr. Kennicott renders: "And this is (or must be) the law of the Man or of the Adam." Bh. Horsley translates it: "And this is the arrangement about the Man, O Lord Jehovah," thus making an exact parallel with 1 Chron. 17 : 17, which he renders: "And thou hast regarded me in the arrangement about the Man, that is to be from above, O Lord Jehovah." (Comp. Jones's *Notes on Scripture*, p. 95, Lange's *Com.* 2 Sam. *loci*, Poole's Synopsis, etc.). In comparing the different renderings, keeping in view what preceded and followed in the Divine Purpose

(and noticing Paul in 1 Cor. 15 : 45-47), there can be no reasonable doubt but that David regarded this *Man*, this promised Son, as the covenanted Seed of the woman, the Seed of Abraham, the Man above all others, in whom, as the Second Adam, the Redemptive process would exhibit a complete restitution. This is confirmed by his Psalms, and the use made of them by the apostles. David anticipated, by inspiration, His own Salvation, and the perpetuity of His throne and Kingdom, in the Divine arrangement concerning *the Man*.

The reader's attention is called to a feature, which gives us one of these indirect but most forcible (because undesigned) proofs of divine inspiration. Here is David receiving a covenant from the Almighty which explicitly affirms the perpetuity, etc., of his throne and Kingdom, and yet David himself now proceeds to predict *the long continued overthrow and desolation* (e.g. Ps. 89) of his throne and kingdom, and that *this very covenant*, confirmed by oath, should for *a long, indefinite time* be held in abeyance. Now it is not in the nature of man *to do this himself*, for professing this covenant relationship, the most unlikely thing would be the prediction of such an overthrow. In fact it is unnatural, because the natural man would inevitably eulogize the future prosperity of his throne and Kingdom under the auspices of the Almighty. *How then* do we account for this mental phenomenon, and that David described *the exact* condition of his throne and kingdom as it has existed during many centuries? The only reasonable way to explain it is to receive the Biblical account, viz. : that David was inspired by God's Spirit to foresee and describe the future—accurately—against what the natural man, influenced by desire and such expressed covenanted relationship, would have done.

Obs. 4. The Prophets following, had a similar understanding of this divine-human disposition or ordering, by which David's Son would *personally, through David's Kingdom*, bestow the blessings of perfected Redemption. Thus e.g. Isa. 9 : 7, Jer. 23 : 5, 6, and 30 : 9, and 33 : 15–26, etc. (comp. Props. 21, 31, 33, 68, 122, etc.).

Obs. 5. Before censuring the Jews, as many do, for believing that Jesus would *literally restore* the Davidic throne and Kingdom, we must consider, in fairness, that they *were justified* in so doing by *the very language* (Props. 4, 21, and 48) *of the covenant*. It is incredible that God should in the most important matters, affecting the interests and the happiness of man and nearly touching His own veracity, clothe them in words, which, *if not true* in their obvious and common sense, *would deceive* the pious and God-fearing of many ages. We cannot, dare not (however upheld by many eminent names) entertain an opinion *so dishonoring both to God and His ancient believing children*. The Jews are abundantly defended in their faith by the covenant itself; the correctness and justness of their fondly entertained hopes appear from the particulars incorporated with it.

(1) The words and sentences in their plain grammatical acceptation, do *expressly* teach their belief. This is denied by no one, not even by those who then proceed to spiritualize the language. Therefore already the Jews are excusable in believing what God so definitely declares (comp. Prop. 48).

(2) The covenant is distinctively associated with *the Jewish nation* and none other. Passing by the numerous proof texts which will be presented hereafter, let us confine ourselves to the understanding of this relationship by David at the giving of the covenant. In 2 Sam. 7 : 23, 24 (1 Chron. 17 : 21, 22) he expresses before God his consciousness of the magnitude of the blessing; that this covenant, in virtue of *his* throne and Kingdom being thus distinguished, embraces "*one nation*" (comp. Props. 24, 59, 60, etc.), and this *the same* nation that was brought out of Egypt (i.e. Abraham's descendants), who should be established in "thy (God's) land."

And then ascending to the promise previously given that *this* nation is specially chosen, i.e. the elect nation, and that this very covenant made with himself is a marvellous confirmation of this truth, he adds: "*Thou hast confirmed to Thyself thy people Israel*" (the same nation brought out of Egypt, as the connection shows) "*to be a people unto Thee forever; and Thou, Lord, art become their God.*" With such testimony before them, *how could* the faithful Jews hesitate in believing as they did respecting their nation, its elect position, its supremacy owing to *this Theocratic exaltation in and through the Messiah.*

(3) It is called *a perpetual covenant,* i.e. one that shall endure forever. It may, indeed, require time before its fulfilment; it may even for a time be held, so far as the nation is concerned, in the background, but *it must be ultimately realized.* David himself, in his last words (2 Sam. 23 : 5), emphatically says: "*He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure; for this is all my salvation and all my desire.*"[1] The prophet Isaiah reiterates (55 : 3), pronouncing it "*an everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David.*" Surely no one can fail to see that this denotes, as Barnes (Com. *loci*), "*an unchanging and unwavering covenant,—a covenant which was not to be revoked,*"—"*one which was not to be abrogated, but which was to be perpetual,*"—and that "*God would ratify this covenant.*" Assuredly so;—*why then accuse the Jews of folly in trusting in it?*[2]

(4) It was *confirmed by oath* (Ps. 132 : 11, and 89 : 3, 4, 33), thus giving the strongest possible assurance of its ample fulfilment. Could the Jews do less *than trust* in language thus confirmed? (comp. Props. 47 and 48).

(5) To leave no doubt whatever, and to render unbelief utterly inexcusable, God concisely and most forcibly presents His determination (Psl. 89 : 34): "*My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.*" It would have been sheer presumption and blindness in the Jews to have *altered* (under the plea—modern—of spirituality) the covenant, and to have refused to accept of *the obvious sense* conveyed by the words; and there is *a heavy responsibility* resting upon those, who, even under the most pious intentions, *deliberately alter* the covenant words and attach to them *a foreign* meaning.[3]

[1] In the context he clearly intimates that his house will not continuously advance in prosperity that of itself it will fall, but that it will rise again under the Messiah to the highest attainable prosperity. Now after so much of fulfilment we can appreciate the sudden transitions from predicted triumph and glory to sad reverses and downfall of throne and kingdom, followed by expressed hopes of a glorious restitution. The reason for such abruptness and a certain degree of obscurity in the allusions to the overthrow, etc.. of the Kingdom, will be found in the predetermined offer of this Kingdom to the Jewish nation at the First Advent (Props. 54-66). While foreseeing and foretelling (in order to vindicate His knowledge) this downfall, yet God, in consistency with the moral freedom of the people, offers to perpetuate this throne and kingdom, that not a son shall fail to David to sit on his throne if obedient, etc. He could not do less, and therefore, in testing the nation—which Moses even foretold would fail to endure the test and would meet with a long, prolonged punishment—these things are carefully, prudently revealed so as not to interfere with God's tender of the Kingdom.

[2] Barnes and a host besides do, however, change this identical covenant; seeing its perpetuity so clearly asserted, they receive it as perpetual, but *only after changing its meaning.* The plain grammatical sense—the one the Jews and Primitive Church received—is rejected as "carnal," and another substituted by which David's throne and kingdom is transmuted into God's throne in the third heaven and God's Kingdom in heaven or in the church. Alas! when pious and excellent men can thus *tamper* with the foundations of our hope. (Comp. Prop. 122.)

[3] Such altering is only building with "wood, hay, and stubble." The motives may,

like Paul's in Stephen's case, result from a zeal for the truth's sake, but, in the light of *the unchangeable covenant*, it is evidently misdirected zeal. Learning, philosophy, piety, cannot, ought not *to assume the liberty of altering* what God has so solemnly spoken; but, alas, it is so prevailingly done that the Church, with here and there some exceptions, has lost sight of this covenant. Theologies that profess to give a systematic statement of the truth either ignore it, or very briefly mention it as something in which we are not interested. Those who cling to this oath-bound, perpetual covenant are regarded as very "carnal" and "Jewish," etc. The simple reason for all this is, that because there has been no fulfilment of this covenant promise it is taken for granted that either there will be none, or else the language must be spiritualized to suit existing circumstances. From what has taken place in the past, we rest assured that God means *just what* the words in their plain grammatical sense convey, and that as such they will, in God's own time, be realized. God has hitherto rejected substitutions of His Word. Abraham tried it, when, after waiting for some years he contemplated adopting a son, thinking that God probably meant an adopted son, and then after another waiting he went in to Hagar supposing that the seed would be his and not Sarah's, but God fulfilled His Word *just as written*. Others attempted this with the same result; no substitution, however learnedly or eloquently presented, is to be received over against *the express words* of God. We, indeed, may not be able to tell *how* they can be fulfilled, but if unable, the matter may safely be trusted to God without putting forward our weak, accommodating interpretations. We, therefore, must earnestly protest against the manifest injustice that is done to this covenant. Books specially devoted to the subject of the Covenants have much to say respecting an eternal covenant entered into between Father and Son, at some period in eternity, of which nothing is said, but all is inferred, and a covenant plainly given, confirmed by oath, declared to be perpetual, is coolly set aside. Theologies, Bib. Dictionaries, etc., totally ignore it. Indeed, it has become fashionable to ridicule the Jewish and Primitive belief based on this covenant, as e.g. Gregory (Four Gospels), who declares, with intended sarcasm, that their "Messiah was to be the Jewish *Cæsar* of the world," because they "had cast away that grander idea of a spiritual, universal, and everlasting Kingdom (i.e. the Church) which fills the books of the prophets." It is no matter of surprise to find such writers to have no manner of use for the Davidic covenants, either in "the preparation for the Messiah" or in "the mission of the Jews," or in the present and future. Instead of being fundamental, it only, in their estimation, is indicative of the Messiah being of David's line, and can be employed, if at all, in a mystical or spiritual sense. We hold, against all such, that, no matter who was on the throne (David, Solomon, Hezekiah, etc.), and no matter how flourishing the Kingdom, the pious and believing held that the covenant looked for that special "Anointed One," David's Son, who should exalt the identical Theocratic throne and Kingdom to a grandeur immeasurably great.

Obs. 6. The language of the apostles is eminently calculated to confirm the Jewish belief in *the literal fulfilment of the Davidic covenant*. Thus e.g. let any unprejudiced reader take the first sermons that were delivered after the day of Pentecost, addressed to Jews, and he cannot fail to see this feature. Peter (Acts 2 : 14–36), referring to the covenant promise that *Jesus Christ would sit on David's throne*, correctly argues that the performance of this requires the resurrection of Jesus, which David also foretold as a prerequisite. He then informs the Jews that He did thus arise, that He ascended to heaven where He is exalted as Lord and Christ, waiting for the time when His foes shall be made His footstool, "whom (Acts 3 : 12–26) the heaven must receive *until the times of restitution of all things*" (keeping in mind the Jewish idea of restitution as *always associated* with the restored Davidic Kingdom) shall come, and then "He (God) shall send Jesus Christ" through whom this is effected. He exhorts them on the ground that they "*are children of the covenant which God made with our fathers*" to repent that they may become worthy participants in "*the times of refreshing*" (Jewish expression), which "*shall come from the presence of the Lord.*" Let any one read the covenant and prophecies directly bearing on it, and then place himself in the position (Prop. 20) of a Jewish

hearer of Peter, with Jewish faith, expectations, and covenant relationship, and the decided impression will be made that the covenant is not altered but remains unchanged, that the death of Jesus combined with resurrection and exaltation only qualifies Him the better to meet the conditions of the covenant, and that through this resurrected Jesus, when *the time appointed* by the Father arrives, *this covenant will be verified.*

Obs. 7. This is confirmed by the fully admitted early church view on the subject. Let the reader pause and reflect, *how it comes,* if the prevalent modern notion of the covenant is correct, that the early Christians (who had the advantages of apostolic, inspired teaching, or were close to it) *held to the grammatical sense of the covenant* and fully believed with the Jews that *the Messiah would come* (again, as to Jesus) *to restore the Davidic throne and Kingdom?* Upon what supposition can it be satisfactorily explained, excepting the one that they were *correct?*

Acknowledging Neander's manly concessions to the prevalence of Chiliasm in the early church, and his favorable estimate of Millenarians, he, to make room for his own modern theory, does these ancient worthies injustice, when (*His. Church,* vol. 1, p. 78) he informs us that it was "a distinguishing character" of Christianity "*to lower itself down to the comprehension*" of these men. His standard of comparison, derived from an anti-Chiliastic bias, is *not* a true one; and this appears evident from the covenant itself. These men, believers in whom the truth is perpetuated, embraced a pure, fundamental truth, a high and noble faith, indorsed and supported by Divine authority, and needed not the Origenistic, or the elevating Hegelian, Philosophy to discern it. We leave this able, but in this respect mistaken, writer give the following testimony to the early church doctrine. "Christianity (*His. Plant. Chr. Church,* vol. 1, p. 500) allied itself to the expectation of *a restoration and glorification of the Theocracy,* which was preceded by an increasing sense of its *fallen state* among the Jews. Those who clung to a national and external Theocracy looked forward to this glorification as something external, sensuous (?), and national. The Messiah, they imagined, would exalt by *a divine miraculous power* the depressed Theocracy of the Jews to a visible glory such as it had never before possessed, and establish *a new, and exalted, unchangeable order of things,* in place of the transitory earthly institutions which had hitherto existed. Thus the Kingdom of the Messiah would appear as *the perfected form of the Theocracy,* as the final stage in the terrestrial development of mankind, *exceeding in glory* everything that a rude fancy could depict under sensible images, a Kingdom in which the Messiah would reign *sensibly present* as God's Vicegerent and order all circumstances according to His will. From this point of view, therefore, *the reign of the Messiah would appear as belonging entirely to the future;* the present condition of the world, with all its evils and defects, would be set in opposition to that future golden age, from which all wickedness and evil would be banished." He then proceeds to tell us how a change of belief was gradually brought about in the Church doctrine, and the substance, compressed, is, that man unauthorized made this change under the plea that a deeper insight, greater knowledge, indicated the early belief to be erroneous. Such a change may commend itself to human wisdom, but it is not reasonable according to the covenants and the assurances surrounding them, or to the prophecies and the teaching of the first three centuries. No! let us, in all lowliness of mind, seek no change, but content ourselves, even if it gives rise to invidious comparisons, with the faith held by the early confessors and martyrs. (Comp. Props. 75-78.)

It is exceedingly gratifying to find this Jewish faith, thus founded on the covenants, recognized and continued in the early history of the Chr. Church; for, if true, *this very feature*—now regarded by many as a stain or blot—ought, in the very nature of the case, to characterize the churches established by the apostles and their immediate successors. There is a disposition on the part of some writers to treat this matter unfairly (as in Corrodi's *His. of Chiliasm,* Shedd's *His. of Ch. Doctrine,* etc.), and to ignore, as much as possible, the early Jewish belief as something of no value to us (as in various Quarterlies, Reviews, Theologies, etc.).

Obs. 8. Having called attention to the covenant and its literal fulfilment, it may be suitable to present *the order* of fulfilment as given by

David himself. Necessarily brief and abrupt, so as not to conflict with the free agency of man, it is a sublime vindication of David's *inspiration*, the *perpetuity* of the covenant, and its *ultimate literal realization.*

Consider Ps. 89, and observe these particulars as stated: (1) David acknowledges the bestowal of the covenant by God, and its confirmation by oath, "I have made a covenant with My chosen, I have sworn unto David My servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations" (v. 1-4). (2) He expresses praise that God's wonders and faithfulness will be shown "in the congregation (gathering) of the saints," and that He has the authority, power, and mercy to perform His promises (v. 5 to 18). (3) He again refers to the covenant, shows that One shall be specially exalted, and that God says: "I will make Him My First-born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for Him forevermore, and My covenant shall stand fast in Him. His (David's) seed also will I make to endure forever, and His throne as the days of heaven" (v. 19-29). (4) Then as this Kingdom is offered to the regular descendants of David, and it is foreseen that they will become unworthy of it, God foretells the same, with the additional assurance to David that, *notwithstanding* such rebellion and His withdrawal for a time, the covenant will still be fulfilled, in these pregnant words: "If his (David's) children forsake My law and walk not in My judgments, if they break My statutes and keep not My commandments, then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. *Nevertheless*, My lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips. Once have I sworn by My Holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before Me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven" (v. 30-37). Here it is positively asserted that the relapse of the nation and a resultant infliction of punishment (just as centuries have witnessed) shall not change God's promise to David respecting that seed of his that shall reign on his throne. (5) Now comes a remarkable transition, which should shame the unbelief of doubting ones, seeing that it is descriptive of the precise condition of things as they exist to-day. David having foretold the *conditional* overthrow of his kingdom, and yet that God will be faithful in its final restoration, now plainly predicts *the downfall itself:* "But Thou hast cast off and abhorred; Thou hast been wroth with Thine anointed" (i.e. the Theocratic kings that followed David). "Thou hast made void the covenant of Thy servant; Thou hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground," etc. "Thou hast made his glory to cease, and cast his throne down to the ground," etc. The covenant is unrealized; the Theocratic Kingdom is fallen; the very throne and Kingdom, the subject of such special promise, is now overthrown. Then, however, resting upon the assurances given, he asks: "*How long, Lord?* Wilt Thou hide Thyself forever? Shall Thy wrath burn as fire?" "Lord, where are Thy former lovingkindnesses, which Thou swarest unto David in Thy truth?" David's faith in God that He would remember His covenant and restore his cast-down crown and throne, is briefly but finely expressed: "Remember, Lord, the reproach of Thy servants." "Blessed be the Lord forevermore. Amen and Amen." Who, that is an humble believer in the Word as written, can, in the face of such predictions, deride the early church faith evolved by them? Who, when observing how carefully every objection is answered lest faith should stumble and fall, can resist the conviction that there is a force in these words, which are yet—when realized—destined to form one of the grandest displays of God's faithfulness and mercy in the Redemptive scheme?

PROPOSITION 50. *The Kingdom will be the outgrowth of the renewed Abrahamic covenant, under which renewal we now live.*

Leaving the first part of the proposition to be brought out by our general argument and the considerations under various propositions hereafter, we confine ourselves to the other fact stated, viz.: that the Abrahamic covenant is *renewed or re-confirmed* in this dispensation, under which re-confirmation we now live.

Obs. 1. This, indeed, might already be inferred by the reflection, that the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom being overthrown, and the Mosaic institutions abrogated, and the covenant made with David being held in abeyance (or, as David expressed its "made void," i.e. not fulfilled) *the original Abrahamic covenant,* from which the others spring, in consequence *alone remains* in complete force. The covenant of this dispensation, called the New Testament, or the New Covenant, is none other than the Abrahamic *renewed or confirmed* by Jesus the Christ. We are not left to conjecture or inference on so important a point; it is one *plainly taught* in Holy Writ.

The reader will carefully regard this matter, as it is essential to a correct understanding of much Scripture. It is a sad fact, that more ignorance and misunderstanding exist in relation to the covenants than perhaps of any other portion of the Bible. This originates from the manner in which the subject has been handled by theologians of talent and eminence. Instead of confining themselves to the covenants in which man is directly interested and which have been directly given to him by God, they have much to say concerning "a covenant of Redemption" entered into by the Father and Son from eternity (and undertake to give the particulars of what is not on record), and "a Covenant of Grace" (which embraces the particulars of salvation, etc.), but the distinctive Abrahamic covenant and the manner in which it is confirmed is left without due consideration. This introduces a series of wild and fanciful interpretations, such as that all nations are now in the position once occupied by the Jewish nation; that God does not regard the Jewish nation with more favor than other nations; that the promises to the Jewish nation are typical, temporary, conditional, etc. Believing that we are under an entire New Covenant (which they cannot point out in the Scriptures, but which they affirm is this or that, viz.: this dispensation, or the sacrifice of Christ, or the tender of salvation to all believers, etc.), they, of course, ignore *the necessity* of our becoming "the seed of Abraham, of our being engrafted, etc. The relationship that believers sustain to the Jewish nation is utterly misapprehended, and inevitable confusion and antagonism arise. (Comp. e.g. Pres. Edwards's *His. Redemp.*, Russell, Witsius, Boston, Strong, etc., on the Covenants, and our various systems of Theology). It is painful to notice the discrepancies, amid a show of profound learning and speculation.

Obs. 2. Turn to Galatians (the more significant, because addressed to Gentile believers), ch. 3, and the apostle argues that Gentiles come in *under the Abrahamic covenant,* which, consequently, must be the one under which believers live and inherit. Notice: (1) v. 16, "*To Abraham and his seed were the promises made,*"—the promises of salvation pertain

then to this covenant. (2) By this seed) v. 16) is denoted "Christ"—so that Christ Himself as Abraham's seed has the promises pertaining to Himself in the same covenant. (3) Hence (v. 17) this "*covenant was confirmed before of God in Christ*"—i.e. the Divine Purpose embraced this as a fact to be accomplished, and therefore the Messiah came. (4) In view of the relationship of this Abrahamic covenant to Jesus Christ, it is added (v. 17) that the law or Mosaic institution, which was afterward given, "*cannot disannul*" this previously given one. (5) For, if it did disannul it, then it would "*make the promise of none effect*," i.e. it could not be realized, but because the covenant continues unimpaired, the promise also is sure. (6) The inheritance of the saints is originally given (v. 18) by God "*to Abraham by promise*," and hence is not affected by the abrogation of the law. (7) For the law "was (v. 19) added because of transgressions, *till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.*" (8) By the death of the Seed provision is made so "*that* (v. 13, 14) *the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith*,"—i.e. the promise contained in the Abrahamic covenant. (9) Now "*if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise*;"—we become inheritors with Abraham and Christ of promises contained in the Abrahamic covenant. (10) Hence we "*receive* (ch. 4 : 5, 7) *the adoption of sons*," "*and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ*;" i.e. we inherit in God's Theocratic Kingdom. (11) "*Then* (ch. 5 : 5) *we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith*" contained in the covenant promise, and (v. 21) can "*inherit the Kingdom of God*" (Rom. 4 : 11, 18). Thus then according to the apostle we are living under the precious Abrahamic covenant, which *is renewed or confirmed in Christ*; and if we desire to inherit with Abraham and Christ, *we must*, by faith, *become the seed of Abraham*, and thus come into proper *covenant relationship*. Well may we say, in view of this, with Paul (Gal. 3 : 15), "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, *yet if it be confirmed*, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto."

Obs. 3. This is corroborated and strengthened by what the apostle says in other places respecting *the Abrahamic covenant containing the promises, which we hope to inherit through and with Christ.* The entire analogy of the Word sustains our position.

Having given Paul's views addressed to Gentiles, let us turn to the same as given to Jews, who were well acquainted with the covenant. Notice the train of thought as given in Hebrews. (1) Paul informs us (ch. 1 : 16), as a preliminary, that Jesus "took on Him the seed of Abraham;" covenant relationship demanded it. (2) Then after referring to the rest that remaineth for the people of God (and mind, speaking of it as something well understood by his hearers, comp. Prop. 143), exhorting to steadfastness, upholding the faithfulness of God in fulfilling His promises, he approaches the subject of the covenant by informing us (ch. 7 : 18) of the "disannulling" of the Mosaic law, and (v. 22) that "Jesus was made surety of *a better covenant*;" that (ch. 8 : 6) "He is the Mediator of *a better covenant*, which was established upon better promises. For if the first covenant" (Mosaic, as all admit, being the first in actual course of realization) "had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the second;" i.e. the Mosaic had many things attached which were merely provisionary. Let the reader pause and consider what is "*the better covenant*" here designated. According to Gal. 3 it is the one established on better promises; the one which gives the promises of blessing and inheritance to Abraham and his Seed, the Christ—in brief, *the Abrahamic*, and which, therefore, not being annulled or set aside, remains in force, for otherwise "the

promise would be of none effect." Jesus becomes, by virtue of His being the Seed of Abraham and because of His death (which provides the way of ultimate fulfilment through resurrection power, etc.), "*the surety*" of its final realization. But we will leave the apostle to state this in his own language. (3) Then he adds (v. 8 : 13), "For finding fault with them" (viz. : Mosaic), "He saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make *a new*" (comp. Obs. 4, following) "*covenant* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah ; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them out of Egypt," etc. "In that He saith *a new covenant*, He hath made the first old." While the Sinaitic covenant is an outgrowth of the Abrahamic, and yet, owing to the foreseen defection of the nation and to the necessity of securing a satisfactory remission of sin, it was in many of its provisions merely preparatory, and hence, when removed, must give place *to that* which introduced it. Here the Mosaic is called the first because under it the Theocratic government was first established, and the Abrahamic is designated the second or new because under it, when fulfilled, that government will be re-established and existing. Paul, it must be remembered, wrote to Jews, and used this quotation as they employed it. Now that the Abrahamic covenant is alluded to in this quotation from Jer. 31 : 31, etc., is evident : (*a*) from the context in which the passage stands in Jeremiah—preceded, followed, and connected with *a literal restoration* of the Jewish nation, and identified with (for the prophet does not contradict himself) the Davidic covenant (which is *an amplification* of the Abrahamic, showing how it will be fulfilled) in its renewal. (*b*) The prophet calls this "*a new*" covenant, not because it is entirely new, but, as is said by the apostle, because the other is superseded by it, i.e. it is renewed, as e.g. in the coming of the seed, etc. (*c*) It is given to "*the house of Israel and the house of Judah*," which, as all commentators admit (however they may afterward spiritualize), in its literal aspect denotes the Jewish people. It is *the same* people, too, that were "scattered," "plucked up," "destroyed," and "afflicted," who shall be restored to their "land" and "cities." Although not yet verified, the apostle *aptly* quotes it to prove that God predicts such a superseding of the Mosaic. Addressing Jews and admitting their hopes of a restoration under the Messiah, they would feel the force of such an argument, which indicated the setting aside of the law. (*d*) Unity of prediction requires this, for we have decided references to this renewed Abrahamic covenant, conjoined with the Davidic, being a distinguishing characteristic of, and fundamental to, the Messianic period, as e.g. Mic. 7 : 9, Ezek. 16 : 60-63, Isa. 55 : 3, etc. Indeed, many are the prophecies which assume that under the Messiah both the Abrahamic and the explanatory Davidic, *shall be realized*. As we shall have occasion hereafter to quote these largely, it is sufficient here to say that they not only specifically refer to it, but denominate it (hence it cannot be superseded) "*an everlasting covenant*" (which it must be, since its promises bring Salvation). This does not interfere, as the predictions themselves intimate, in allowing other and new arrangements under the reign of the Messiah, as e.g. a new dispensation, the rulership of immortals, the renewal of the earth, etc. But the Bible still insists that these covenants are *fundamental* to all those things ; that the dispensation, honor, privileges, glory, etc., enjoyed, are all *the resultants* of an existing and then realized Abrahamic-Davidic covenant—the Abrahamic being the foundation of the others.

But to return to Paul : (*e*) In the next chapter he shows how the Mosaic introduced rites, sacrifices, etc., which were typical, and that to obtain the promise of the inheritance (for we have already shown, Prop. 49, how it necessitates, e.g. a resurrection) the death of Jesus is requisite. Hence (ch. 9 : 15), "For this cause He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive *the promise of eternal inheritance*." This promise, let the reader notice, of inheriting the land forever, is found in the Abrahamic covenant. Now the Mosaic economy made no provision for the Patriarch's or Christ's inheriting (and through them of the righteous dead), because it provided for no resurrecting power through which it could be accomplished, but pointed onward, by its types and sacrifices, *to Him* who should have power to perform it. In this Plan, *the death* of Jesus is an important factor. Therefore, he adds (v. 16, 17), "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead ; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." While the original word, constantly and carefully selected, does not mean either a will or testament,* but an arrangement, disposition, disposal of matters,

* That we are not forcing a meaning, is apparent from what our opponents themselves say, as e.g. the excellent remarks of Barnes, *Com. loci*, and Stuart, *Com. loci*. We are

or ordering of things, yet Paul illustrates the fact that the Abrahamic covenant required, before its realization, the death of Christ, by what occurs with the disposition men usually make of their affairs, which disposition is effective after their death *as far as inheriting is concerned.* (This is also additional proof of the correctness of our position that the promises of the covenant are not yet fulfilled.) Without keeping in view this manifest allusion to the promise of inheriting, the illustration would be unnatural and out of place. Or, if it be preferred, as some do, that the illustration be drawn from the ratification of a covenant or arrangement over dead sacrifices, the same truth is still presented, that without the death of Christ the promise of inheritance cannot be obtained. (7) The matter is summed up, (v. 28), and attention directed to *the time* of inheriting: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; *and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation.*" To a Jew, with his belief in the covenanted mercies of Abraham and David, the only possible conclusion, from the language of the apostle, was, that at the second coming, thus specified, *the covenant would be realized.* This Jewish opinion would be strengthened by the direct quotations from the covenants; by speaking of "*the world to come*" (a favorite Jewish phrase, employed to designate the period when these covenants would be fulfilled); by declaring that "this man" "sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool;" by foretelling "the day approaching," "the day of Jesus Christ," in which salvation (as covenanted) was to be experienced; by saying: "For yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry;" by pointing to Abraham and all the ancient worthies that they had *not* received the promise in fulfilment, but would with us at the appearing of this Jesus; and by adopting, in conclusion, the prophetical and Jewish denomination of "*everlasting covenant*" in the phrase "*the blood of the everlasting covenant,*" thus showing that the Abrahamic, known as "the everlasting," was ratified by the blood or death of Jesus. Thus a perfect unity of doctrine is preserved between the Old and the New Testaments, both uniting in the same declaration, that the Kingdom of the Messiah, the glory and blessedness of the reign of David's Son, is a resultant of an existing, confirmed covenant relationship, a divine arrangement, which finds its basis, so far as humanity is related, in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the Jewish nation, and, above all, in the man Christ Jesus.

Obs. 4. Persons are apt to be misled by the use of the word "*new,*" thinking that it necessarily means something entirely new, different from what preceded. They forget that in Bible usage it frequently means *renewed, restored again, newly confirmed,* etc., as in new heart, new moon, new creature, new heavens and new earth, new commandment, drink new (Matt. 26 : 29), etc. It is important then to discriminate whenever the word is employed, especially in so weighty a matter as this, seeing *the high interests* that are involved. As the phrase "new covenant" only appears once in the Old Test. and but a few times in the New, the general analogy of Scripture must be allowed to determine the sense in which it is used.

Obs. 5. The corroborating proof, drawn from the fact that Gentiles to inherit the promises must become *the seed of Abraham,* has already been

---

not specially concerned, so far as our argument is related, to advocate any of the views entertained respecting these two verses (16th and 17th), for whatever opinion is entertained, all admit that, in some way, the death of Christ is made *necessary* to ratify or secure the fulfilment of the covenant, and this is *all* that is required in our line of argument. We only suggest that these verses, which give so much trouble to Expositors, are easily reconciled. For although the word does not denote strictly a will or testament, yet the apostle can, and does, correctly compare it with such, on account of *the resemblance* that exists between the Abrahamic covenant and an earthly will or testament. Both, in order to be realized, call for the death of the testator (and here indirectly we have the Divinity of Jesus asserted, inasmuch as God *in Christ* gave this covenant, etc.); both are only valid in their appropriations or fulfilment of contained promises of interest through the death of the parties bestowing them. Keeping this resemblance in view, all difficulty vanishes. (Comp. Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 39 and note, Fairbairn's *Herm. Manual,* P. 2, Sec. 7, Judge Jones's *Notes,* Nast, *Com.* Matt. 26 : 28, etc.)

briefly given in Props. 24, 29, 30 (united), but will be presented in detail under Props. 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, etc. To avoid repeating, let it only be said that *the very engrafting or adoption* of Gentile believers into the covenanted, elect nation, is itself evidence that *we live under the reconfirmed* Abrahamic covenant.

As a correct knowledge of covenant relationship is essential to *a proper understanding* of the truth in Redemption, and to inspire within us *correct hopes* of the future, it seems reasonable to suppose that those believers who lived the nearest to apostolic times and enjoyed the advantages of apostolic explanations upon so interesting and fundamental a subject, ought to know *under what* covenant we are living, what covenant Jesus confirmed by His death, and under what covenant saints inherit. Now down to Origen not a single Father has the least idea of *an entire new covenant* instituted by Jesus, but every one, either directly or indirectly as far as we can gather, *confirms our view* of it. If moderns are correct with their notions respecting a new covenant as taught in Hebrews, is it not remarkable that they cannot point to a single church, Jewish or Gentile, that received and taught their views in the first and second centuries. If the modern notion is so plain and distinct, as is claimed, why not then proclaimed by some, at least, of the earliest Fathers?

This is seen by their Chiliastic attitude and looking for the fulfilment of the Abrahamic-Davidic covenant at the speedy Advent of Jesus. They all held that Christ is become the surety or pledge of the Abrahamic covenant; that He will fulfil it in connection with the Davidic, with which it is incorporated; and that they would, through Christ, inherit the promises under that covenant. A large array of quotations might be presented to indicate the general sentiment on this point, but having already given (Prop. 49, etc.) some testimony, and having occasion hereafter in connection with other points to quote others, it is unnecessary (the more so, in view of the admissions already quoted from Neander and others respecting the prevailing belief) to do more than simply refer to the *Epistle of Barnabas*, who (Sec. 14 and 15) positively argues that God has *not yet* fulfilled the Abrahamic covenant, *excepting* in sending the Seed, Christ, who is the covenanted *pledge* that the remainder will be realized at the Sec. Advent, at "*the day of restitution*," at "*the renewal of all things*." The decided and impressive testimony of these early Fathers, given amidst weakness and imperfection, and the strong and unwavering faith they manifested, held amidst derision and persecution,—that they were living under this *renewed* Abrahamic covenant as the seed of Abraham, which the death and exaltation of Jesus ensured to them of finally realizing in the inheriting of the land with Abraham,—this *cannot* be set aside as a departure from the truth, or as "carnal," without undermining *the foundations* of Christianity itself. If these men, who appealed to the apostles and elders, are not to be trusted in giving an exhibit of the covenanted foundation of their Christian faith,—if they were in error and deceived,—then who in the Church can be trusted in presenting one? Shall we select Origen, or Augustine, or Jerome, or some later one? We prefer to take that which harmonizes with Scriptural authorities and keeps the closest to covenant promise *as written*, and, therefore, in making our selection, we find Barnabas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and their fellows in like faith, consistent both with covenant language and explanation as given in Holy Writ. In their simplicity, and with all their imperfection, they have *far more* of the truth, fundamental, than multitudes, learned and eminent, who deride them. (Comp. Props. 73-78.)

Obs. 6. This view of the covenant was overshadowed and crushed by the Alexandrian, monkish, and Popish theories introduced (comp. Props. 77 and 78). It was entertained in some of its leading aspects by a few (as e.g. Waldenses, Albigenses) down to the Reformation, when it was partially (not in its primitive purity) revived by the Reformers. The influence of the late Fathers (as Augustine, etc.) and of the schoolmen, prevented that clear, consistent, and simple statement that once pervaded the Primitive

Church. But notwithstanding this, every Reformer saw and recognized *the fundamental* character of the Abrahamic covenant, that we lived under its promises, that Christ made provision for their fulfilment, and thus confirmed the covenant. Thus e.g. Luther repeatedly asserts the present existing force of the Abrahamic covenant in his Com. on Galatians; Calvin in his Institutes (B. 2, ch. 10) rightly makes the promises of this covenant to extend over into the future.

It is interesting to notice Luther's views. Thus e.g. in *Com. on Gal.* ch. 3, taking "the testament" in the sense of a will (instead of disposition, etc.), he expressly says (v. 15): "Now, if a man's will be kept with so great fidelity, that nothing is added to it or taken from it after his death, how much more ought the last will of God to be faithfully kept, which He promised and gave *unto Abraham and his seed after him?* For when Christ died, *then was it confirmed in Him*, and after His death, the writing of His last testament was opened; that is to say: 'the promised blessing of Abraham was preached among all nations dispersed throughout the world.' This was the last will and testament of God, the great Testator, confirmed by the death of Christ; therefore no man ought to change it, or add anything to it, as they that teach the law and man's traditions do." He tells under v. 16, that "the promises of God made unto Abraham" being called "a testament" makes them "a donation or free gift," and that the "*heirs* look not for laws, exactions, or any burdens to be laid upon them by a testament, but they *look for the inheritance* confirmed thereby." In commenting on v. 17, he advocates *the perpetuity* of the Abrahamic covenant (hence is not superseded,—God forbid!), and beautifully illustrates the relation that the Sinaitic covenant sustained to it: "the promise was not abolished either by the law, or by the ceremonies of the law; but rather by the same, as by certain seals, it was for a time confirmed, until the letters themselves, or the writing of the testament (to wit, the promise), might be opened and by the preaching of the Gospel be spread abroad among all nations." He frequently expresses his faith in this promise, that he rests in it, that he hopes to obtain *the inheritance* (in which, mingling *the means for* obtaining the inheritance *with* the inheritance itself, and thus introducing confusion of ideas, he includes, v. 18, "remission of sins, righteous, salvation, and everlasting life; that we should be sons and heirs of God and fellow-heirs with Christ") through it, and that to receive the promise we must, v. 29, become "*the children of Abraham by adoption*," and "*the heirs of Abraham after the promise.*" Thus Luther makes much of an existing Abrahamic covenant, confirmed to us by the death of Jesus, under which we already enjoy an earnest or prelude to the final inheritance.

Obs. 7. Many writers might be presented who acknowledged the essentials, viz.: that the Abrahamic covenant is an existing one, made sure by the death of Christ, under which we have the hope of inheritance, and which shall finally be realized. But under a strange misapprehension, they either deny, or else omit to state, that *all* the promises of the covenant will be fulfilled; some they make literal, others are typical or spiritual, and others are ignored. Whatever view may be entertained, they are forced by the tenor of Scripture representation to confess its *continued fundamental* relationship to Christianity.

We append a few illustrations: Schmucker (*Pop. Theol.*, p. 247–8) says that the covenant made with Abraham "was not a temporary one, soon to be abolished, but that it was to remain in its essential features through all future generations, for an everlasting covenant." Hodge (*Sys. Div.*) asserts the identity of the Abrahamic covenant in succeeding dispensations and speaks of it as "the common doctrine of the church." When Hodge says of Christ, "He guarantees the fulfilment of all the promises and conditions of the covenant; His blood was the blood of the covenant" it may well be asked, were not those promises contained in the Abrahamic, and is not, therefore, the Abrahamic covenant the one sealed by His blood? Any amount of such testimony, which flatly contradicts other statements of the same writers, might be adduced, but these are sufficient to show how fundamental the covenant is regarded even by those who are largely addicted to spiritualizing. When drawing up the first draft of this Proposition, the writer (March 27th, 1873), being in company with his former theological instructor, Rev. Dr.

Sprecher, directly asked him the question : Under what covenant do we now live? The Dr. quickly and unhesitatingly replied : that the church now lived under the Abrahamic covenant and that it would ultimately reap the promises of that covenant ; and that the new covenant was the Abrahamic renewed or confirmed by the death of Christ, so that we had the strongest possible assurance in its realization. It was a gratification to find my honored friend thus cordially receive the Primitive doctrine, which is the only Scriptural and logical view.

Obs. 8. There are writers who clearly apprehend the truth and fairly state it. These, of course, are Millenarians ; for it is *a distinguishing feature* of their system, from the Primitive Church down, that it is *directly founded on the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants.* Holding to those covenants *as written,* clinging to those promises *without changing* them, believing that they will *all, as recorded,* be finally realized through Jesus Christ,—*leads necessarily to Chiliasm.* The history of the Church conclusively shows, that just as Chiliasm in its purity prevailed, in that proportion were *the covenants upheld and exalted* as signal landmarks ; and just as the Origenistic, Popish, and Mystical interpretation extended so were these covenants ignored as non-essential, or else spiritualized so as to make them scarcely recognizable.

Outside of the Scriptures, we are alone indebted to Chiliasts for a distinct statement of the relationship that the covenants sustain to the Plan of Salvation or to the Kingdom of God. But even some Millenarians, influenced by the neglect that the covenants have sustained, or, not realizing sufficiently their *vital and fundamental* relationship to the Kingdom, either omit an extended reference to them when such an one would be in place, or intimate the same with the briefest mention. It is, indeed, a very simple doctrine when contrasted with many of the elaborate antagonistic systems of divinity originated by the assumptions of Popish doctors, the Schoolmen, Philosophers, etc., but its simplicity, to a scholar posted in the history of doctrine, and to a believer who knows that "*the just live by faith,*" only recommends it the more to our notice. Nearly every Millenarian work refers to the covenant as we have done, more or less, extended. Admirable things are found in the writings of M'Neile, Noel, Bonars, Shimeall, Bickersteth, Jones, etc., etc. An illustration is given : Brooks (*El. Proph. Inter.*, p. 19) says : "The covenant made with Abraham is what is called the 'New Covenant' and the 'Covenant of Promise' ; for unless he (the reader) be clear in this matter, he will be unable to understand '*the hope of his calling*' in Christ Jesus, as set forth in the word of prophecy. It is the more needful to premise thus much, seeing that many, even pious Christians, have but a vague notion of the nature of the covenant of grace." Brethren, who may differ from the author, must not become offended at the plainness of speech, seeing that faith is involved. Luther once said : "Charity beareth all things, faith nothing." Charity will be gentle, embracing those from whom we are compelled to differ ; faith makes no compromise in doctrine and states its position plainly, and frankly, and boldly.

Obs. 9. Those who advocate that *an entire new* covenant was given and confirmed by the death of Jesus *differ very much* as to the nature and meaning of this alleged covenant. A variety of explanations are tendered, but all these, so far as noticed, with but few exceptions, attempt *no Scriptural proof.* We are simply to receive assertion, without having the *new covenant itself* pointed out and *its language quoted.* If Jesus gave such a covenant, as alleged, it ought, in the very nature of the case (like preceding ones) to be plainly stated ; for a covenant is of so special a character that it cannot be taken *for granted,* or be *simply inferred.* Now not a single writer of this class has attempted to produce the covenant itself.

To indicate this variety and the loose method of procedure, several illustrations are annexed. Augustine (City of God, B. 17, S. 3), makes Heb. 8 : 8-10, the new covenant, to refer to King Solomon building the temple (against the context of Jeremiah), and thus

to the earthly Jerusalem historically, and then spiritualized: "without doubt this is prophesied to the Jerusalem above," i.e. as elsewhere explained "the true Jerusalem eternal in the heavens." And such nonsense—if not worse—is to be received as worthy of reception. Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 301) calls it "a new dispensation, a new economy, that which Jesus had called a new covenant." Barnes (*Com.* Matt. 26 : 28) terms it, "the Gospel economy," a new compact with men, etc. The Encycl. Relig. Knowl., Art. "*Covenant*," makes the new covenant "a new dispensation," or "the Christian Economy." Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 499) says: "On the day of Christ's death the ancient Mosaic dispensation ceased, and the new covenant or the new dispensation, instituted by God through Christ for the Salvation of men, commenced." "It is therefore the uniform doctrine of the apostles that the new dispensation of God began with the death of Christ, and was thereby solemnly consecrated." The texts cited to prove such an important deduction are all of a nature, first, to show that the Mosaic economy is abolished (which we do not deny), and secondly, to indicate the efficacy, etc., of Christ's death (which we as cordially accept), but in none is the slightest hint given that this dispensation *is* the New Covenant, which is inferred from Matt. 26 : 28. Certainly this process of reasoning, which makes a dispensation equivalent to the bestowal of a covenant, *is utterly wrong and derogatory* to the Word itself, whose explanation of the covenant is passed by for an unlawful inference. Those who favor the dispensational theory involve themselves at once in a gross absurdity and contradiction. Thus e.g. Hodge, a writer in Encycl. Relig. Knowl., Schmucker, etc., call this covenant "*an everlasting*," "*an eternal*" *one*, and yet they make it *identical* with a dispensation or economy which they tell us is *not eternal*, but will come to an end. The trouble with this class of dispensational theorists is, that making this *the final* dispensation, everything, whether it fits or not, must be crowded into it to fulfil the Scriptures. Lange (*Com.* Genl. Introd., p. 20), makes "the New Testament the covenant itself," which is totally irrelevant. Something of the kind must have influenced the mind of Origen, for we are indebted to him (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 38) for first applying the phrase "New Testament" to the writings of the Apostles. (This is a title, which, while merely of human origin and incorrect, if understood as *pertaining to* the New Covenant, may be retained.) Some, therefore, are misled in making the Scriptures as contained in the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse, the New Covenant. This embraces too much, and defeats itself. Lange, however, only applies this in a *general* way, for on the same page he particularizes: "the Lord designates *the Eucharist* the New Covenant in His blood, in the strict sense of the term." But Lange is again mistaken, for Christ did not call the Eucharist or Supper the covenant, because "*the cup*" is significant of the Eucharist, and hence "the cup *of* the New Testament" shows that the Supper or that expressed by it is *separate from* the covenant. It simply denotes what we have already shown, that by the death represented in this cup the covenant itself is renewed or confirmed. Otherwise if the covenant is the Eucharist, the propriety even of language is violated, for we have "the Eucharist (the cup) of the Eucharist." Pressense (*The Redeemer*, p. 95) has the old covenant spiritualized to form the New, for he informs us: "He (Christ) cannot develop it (the old covenant) except by rendering it spiritual; and the ancient covenant when made spiritual *becomes* the New Covenant." This is simply a repetition of Augustine (*City of God*, B. 16, S. 26), who says: "The New Covenant is shadowed forth in the old. For what does the old covenant imply, but the concealing of the New? And what does the term New Covenant imply, but the revealing of the Old?" All this proceeds on the assumption that the old covenant was not *also* of a spiritual nature, which is refuted by the spiritual blessings that it also promises. And if temporal blessings, blessings relating to this earth, are connected with it, *how* can these in *an everlasting covenant* be changed, modified, altered, spiritualized without invalidating God's truthfulness? And, if it is *so exclusively* spiritual, how comes it that Jesus came *literally in the flesh* as the promised Seed? And if spiritual, who, of all those who spiritualize it, have spiritualized it correctly? For Jesus, the Christ, certainly *never, never spiritualized away* His own inheritance (comp. Prop. 122). Schmid (*Bib. Theol.*, p. 213) defines the New Covenant to be "a covenant of more complete alliance and forgiveness, concluded and consecrated by the death of Christ," etc. Cheerfully admitting the necessity and efficacy of Christ's death, yet the Abrahamic covenant itself requires in those who shall inherit its promises the remission of sins, and as the shedding of blood is required according to the Scriptures, provision is made for fulfilment in and through the death of Jesus, so that the resurrection power implied (Prop. 49) in the covenant may be exerted. Hence, it will not answer to exalt the provision made by Christ *for* the fulfilment of covenant promise, however indispensable and precious, *into* the position of the covenant itself. Where is the express covenant, consecrated by the death of Jesus, found, if not in the

Abrahamic? If any other exists, as Schmid and others state, *why* is it not formally expressed somewhere in the Scriptures. Others, however, refer us to Isa. 49 : 8 and 42 : 6, where it is predicted of Christ, "*I will give Thee for a covenant of the people*," and assert that this means that Christ Himself is the New Covenant, or that He will make such an one. As to the first, that Christ is the covenant, commentators admit (even Barnes, *loci*) that the phrase does not mean that Christ himself is the covenant but the One through whom it is to be effected or established, appealing to Mic. 5 : 5, "and this man shall be the peace," i.e. the establisher of peace, etc. Aside from some Germans (Hitzig, Ewald, etc.), rendering the word "covenant" "a mediatorial people" or "covenant people," which Alexander (Com. *loci*) says "yields a good sense," we accept of Alexander's explanation : "this use of 'covenant' although unusual is in itself not more unnatural or forced than that of 'light' in the next phrase. As light of the nations must mean a source or disponser of light to them, so 'covenant of the people' in the very same sentence may naturally mean the dispenser or mediator of a covenant with them." Christ, because He confirms the Abrahamic covenant and eventually fulfils it, bears this significant title. As to the second idea, that Christ makes an entire new covenant, it is pure inference and remains unproven. The reader has only to read the context of these phrases in Isaiah, and he will find our position fully sustained by its intimate relationship to *the restoration of the covenanted Jewish nation*, and hence these references to Christ denote that He causes the covenant to be realized. These examples are amply sufficient to illustrate the opposite views and to indicate their variety and strength. Hence, we cannot receive the current phraseology on the subject, as e.g. Pressense (*The Early Days of Christianity*, p. 240), who says of Paul's teaching : "The new covenant is to him essentially a new fact, the proclamation of pardon, the sovereign manifestation of grace—in one word, *the Gospel*"—for this is simply to mistake *the means* intended to secure covenant blessings *for* the covenant itself. Much that is said of a "covenant of grace" (as distinguished from a "covenant of works"), while correct in principle and showing the contrast between the dispensations, may be retained, but just so soon as it is made to occupy the position of "the everlasting covenant" which contains the promises and under which we inherit by grace extended, then we reject it as unscriptural and misleading.

Obs. 10. It follows, then, that it is a grave misapprehension of Scripture teaching to say, as some do, that all the older covenants *ended* in Christ. Able writers take the position (Kurtz, *His. of Old Cov.*, Vol. 1, p. 1) that the old covenant ended in the Incarnation of Christ (Knapp, *Ch. Theol.*, p. 499, prefers to end it at the death of Jesus), giving place to *an entire new one.* Kurtz tells us that "the ultimate aim and the highest point of the Divine covenant activity in all its manifestations is the incarnation of God in Christ," and (p. 221) that Christ is "the highest and last representative of the Abrahamic covenant." *No! never!* for the covenant *comprehends immensely more* than the incarnation of the Messiah ; it embraces His inheritance and future glory ; it is world-embracing, for, as will be shown hereafter, in its brief but pregnant sentences, it includes the resurrection, restoration, and inheriting of the Patriarchs and of their believing descendants and of the adopted seed,—the Kingdom under the reign of that pre-eminent Seed, the ultimate salvation of the race as a race, the final removal of the curse, and the perfected Redemption of man and the creation. The Incarnation, *inexpressibly precious and indispensably necessary*, is an important—the first in magnitude—*means for the accomplishment of covenant promises*, but it too is *only preparatory.* Hence it is wrong to narrow down the covenant to the First Advent, just as if the Seed was not *in His glorified humanity* (comp. e.g. Props. 82, 83, 199–203) yet to exhibit a glorious part in the fulfilment of covenanted promises *at His Second Advent.*

Seeing the weighty consequences resulting to interpretation from this source, we leave Dr. Kurtz (p. 207) present his view as follows : After justly speaking of the fulness of the name of "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," calling it "the inscription on the por-

tal of the historical development of the covenant," and " the seal of that covenant," he then adds, that it continued such until the appearance of Jesus Christ, " until the time arrived in which Abraham *ceased* to be the rock whence the people of the covenant were hewn and Sarah the hole of the pit whence they were digged (Isa. 51 : 1, 2), and the new Israel found in Christ the author and finisher of faith, and in the Spirit of God the fountain of life." This is *a serious misstatement* of " the hope of our calling," and *if* true, *then* our promised inheritance is withheld from us and God's promises covenanted to Abraham will not be faithfully performed. Let us briefly point out the fallacy of such language (selecting Kurtz as the ablest advocate of this view), because of its bearing upon the highest interests of man. (1) The reference to Abraham and Sarah (Isa. 51 : 1, 2) is an utter reversal of what the inspired prophet declares. Kurtz informs us that in the Messianic times we shall not look to Abraham, because the people of the covenant are not derived from him ; the Prophet says exactly the reverse, viz. : that we shall look to him, and the reason is assigned because of his election (" for I called him alone"). *It stands connected with a glorious Millennial portrayal.* In some way (as we shall explain, Props. 61-65) Abraham is *still* our Father, i.e. of the elect, them that believe, and *because* of his being chosen and his seed in him " *the Lord shall comfort Zion, He will comfort all her waste places,*" etc. (2) When the Jews were rejected nationally during the allotted " times of the Gentiles" still a seed must be raised up unto Abraham, to be recognized as *his children. Why?* Because to him and to his seed was given the covenant, and hence we *must be related* to him. (3) Believers inherit *with* Abraham, and this because they come *into covenant relationship* with him. (4) All who are received as *the seed of Abraham* are received on the same principle of faith that Abraham was, i.e. by faith, and in view of the same are adopted as *his* "*children,*"—thus are connected with him. (5) Hence Abraham is expressly called *the Father of all the faithful,* because of a sustained relationship. (6) The chosen are never called the children of Christ, but *His brethren, co-heirs,* etc., because they inherit with Him covenanted promises *given to Abraham.* (7) Being the author and finisher of our faith does *not* by any means place Christ in the position of Abraham, it only shows *how* through Christ we can attain and retain Abrahamic faith. (8) Christ Himself is the subject of covenanted promise *not yet* fulfilled, and therefore the covenant is not superseded in Christ, for that would destroy promises pertaining to Him. (9) The " Spirit of God " was just as much " the fountain of life" to Abraham and believing Jews as to us now, for the Bible abundantly testifies (comp. Prop. 171) how that Spirit attended, enlightened, confirmed, and strengthened them. In the light of the Abrahamic covenant, we dare not depart from the plain statements of the Word and reverse one of the most impressive utterances of Isaiah, and destroy *our own* covenanted hopes of a blessed inheritance. Men may honestly and sincerely think that they are exalting Christ by this method, but the real truth is, that they are lowering Christ as *a faithful Fulfiller* of the promises made to the Fathers.

Obs. 11. We read and hear, at present, what are *supposed* to be axiomatic truths respecting the New Covenant, which are eminently calculated *to mislead* the inquirer. An immense array of *alleged* self-evident truth will not stand the test of Scriptural examination ; and yet men, blinded and biased by the authority of great names who promulgate them, persist in retaining them because of their plausible appearance. It is singular how a rut made by the ornamental carriage of an Augustine or of a Cyprian, or even by the ruder cart of some monk, has been followed for centuries, unquestioned, as if it alone, and none other, was the proper road to an intended goal. The time has arrived when those well worn ruts are carefully, through their entire length, examined both by the enemies and friends of the truth ; and we may rest assured, from the nature of truth itself, that if honestly made the Divine Directory will never suffer.

If men have erred, if even the multitude have gone astray, it is only what the Bible has predicted, has threatened, has warned us against, and has pointed out as the natural result of human wisdom, weakness, and depravity. Hence, as in the present case, when but few really entertain the truth on a given subject, instead of feeling that this is antagonistic to the truth, we ought rather to say that it precisely corresponds with what God Himself asserts respecting it. A lack of great faith is predicted, and as Gentiles we are warned not to be " *high-minded* " in our privileges. Indeed, we ought only the more

narrowly examine even the things that may be deemed well established. Surely in such a procedure is there safety and well-grounded hope. For, as practical Christianity is fostered and strengthened by a constant renewal and self-examination, so theoretical or doctrinal Christianity is confirmed and improved by reflection, study, and testing. When a student has advanced so far that he is unwilling to have his most cherished views subject to a candid but searching criticism, *then* advancement in knowledge, and improvement in understanding, also ceases ;—he no longer occupies a student's attitude. By the axiomatic truths alluded to in the Obs., we mean the exalting of *means* to accomplish the covenant into the covenant itself ; the elevation of this dispensation, which is *only* preparatory, into the covenant ; the making the Gospel, which gives the glad tidings how the covenant is to be realized and that we are invited to participate in its realization, the covenant, etc. The student can readily find them in ten thousand works.

Obs. 12. Some readers may desire to have the mistakes, into which a misconception of the covenant necessarily leads, pointed out. In the annexed note several of the more prominent are given, in addition to those already specified.

(1) Making an entire New Covenant and the Old Covenants abrogated, necessarily disconnects this dispensation from the preceding, and erects an independency which is destructive to *the unity* of Divine Purpose as exhibited in the Abrahamic covenant. The reverse of this follows our argument.

(2) Professing to live under an entire New Covenant, and that the Old is no longer existing, leads to a denial of the Jewish elect and covenanted position, and that the Jewish nation has certain indisputable privileges pertaining to it which it is plainly predicted to realize in the future. The reverse of this follows the reception of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants.

(3) The annulling of the Abrahamic covenant in Christ and the bestowal of another covenant, while unjust to the faith of centuries in that covenant, while hostile to the grammatical sense of the covenant, evinces the grossest injustice in that it denies that Gentiles, to participate in the blessings of the covenant, must also, in some way, *be identified* with the believing portion of the Jewish nation that received the covenant.

(4) The fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant in Christ, and a consequent New one entered into, flatly denies the inheritance of the land promised to Abraham's Seed, the resurrection and subsequent inheriting of the land by the Patriarchs, etc., and thus entirely misapprehends *the nature* of Christ's inheritance and that of the Patriarchs.

(5) Having such a New Covenant and ignoring the Old, causes its advocates to insist upon a present fulfilment of promises which are located at the Sec. Advent. To make such an application, the grammatical meaning must give place to engrafted spiritual ones. Preparatory measures, means of grace, the earnests of faith and hope, are elevated into an ample fulfilment.

(6) Those who admit the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant in the distant future, but deny that we live under it now (making a new covenant existing), thus ignore its not having been annulled, that our adoption as children of Abraham hinges on it, that Christ's death confirms its validity to us, and that all our blessings flow from it. The dislocation offered by them is unnatural and destroys the unity.

(7) Those who make the covenants exclusively pertaining to the Jews, the natural descendants of Abraham, and hence something not pertaining to the Gentiles, the latter being under another and new covenant—forget that it is the blessing of Abraham that is to be extended to the Gentile believers, but only on the ground of their becoming the seed of Abraham through faith, so that they may inherit the promises *with* Abraham. The Bible makes no distinction between the believing natural descendants or the believing adopted. It is, however, not as Gentiles that we can inherit, but Gentiles who, on account of faith, are adopted, engrafted.

(8) Those who make a New Covenant existing, because the Old was conditional, overlook the fact that its unconditionality is expressly asserted in that all believers inherit under it. It is an everlasting covenant unto all generations, and cannot, will not fail to be realized in the Patriarchs and their seed—those natural and adopted who are of faith.

(9) To create a New Covenant on the ground that the Abrahamic will not be realized because the Jewish nation has rejected Christ, is to raise up a false issue, and make it the basis of an important doctrine. For if there is a truth distinctly taught in the Bible, it is, that the Jewish nation will some time in the future recognize Him whom

they have pierced as the Messiah, the one who is to fulfil the Abrahamic covenant. This will be shown at length as our argument proceeds.

(10) Advocating a New Covenant and ignoring the renewed Abrahamic, leads to an entire change of Biblical terms. Thus e.g. Israel and Judah are made to mean simply believers in Christ without the slightest reference to their adoption as the children of Abraham by which they become entitled to the name. The true Israel are a covenanted people, which they obtain by their relationship *to* Abraham as the covenanted head. Gentiles only can become such by adoption.

Such are some of the mistakes made on this subject; and let not the reader consider them unimportant, for they largely affect the interpretation of the Word, a correct faith and hope in the things of God. By adopting them, no proper discrimination can be maintained in the fulfilment of promises, no existing and vital connection between the dispensations under covenant is observed, no satisfactory and unvarying fundamental covenant forms the theological basis of doctrine, no undeviating usage of the sense contained in language is constantly preserved, in brief, no correct and consistent Plan of Salvation, *preserving the promises to Abraham, to David, and to Christ*, can be successfully advocated. In this again, the Primitive Church shows its wisdom and logical consistency.

Obs. 13. The very coming of the Seed covenanted to Abraham, *insures* the fulfilment of the covenant *as written*. It is in view of this that He Himself is designated "*the covenant*," for He is the Fulfiller of it, and without Him it could not possibly be realized. Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho*, ch. 51) and others of the Fathers, who viewed the covenant in the light that we do, called Christ "the New Testament," meaning that in Him the covenant was confirmed and fully assured of ultimate fulfilment. The Advent of Abraham's Seed, then, is evidence *already* that the purposes of God expressed in that covenant are sure. Literally He came, vindicating the truthfulness of the covenant given many centuries before, and teaching us, if we will but receive it, that *every promise* will be literally verified.

Hence Paul in 1 Cor. 11 : 26, having directed attention to this covenant renewed in the blood of Jesus, immediately in connection points to the Sec. Advent as certain, and the means of fulfilment, thus: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."

Obs. 14. In the promises of the covenant are involved blessings, such as a resurrection from the dead, a perpetual inheritance, a constant presence and blessing of God, a Theocratic ordering intimated, etc., which to be secured in all their fulness, as the Divine Plan in its unfolding shows, demands a Mediator, a Sacrifice for sin, in order that those who believe unto obedience may be thus blessed. The death of Jesus becomes *a prerequisite* to the fulfilment of the covenant, for through this death, as Paul says in Heb. 9 : 15, all (in the past, present, and future) "*which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.*" By that death not only the power and majesty of moral law is vindicated, not only a never-failing proof of God's love and mercy is manifested, etc., but it constitutes Him *a worthy Messiah, a worthy Theocratic King*, tested and tried, acknowledged and accepted by the Father, able to save unto the uttermost, able to save from sin and death, able to verify the promises, able to secure the inheritors of the Kingdom, able to carry out the Divine Will in Redemption in ransoming from the grave and restoring, once forfeited but now covenanted, the blessings of an Edenic state. By His birth, death, and resurrection He is become the promised *immortal* David's Son; by the same He has given assurance to all men that He is "*the surety*" of the Abrahamic covenant, so that its words cannot fail; by the same He has

confirmed and ratified it, showing in the most impressive manner how it can be realized (embracing as it does an endless life and unchangeable happiness) in the justification, purification, and immortality that He graciously provides.

Obs. 15. How can we refuse to believe in the promises of a covenant, *sealed* by the blood of Jesus, *established* by His resurrection, and *confirmed* by His present exaltation? Yea, in *all* the promises; not merely in the Seed, it being said "to thy Seed," but in what is promised to this Seed. What faith does it require to receive *part* of the sentence and explain away *the remainder*, just as if God never intended that the remainder "*to thy Seed will I give this land to inherit*" should likewise be fulfilled? What faith is this, to accept of a portion literally and deny the remainder *when joined together by God Himself.* Because not yet realized, is that a reason that it never will be accomplished? Do men forget how long (humanly speaking) it takes for covenanted blessings to be realized, owing to the necessary preliminary measures? Let the Scriptures testify on these points, and with reverent, believing hearts *let us receive the same*, especially when a crucified and resurrected Abraham's Seed is given to us as *a pledge* of its ultimate and most happy realization. That Seed, as we shall show, is yet to exhibit a most triumphant Redemptive work in connection with His earthly inheritance.

Obs. 16. This enables us better to comprehend the passage in 2 Cor. 3 : 6 (already referred to at length, under Prop. 4, Obs. 3): "Who has made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: *for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.*" Let the reader notice how the word "giveth life," "quickeneth," is directly applied *to the resurrection* in 1 Pet. 3 : 18 (comp. Barnes' admirable comment, *Com. loci*), and in other places; then let him remember how the covenant for its fulfilment necessitates a resurrection, and how Jesus has amply provided for the resurrection of His believers, and in the light of this renewed covenant the passage is easily understood.

Paul says that they are made sufficient, competent ministers or expounders of a renewed covenant (which remained after the Mosaic came to an end), not of the letter as Abraham received it and trusted in it, but of the Spirit, as it has been unfolded and ratified by the appearance of the Seed, His death and resurrection, etc.; for the mere letter, without this attestation and provision, killeth, i.e. it cannot give life because although Abraham and all the ancient worthies believed in it yet they all died without receiving the promise. Something more than the letter is required, and this is furnished in Christ whom Paul in the context calls "the Spirit." The Spirit giveth life, i.e. it insures the fulfilment of this covenant by the power of the resurrection (ch. 4 : 14), seeing that the dead can and will now be quickened. That this is the meaning of the apostle is evident from the use of the word "quickeneth," and by a comparison of chs. 1 : 9, 14, 20, 22, and 2 : 17 and 4 : 14 and 5 : 5, in the same epistle. It is wrong to decry, under the cloak of this passage, as worthless the literal meaning of the Word, and we can see how through a false interpretation of it (comp. Prop. 4, Obs. 3, etc.), the floodgates of professed spiritual interpretation have been opened, and the valuable treasures of God's promises so covered over with man's additions that they are unrecognizable. No! the apostle means that we now, in a covenant renewed by the blood of Jesus and by His resurrection from among the dead, have *immensely more* than the mere letter originally given and which in itself cannot save from death; for now we have the Spirit, which in the same chapter is said to be Christ, who "giveth life," i.e. fully ensuring to all who receive the promises that they by being also "quickened" shall inherit the covenanted promises. Christ is *the root* of the whole matter; without Him and His solemn ratifying

acts, the Abrahamic covenant would forever remain *a dead letter*. It is in Him, through Him, by Him, and for Him, that it is given, and proceeds to its final accomplishment.

Obs. 17. The blood of the covenant, i.e. the blood or sacrifice pertaining to or sealing the covenant, brings us, if received by faith, *into covenant relationship*. This is clearly announced in Eph. 2 : 13, "*But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ.*" Notice the train of the apostle's reasoning : (1) The Jews were nigh (v. 17), being already in covenanted relationship ; (2) the Gentiles who "were far off," i.e. not in such a covenanted position, are now, *when believing* (otherwise not), brought also "nigh," i.e. they too obtain an interest in the covenanted blessings ; (3) this covenanted attitude brings them into union and fellowship with the covenanted people of God, "the commonwealth of Israel ;" (4) and this, enjoying now the same privileges and hopes of the covenanted people, makes them co-heirs with the inheritors of covenanted promises ; (5) but to become this believing covenanted people, faith (leading to obedience) must be exercised in the sacrifice of Christ, through which provision is made for fulfilment of promises.

Obs. 18. The covenant being thus confirmed in Christ, we are not at liberty (as multitudes do) to select portions of it for belief, and reject others as unworthy of credence ; or, to accept of one part as literally fulfilled, and refuse such a literalness to the remaining ; or to receive the Seed and then disdainfully refuse, as "carnal, sensual, lowering," etc., the inheriting of the land. It is not to be *set aside* in any of its features ; it is not to be *limited* in any of its promises ; but it is to be received *in all* its statements, *as written*, without substitution, change, or addition. *It is God that promises*, not man.

Obs. 19. We Gentiles should be careful lest we fall into an error the reverse of the Jewish. The Jews at the First Advent believed in the covenant, but refusing to credit the fact that the covenant must be sealed with the blood of the Messiah, *they rejected* the Seed through whom alone the covenant can be realized. The error of many Gentiles now is, that while receiving the crucified One, *they reject* the covenant promises and do not look for their fulfilment, as recorded, on the ground that it would be "too Jewish" (comp. Prop. 68). The latter error, while not so fatal as the former, obscures the truth, and destroys the wonderful unity of the Bible.

Obs. 20. As we proceed in our argument, this covenant will pour a flood of light on many precious promises linked with it. Language, otherwise dark, becomes easy of comprehension ; dispensational procedures, otherwise dim and unaccountable, become precise and significant in their meaning ; the preaching of John, Jesus, disciples, and apostles, instead of being contradictory or accommodating to error, is found consistent. It explains much that enables us the more clearly to perceive and appreciate *a regular Divine Plan* in preparing for and ultimately establishing the Theocratic Kingdom under the Messiah. It tells us, as nothing else can, why the Gentiles must be grafted in, why "blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles is come in. And so all Israel

shall be saved, as it is written : *There shall come out of Zion a Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob, for this is my covenant with them.*" It, and it alone, as the outgrowths from it are developed, gives us a strict historical, providential, doctrinal, and Divine *Unity of Purpose* in the Word (comp. e.g. Props. 182, 184, 186, 187, 194, and 196).

Obs. 21. Persons under the influence of an entire New Covenant theory make the Gospel to begin with the Incarnation, or the death of Jesus, or the call of the Gentiles. But this is a mistake; for "the Gospel" is already contained in the Abrahamic covenant, so that (Gal. 3 : 8) God "*preached the Gospel before unto Abraham,*" and (Heb. 4 : 2) "*unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them,*" i.e. the Fathers, only that with a covenant reconfirmed, "the Gospel" is clearer in sound, and far more faith-inspiring. Now, instead of having the eye of faith solely directed to the future for the Seed as it once was, it is directed to the Seed as He came at the First Advent, and, hopeful at what it sees thus far, it looks onward to the Seed, glorified, as He shall come again.

Obs. 22. It seems almost unnecessary to add, and yet its importance will justify it, that this Abrahamic covenant *was always received by faith*, simple faith. Thus the Patriarchs, the ancient worthies, the Apostolic Fathers, and many others, have received it. It demands to-day *the same* simple, confiding faith exercised by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, only that, in view of what God has done to verify it through Christ, we are *less excusable* if we do not entertain such faith.

Alas! how little of *such* faith is prevalent. Reason and Philosophy linked with unbelief, cannot possibly comprehend the covenant, for it is united with the miraculous, the Supernatural. Hence its promises are idle dreams. But even professed believers are unwilling to believe and coolly ask, *how* this and that is to be accomplished, just as if no Omnipotent God had given the promises. Unbelief even, not seeing the connection of these promises with the Second Advent (therefore called "the blessed hope"), deliberately proposes to reject the doctrine of the Second Advent itself as an addition made by enthusiastic followers. Now the clamor is, to have everything demonstrated and leave nothing to faith. But this is fundamentally opposed to a Scriptural attitude and a Christian character. Science and unbelief joined may in fancied triumph and scorn ask, *how* this and that can be accomplished, and we may, like the Patriarchs, be utterly unable to explain, yet this should not prevent us from clinging to a covenant rendered the more credible and estimable, the more worthy of faith and hope, by the death and resurrection of Jesus, and the earnest of blessing that we receive. Brethren, fellow-Gentiles, it is as true to-day as it ever was, that "*salvation is of the Jews ;*" and if, owing to their fall, we have been brought in by faith, let us exercise such faith in humble acknowledgment of our dependence on a covenanted people, lest we be "high-minded" (as Paul warns us Rom. 11 : 20), and also be cut off on account of our unbelief and being "wise in our own conceits." It is saddening to think how many ministers and churches there are, professedly believing and even pious and devoted to much truth, of whom it can be truthfully said, that they have no faith in "*the everlasting covenant,*" saving perhaps that in some spiritual way all the blessings are to be heaped on the Gentiles, or that all has been perfected at the First Advent so that it concerns us little.

Obs. 23. The doctrine of the Kingdom *presupposes* the covenants. Hence the New Test. Scriptures begin with taking the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants *for granted, as something well known and correctly apprehended.* These fundamentals of knowledge were so deeply rooted in the national faith, were so constantly the subjects suggestive of hopeful anticipations of future glory, that *no necessity* existed for their recapitula-

tion. Allusions to them, confirmatory teaching, a consistent harmony with their promises, is all that is required, and this is abundantly found in every writer.

Obs. 24. Let a peculiarity, attached to the fulfilment of this covenant, be deeply pondered, viz. : that in the history of a partial fulfilment in the past, it has *never yet* been so realized as to meet the natural wisdom of man, or to answer to the general anticipations of the period when thus fulfilled. Observe this procedure in the very beginning, when Abraham, contrary to all human expectations, raised up Seed in the covenanted line against the course of nature. And down to the miraculous birth of Abraham's pre-eminent Seed, all things were so ordered that they did not meet the expectations of the mass of the nation. The Advent itself, a strictly literal fulfilment, did not meet the hopes entertained by the Jews. The calling of the Gentiles, to raise up a seed unto Abraham, was a thing unanticipated. Judging from the writings of the Church, its expectations have been repeatedly disappointed, so much so that now men deliberately and unhesitatingly deny some of the most precious promises of the covenants, both relating to the Christ and His co-heirs, as e.g. the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom and the inheriting of the land. Analogy teaches us what prophecy distinctly announces, that at the period when this covenant is to be most amply fulfilled by the Christ who confirmed it, the multitude including the kings and nations of the earth, will be arrayed against it, will have no faith in its realization. This, alone, should make us *thoughtful and careful.*

Now, as illustrative of our position in general, we may give the views of two writers. Take e.g. Dr. Brown (*Com.* Rom. 11 : 29, to which special attention is invited because of his being Post-Millenarian and a writer against us), and he allows the connection of the covenant with the future conversion and restoration of the Jewish nation. He refers to the irrevocable nature of the Abrahamic covenant in view of the unchangeableness of God, as it applies to " the final destiny of the Israelitish nation," saying : " It is clear that *the perpetuity through all time of the Abrahamic covenant*, is the thing here affirmed. And lest any should say that though Israel, *as a nation* has 'no destiny at all under the Gospel, but as a people disappeared from the stage when the middle wall of partition was broken down, yet the Abrahamic covenant still endures in the spiritual seed of Abraham, made up of Jews and Gentiles in one undistinguished mass of redeemed men under the Gospel, the apostle, as if to preclude that supposition, expressly states that the very Israel who, as concerning the Gospel, are regarded as 'enemies for the Gentiles' sakes,' are '*beloved for the fathers' sake ;*' and it is in proof of this that he adds, '*For the gifts and calling of God are without* repentance.' But in what sense are the now unbelieving and excluded children of Israel 'beloved for the fathers' sakes?' Not merely from ancestral recollections, as one looks with fond interest on the child of a dear friend for that friend's sake (Dr. Arnold)—a beautiful thought, and not foreign to Scripture in this very matter (see 2 Chron. 20 : 7 ; Isa. 41 : 8)—but it is from ancestral *connections and obligations*, or their lineal descent from, and oneness in, *covenant* with the fathers with whom God originally established it. In other words, the natural Israel—not 'the remnant of them according to the election of grace,' but *the nation*, sprung from Abraham according to the flesh—*are still an elect people, and as such* '*beloved.*' The very same love which chose the fathers and rested on the fathers as a parent stem of the nation, still rests on their descendants at large, and *will yet* recover them from unbelief, and reinstate them in the family of God." In a note (6), he adds : " God's covenant with Abraham and his natural seed, is *a perpetual covenant, in equal force under the Gospel as before* it. Therefore it is that the Jews as a nation still survive, in spite of all the laws which, in similar circumstances, have either extinguished or destroyed the identity of other nations. And therefore it is that the Jews *as a nation* will yet be restored to the family of God, through the subjection of their proud hearts to Him whom they have pierced." Then take a Pre-Millenarian : Fausset (*Com.* Jer. 31 : 31) says of this passage, which so many apply

to a present fulfilment: "The new covenant is made with *literal* Israel and Judah, not with *the spiritual* Israel, i.e. believers, except secondarily, and as grafted on the stock of Israel (Rom. 11 : 16–27). For the whole subject of chs. 30 and 31, is *the restoration* of the Hebrews (ch. 30 : 4, 7, 10, 18, and ch. 31 : 7, 10, 11, 23, 24, 27, 36). With 'the remnant according to the election of grace' in Israel, the new covenant has already taken effect. But with regard to the *whole nation*, its realization is reserved for the last days, to which Paul refers this prophecy in an abridged form (Rom. 11 : 27)." Comp. e.g. Ezek. 36 : 26, 27, and context.

PROPOSITION 51. *The relation that the Kingdom sustains to "the covenants of promise," enables us to appreciate the prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom.*

All predictions, all promises, all preparative measures, relating to the Kingdom, are *based on*, and *result from*, these covenants. The prophecies constantly keep in view what God has covenanted and confirmed by oath, and enlarge and expand the same by amplification, explanation, etc. Therefore, to appreciate the utterances of the prophets, notice must continually be taken of *the foundation* upon which they are erected. To isolate them is to defeat one intent of prophecy, viz.: to instruct us in the manner by which God will *ultimately fulfil* His covenants and establish His Theocratic rule over the nations.

Obs. 1. The one covenant singles out Abraham and his seed, and, in the words of another (Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 189), "*linked indissolubly with it the better destinies of the world.*" The other covenant promises the same Seed, narrowed down in the Davidic line, *a specific throne and Kingdom* from which "the better destinies of the world" are secured. This connection is observed by the prophets, and is held up *so prominently* that many writers (however they explain it) have designated it as "*the Abrahamic* type," or "*the Davidic* type." Whatever additions are made to these two (really one, as the latter is only an amplification of the other in one of its aspects, or rather, perhaps, an outgrowth preparatory to a realization of the other) covenants, they spring from them as from *a root*, and give ample evidence of *the vitality* of the covenants sending them forth, and consequently afford additional assurances of a continued development toward *completeness*.

Hence, in interpreting prophecy, it should be observed how it is founded on, and united with, the covenants; and any interpretation, however plausible, which militates against them, which contradicts or changes their promises, *should at once be discarded* as of foreign origin. For it is unreasonable to suppose that God will invalidate the most solemnly given of all His revelations, or that the Spirit will deliberately contradict Himself in His utterances. Therefore, e.g., all applications of prophecy which do not incorporate *as fundamental* the restoration of the Jews, is radically defective, simply because it makes the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant an utter impossibility. To rid ourselves of the covenant, and the prophecies relating thereto, by spiritualizing, etc., is unworthy of faith in God's promises.

Obs. 2. God *is jealous* of His covenanted Word, and after having confirmed it by oath, by the sending of His Son, etc., He presents it in a form, through additional revelation, admirably adapted *to test the faith* of His people. Much of it, the most precious portion of it, the distinctive features of it, still belong to the future and are dependent upon the Sec.

Advent of Jesus, the Messiah. Hence the predictions of the Old and New Test., unless viewed in the light of the covenant, *cannot* be duly apprehended. They only form additional links to a previously forged chain, and the places in which they fit must be found and matched. God having supplied the material, and given the key for placing them in the covenant, is pleased with *the faith that honors* His oath-bound Word.

Obs. 3. We see *the fatal mistake* of those systems of Biblical and Systematic Theology, which *entirely ignore the Davidic covenant.* The Abrahamic covenant, probably, obtains the merest mention; the Davidic is not noticed, although *confirmed as strongly* as language can make it; and both are practically discarded for the most elaborate theories concerning covenants of grace (just as if there were not such)—covenants made some time in the ages of eternity, etc. The result follows, that these covenants, being more or less (especially the Davidic) deemed unessential to the development of doctrine, *a one-sided, defective system* arises, lacking unity; and, in addition, a large portion of Scripture relating to these covenants, particularly prophecy, is either passed by without incorporation, or else so spiritualized that it may somehow fit into the hypothesis.

To whom are we indebted for a departure so wide from the Scriptural standard? Need we wonder, when the Bible testimony is so much ignored, that men to-day are afraid to adopt its covenanted language; that the early Patristic Theology is cast aside as too "carnal;" and that the doctrine of the Kingdom is covered with a heap of rubbish, the accumulated work of Alexandrian philosophers, monks, Popish schoolmen, mystics, etc., who could not make these covenants blend with their systems. Is it not true, that if a man were to present the Davidic covenant and the Scriptures relating to it, and the hope to the world contained in it, to almost any congregation throughout the land, he would be regarded, such is the ignorance on the subject, as foolish in his belief and as weak in his intellect? What has caused this change, and who are responsible for it? Let us repeat: it is *a fundamental defect* in any professed system of Biblical truth, when it endeavors to give an exhibit of doctrines of God and of Christ without incorporating as *living roots* those blessed, precious "covenants of promise." Instead of erecting new foundations and building on them, we have them *already* laid and built upon in the Word.

Obs. 4. The Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2 : 20). This includes, of course, their teaching and the doctrines pertaining to Christ. Nothing is fundamental in the Christian system which cannot be found in their writings, and this embraces a knowledge of the Old Test. as well as of the New, and particularly the things relating to Jesus Christ.* Now, the great theme of both the prophets and the apostles, and which appertains so largely to Jesus, is that of the *Messianic Kingdom*, and this is specially contained in the Davidic covenant and the prophecies resulting from the same found in the Old and New Testaments.

Obs. 5. The rejection of these covenants in their totality, and a resultant spiritualistic conception of the Kingdom, with a consequent

* To indicate that we do not force a meaning, we leave one of our opponents give us the intent or spirit of the passage. Thus Barnes, *Com. loci*, says: "That is, the doctrines of Divine revelation, whether communicated *by prophets or apostles*, were laid at the foundation of the Christian Church. It was not founded on philosophy, or tradition, or on human laws, or on a venerable antiquity, but on the great truths which God had revealed."

mystical treatment of the prophcies, lead some of our most eminent writers to present utterly unwarranted doctrinal constructions.

We append several additional (comp. e.g. Prop. 50, III., Obs. 10, 12, etc.) illustrations. Dr. Meyer (*Com.* Matt. 3 : 2) says : "With Christ and the apostles the idea of a Messianic Kingdom is not national but universal, i.e. so that the participation in it is not conceived as depending on a connection with Abraham, but on faith in Christ." Here is a mixture of things which, as joined together, are misleading. *Why* did Christ and the apostles at first confine themselves to the Jewish nation, if the Kingdom was not national? (Comp. Props. 54 to 69.) If there is no connection with Abraham, *why* accounted as his seed, inherit with him, etc.? (Comp. note to Obs. 10, under third division of Prop. 50.) The Kingdom, the Theocracy, is first national as covenanted, but this forms the basis, as the prophets predict, from which *it will be* extended into a universal dominion. The inheritance of David's Son forms *the groundwork* of the universal Theocratic reign. While it is true that Gentiles, all believers, inherit the Kingdom because of faith in Jesus Christ, yet it is also true that the promises *remain covenanted* to Abraham and his seed, and that it is by this very faith they become (are adopted as) his seed and thus inheritors. It is *a sad mistaking* of "the hope of our calling" to deny "a connection with Abraham." However done by various theologians, it is, in fact, allowing one important truth to overshadow and obliterate another of great value. Again : Neander (*Life of Christ*, p. 20), in order *to get rid* of the Davidic covenant, with the prophecies pertaining thereto, informs us that David being a *type* of Christ, is a reason why Christ is sprung from the line of David. It is no reason whatever ; the valid reason lies in *the covenanted Theocratic promise*, that a Son of David should, at some future time, receive David's throne and Kingdom, etc. But the same author proceeds (*His. Plant. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 506, footnote) to tell us : "Paul himself, to the common Jewish idea of a Messiah belonging, as a descendant of David, peculiarly to the Jewish nation, who would never break through the forms of their Theocracy, in Rom. 1 : 3, 4, describes Jesus as the Son of God, who by natural descent belonged to thep osterity of David, but evinced Himself to be the Son of God in a powerful manner by His resurrection through the Holy Spirit ; that is, after His resurrection *He divested Himself* of all those peculiar, earthly national relations in which He appeared to stand as a native Jew of the family of David." One stands amazed at *such bold* interpretation (comp. e.g. Props. 81, 82, 84, 200, 203, 204, 122, etc.). What, then, becomes of the promises given to David, that his Son, "*according to the flesh*" (in His humanity, Acts 2 : 30, comp. with Rom. 1 : 3, etc.), should reign as David's Son on his throne? Besides, the Kingdom is never promised to the Son of God, but invariably to the Son of Man (Prop. 81), because it is not the Divinity but the Humanity that is brought into covenanted relationship with God. No ! the resurrection and the subsequent glorification *has not* stripped Him of His Humanity or of His earthly relations. They only qualify Him the better to carry out the promises relating to that Humanity. He is *to-day* David's Son, the covenanted Seed, who shall fulfil the promises. *To-day* He glories in the message that He sends us (Rev. 22 : 16), "*I am* (continues to be) *the root and offspring of David.*" Paul makes no such erroneous deductions, as Neander supposes ; far from it, as he unmistakably shows in the same epistle in the fulfilment of covenanted blessings. Such illustrations could be multiplied, but these sufficiently serve to show that if men once cast aside the covenants, *then*, their views of the Kingdom being antagonistic to those covenants, all Scripture, and even the person of Jesus, must bend to their preconceived theories.

Obs. 6. By observing this relationship of the covenants and of prophecy to the Kingdom, those erroneous deductions are at once removed, which writers of ability have drawn from *alleged* differences in the teaching of the apostles. One party, it is asserted, derive their Christianity from a Jewish covenanted standpoint ; and another, theirs from a form distinctive from the Old Jewish covenanted relation. This has led to a false distinction or classification, called the Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine Theologies. The simple truth is, that they all unite in *this renewed* covenant as *a central point ;* all insist upon our becoming engrafted among the covenanted people (the children of Abraham) through faith in Christ, and that all express their faith in, and hope for, *a realization* of the

covenanted promises through Jesus *at the Sec. Advent.* While there is some diversity in their manner of expressing truth, resulting from temperament, style, etc., instead of being in conflict with "the sure mercies of David," they are *unanimous* in holding up the original "everlasting covenant" confirmed by the death of Jesus (comp. e.g. Props. 187–191).

Obs. 7. One reason why so many Messianic predictions in the Old Test., especially in the Psalms, are explained away as relating to David, Solomon, Hezekiah, etc., arises from the fact that the prophecies do not agree with the writers' preconceived notions of the covenants and of a spiritual Kingdom. The *covenanted foundation* of the predictions is overlooked or perverted, and, of course, the superstructure is correspondingly untenable. Thus valuable Scripture is given up to unbelief. Even pious and able writers, who recognize such passages as Messianic, under the influence of the idea formed of the covenants and Kingdom, will call the very words given (as they admit) by God "very one-sided" (as e.g. Kurtz, *His. Old Cov.*, vol. 3, p. 438, on Balaam's prophecy), because they seem to them too earthly or too Jewish, forgetting that the Theocracy proclaimed pertains both to this earth and to the Jewish nation.

Obs. 8. The covenants *outline* the Plan of the Divine Purpose; prophecy partially *fills up and deepens* the lines thus drawn. Agreeing with Hengstenberg, Fairbairn, and others, that the prophets are not mere soothsayers to predict future events, and that their predictions are based on something higher than mere foretelling, yet we dare not go so far as they do in saying that "a mere knowledge of the future is itself a matter of indifference." The knowledge of the future is an important and essential element to a correct apprehension of the Plan of Salvation.

The prediction being a foreshadowing of God's purposes, must necessarily relate to the future; and as we value truth, all such information imparted, even the slightest, possesses great weight. They add to our knowledge of the covenants and Kingdom, and God Himself regards all such testimony, derived from a foreknowledge of the future, as evidence of inspiration, credibility, etc. Besides this, as our hopes all lay in the future, and the covenants upon which these hopes are based give the merest outlines, we need these extended and enlarged in order the better to appreciate them. A neglect of prediction, therefore, is a weakening of tendered strength and a diminishing of offered hopes. The covenants themselves, in their most precious aspects, relate to the future, and now for any additional information respecting them, we are dependent on that class of men to whom God by His Spirit vouchsafed a knowledge of the future. Prophecy thus becomes more than "a prediction of some contingent circumstance or event in the future, received by immediate and direct revelation;" for it is a communication or message from God, *a pre historic record of the Divine Purpose*, and if properly linked together *forms a continuous chain* of evidence, evincing the unity of the Divine Plan in establishing the Kingdom. To perceive this unity, so confirmatory to faith, a knowledge of the future is indispensably necessary; hence it is graciously given, that we may, beholding the future as present, see the unfolding of covenanted grace, realize the evidences of a prevailing Sovereignty of the Most High, and have excited within us faith, childlike trust, hope, and love.

Obs. 9. History does not become, as some make it, a measure of prophecy concerning the Kingdom; and hence, to make history accord with a notion entertained respecting the Kingdom, prophecy must be so spiritualized and explained as to correspond with the standard adopted. No! History is only *a witness* to the fact that the history of the Church and world, as it progresses, is foreknown to God, and that He orders all

things in such a manner that what He purposes to perform shall be *ultimately* accomplished. History, instead of being a measurer of that which so largely pertains to the future, only gives us *the assurance*, from the testimony of the past and present, that *all* God's predictions will be verified in actual accomplishment.

Thus e.g. it is predicted that at the close of this dispensation the nations of the earth shall be arrayed against the truth, the church shall be persecuted, etc. ; now those who live during or at that period will see history (i.e. fulfilment) *bearing witness* to the truthfulness of God ; and more, they, if believing and receptive of the testimony, will know, in the faith of additional predictions, that this arrogant union of the enemy is doomed to a terrible overthrow, and that, however victorious for a time, it cannot retard the Divine Purpose concerning the Kingdom. History may reliantly testify to fulfilment, but it cannot measure prophecy by the fulfilment, simply *because* the prophecy includes the foreknowledge of God, a divinely inspired Plan, covenants as its foundation to which it stands related, and Christ in His Theocratic ordering as its goal. Besides this, prophecy contains, indeed, that which becomes historical reality, not because God predicts and then causes or allows the fulfilment, but because He foreknows what will arise through the free agency of man and permits it, and yet, in view of such knowledge, provides means and agencies to counteract the evil and carry out His own purposes. Thus e.g. He foretells the successive beasts in Daniel, the beasts in Revelation, etc., and as the time arrives they respectively appear, but affirmative as they are and ever will be to the truth of prophecy, their naked history by no means exhausts the meaning of the predictions, which stand *related* to a progressive and ever-maturing Divine Purpose.

PROPOSITION 52. *The promises pertaining to the Kingdom, as given in the covenants, will be strictly fulfilled.*

This already follows from Props. 4, 21, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51. A covenant must, in the nature of the case, be understood by the parties to whom it is given; the language employed is that ordinarily used, so that the ideas intended may be accurately expressed. This has been shown under Prop. 48. In connection with the same, it is sufficient to say that a partial *literal fulfilment* in the coming of the Seed, should influence us to believe that the remainder will likewise be *thus verified.*

Obs. 1. Among the promises that remain unfulfilled, but which we claim shall be fully realized in their *plain grammatical sense,* one is selected that is either generally denied or totally explained away. We refer to the express, most explicit promise in the Davidic covenant (comp. Prop. 49, III.), that David's Son (viz. : Jesus Christ, as the Scriptures testify) should *personally occupy and reign on David's throne and in David's Kingdom,* i.e. He should appear as *the Theocratic King over the restored Theocratic Kingdom.* This possession of the Davidic throne and Kingdom is corroborated by the equally *precise* phraseology of the prophets and the angel, as e.g. Isa. 9 : 6–7, Jer. 33 : 14–16, Luke 1 : 30–33. That David himself expected *a literal fulfilment* of the promise is evident from his language which follows the giving of the covenant; and in this literal anticipation of the promise he returns thanks to God and praises Him for thus selecting *his house* for honor and in thus establishing *it for the ages, even forever* (2 Sam. 7 : 8, etc., 1 Chron. 17 : 16, etc.). It is presumption to suppose that David returned thanks, and thus prayed under *a mistaken idea* of the nature of the covenant. The reasons for a literal fulfilment follow in the next observation.

Luther on the Second Psalm (quoted by Dr. Seiss, *Last Times,* p. 254) uses language indicative of faith in the grammatical sense of the covenant, in a literal personal reigning of Jesus Christ on the throne of David, that we reproduce it. "Christ was appointed King upon *the holy Mount Zion.* This is *particularly* to be remarked; for the Holy Ghost mentions the *corporeal Zion,* that we may be assured that this King is divinely appointed, and is a real Man. . . . The Person and the place are appointed and made known. The Person is the Son of God, and He is King in Zion; that is, the Son of David, and the *heir* of David; and He who was promised to David to be the King *over the circumcised people* over whom David reigned. We are, therefore, to expect this man to teach in Zion, and to reveal Himself in Zion, because He is appointed of God to be King in Zion. . . . The eternal Father Himself crowned Him to be King of Zion, on Mount Zion, in the City of Jerusalem. . . . He is the Son of God, yet born a man corporeally, that He might receive *the throne* of His Father David, and rule in Zion." Even extravagance and fanaticism has attempted to cloak its enormities by using the covenanted language, as e.g. John of Leyden (with the Anabaptists at Munster, Michelet's *Life of Luther,* p. 234) was ordained to reign over the whole earth, professing (according

to a prophet who, 1534 announced it) "to occupy the throne of David"—the absurdity of which appears that no throne of David was ever at Munster (hence he spiritualized it to make it applicable), and the enormity is aggravated by assuming that which only belongs to Jesus the Christ.

Obs. 2. If the Davidic throne and Kingdom is to be understood *literally*, then all other promises necessarily follow; and as the reception of this literal fulfilment forms *the main difficulty* in the minds of many, a brief statement of reasons why it must be received, is in place. 1. It is *solemnly covenanted, confirmed by oath*, and hence cannot be altered or broken. 2. The grammatical sense *alone is becoming* a covenant. 3. The impression made on David, if erroneous, is *disparaging* to his prophetical office. 4. The conviction of Solomon (2 Chron. 6 : 14–16) was that *it referred* to the literal throne and Kingdom. 5. Solomon claims that the covenant was fulfilled in himself, but *only in so far* that he too as David's son sat on David's throne. Some from this wrongfully infer that the entire promise is conditional over against *the most express declarations to the contrary* as to the distinguished One, the pre-eminent Seed. It was, indeed, conditional as to the ordinary seed of David (comp. Ps. 89 : 30–34, and see force of "nevertheless," etc.), and if his seed would have yielded obedience, David's throne whould *never* have been vacated until the Seed, par excellence, came; but being disobedient, the throne was overthrown, and will remain thus "*a tabernacle fallen down*," "*a house desolate*," *until* rebuilt and restored by the Seed. The reader will not fail to observe that if fulfilled in Solomon, and not having respect unto the Seed, how incongruous and irrelevant would be the prophecies *given afterward*, as e.g. Jer. 33 : 17–26, etc. 6. The language is that *ordinarily used* to denote *the literal* throne and Kingdom of David, as illustrated in Jer. 17 : 25 and 22 : 4. 7. The prophets adopt *the same language*, and its *constant reiteration* under Divine guidance is evidence that the plain grammatical sense is the one intended. 8. The prevailing belief of centuries, a national faith, *engendered by the language*, under the teaching of inspired men, indicates *how* the language is to be understood. 9. This throne and Kingdom is one of promise and inheritance (Prop. 122), and hence refers not to the Divinity but *to the Humanity* of Jesus (comp. Props. 82–85). 10. The same is distinctively promised to David's Son "*according to the flesh*" to be actually realized, and, therefore, He must appear the Theocratic King as promised. 11. We have not the slightest hint given that it is to be interpreted in any other way than a literal one; any other is the result of *pure inference* (as will be shown). 12. Any other view than that of a literal interpretation involves the grossest *self-contradiction* (as seen in Obs. 3). 13. The denial of a literal reception of the covenant *robs the heir* of His covenanted inheritance (comp. e.g. Prop. 122). 14. No grammatical rule *can* be laid down which will make David's throne to be the Father's throne in the third heaven. 15. That if the latter is attempted under the notion of "symbolical" or "typical," then the credibility and meaning of the covenants are *left to the interpretations of men*, and David himself becomes "the symbol" or "type" (creature as he is) of the Creator. 16. That if David's throne is the Father's throne in heaven (the usual interpretation), *then* it must have existed forever. 17. If such covenanted promises are to be received figuratively, it is inconceivable that they should be given in their present form without some

direct affirmation, in some place, of their figurative nature, God foreseeing (if not literal) that for centuries they would be pre-eminently calculated to excite and foster false expectations, e.g. even from David to Christ. 18. God is faithful in His promises, and *deceives no one* in the language of His covenants. 19. No necessity existed why, if this throne promised to David's Son meant something else, the throne *should be so definitely promised* in the form given. 20. The *identical* throne and Kingdom overthrown are the ones restored. 21. But the *main, direct reasons* for receiving the literal covenanted language will be given under Props. 81, 122, 111, 112, 114, 117, 201, 203, 204, etc. These, in connection with the covenants themselves, make David's throne and Kingdom a requisite for the display of that *Theocratic* ordering which God has already instituted (but now holds in abeyance until the preparations are completed) for the restoration and exaltation of the Jewish nation (which is preserved for this purpose), for the salvation of the human race (which comes under the Theocratic blessing), and for the dominion of a renewed, curse-delivered world (the Theocratic arrangement making this possible and a realization). Such a throne and Kingdom *are necessary to preserve the Divine Unity of Purpose in the already proposed Theocratic line.* Thus early in our argument reference is made to this point, not so much to prove it as to direct the reader's attention to it, because it is *a goal* to which the path of Scripture *directly leads us*, as it led the Primitive Church.

Obs. 3. The reasons urged for a non-literal fulfilment must also be fairly presented, so that the reader may compare them with those given on the other side. Storr (*Diss. on the Meaning of the Kingdom of Heaven*) informs us that Christ's sitting on David's throne, etc., was verified by His descent from David, by His being born in David's land, by His claiming to be King of the Jews, and by His exhibiting, after His exaltation, the first fruits of His reign "within the ancient empire of David." But still feeling a deficiency—*for none of these things meet the covenanted conditions*—he goes on to say: "The throne of Christ cannot be called the throne of David *except figuratively*; inasmuch as that divine government over the Israelites which was transferred to David and his posterity as to the Sons of God, the King of the Israelites, was *a shadow and image* of the divine government over the universe, conferred upon that man who sprang from the stock of David, and who was much more truly the Son of God. Which being established, it follows that Christ sits *not* on the throne of David itself, but *on the antetype.*" And this showing that He "sits not on the throne of David," he calls "*a real succession to David's place.*" This is grounded on the assumption that some fulfilment of the covenanted promise is required, and this was the best that offered, viz.: to show that Jesus is *not* on David's throne, and that it is *not really* demanded, refuge being sought under another sense, i.e. a typical. But this is abundantly refuted, (*a*) by covenant promises containing, in the nature of the case, *no* typical promises (Prop. 48); (*b*) by *the personal antetypical* language of the covenant itself, promising a lineal descendant of David's to sit on *his* throne and establish *his* Kingdom *forever* (Prop. 49); (*c*) by *the direct connection* it sustains to the Jewish nation (Props. 47, 111–114, etc.); (*d*) by *the time*, as predicted, when it shall be realized (Props. 66, 68, 120, 121, etc.); (*e*) by overlooking *the postponement* of the covenanted Kingdom (Props. 54–76); (*f*) by *misapprehending the nature* of the

Davidic Kingdom as a real Theocratic Kingdom (Prop. 31); (*g*) by forgetting that it is "*the fallen down*" throne and Kingdom (which shows that it is no type) that is to be restored (Prop. 32); (*h*) by *mistaking the Divine Sovereignty* for the covenanted Kingdom (Props. 79, 80); (*i*) by *ignoring* Christ's inheritance (Prop. 122), and the distinctive features allied with its restoration, as e.g. place of manifested royalty (Prop. 168), a visibly manifested Theocracy (Prop. 117), pre-millennial Advent (Prop. 121), the visible reign of Jesus (Props. 131, 132, 133), etc. The fact is, that the language of the covenant does not fulfil the conditions of typical language, for the throne and Kingdom of David were already incorporated (Props. 28, 49) as *the real, undoubted Kingdom of God—a Theocracy.* There is *no* Scriptural authority for constituting it a type; it is *mere human inference,* because its language cannot otherwise be made to fit into a system or theory. It is *unreasonable* to make it a type, because it makes a throne *cast down* the type of an eternal one in heaven, and *David* a type of the Father, which is an unfit application, there being *no proper analogy* between them. Such a view entirely overlooks the important and essential fact, that this throne and Kingdom was covenanted, not to the Son of God (for it, in virtue of His Theocratic relationship, already belongs to Him as God, and no covenant is necessary), *but to the Son of Man* (comp. Props. 81, 82, 83). It is *sadly defective* in making the promises of such a nature, that pious Israelites, John the Baptist, and the disciples, were *deceived* by them, resting their faith and hope not in *a reality,* but in misconceived figures of speech, thus placing the Church before and at the First Advent in an *exceeding low state* of intelligence.

Horne's (*Introd.* vol. 1, p. 386) declaration concerning types is commended to the consideration of those who adopt this typical view: "But if we assert, that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing when *no such* prefiguration has been declared *by divine authority,* we make an assertion for which we neither have, nor can have, *the slightest foundation.*" To this it is alleged that Christ is called David, and hence David must be a type (others claim that it is mystical to make David mean Christ); but this does not follow, it being a common figure of speech indicative of Christ's occupying the station, etc., of David, being his *legal royal descendant,* as is seen in the line of emperors, occupying the throne of Cæsar, calling themselves Cæsars. The name itself is evidence of *the restoration* of the Davidic throne and kingdom, being appropriately, significantly, and forcibly applied to the Messiah. (Killen, in *The Old Cath. Church,* quotes from Bin. Council, 3, P. 1, 184, how even the "most religious" emperor, Constantine Pogonatus, was complimented as "a new David" whom "God raised up," etc. What men employ by way of flattery, God uses to designate the certain restored Davidic royalty.)

In view of the importance of this promise, and the persistent attacks against its literal fulfilment, we present additional remarks urged by others in opposition to our belief. Thus e.g. the strictures contained in *The Kingdom of Grace* embrace the following: (1.) That Christ "was King of the Jews, and, of course, *the rightful heir* of David's throne, but never once did He set up any claim to the literal and material throne on which David sat." From this we are to infer that Jesus waived His right, and does yet. It is taken *for granted,* that since there has been no such a literal fulfilment, there *never will be one,* and that, therefore, the whole matter must be understood spiritually. That is, we are to do just as the unbelieving Jews did: because such a Kingdom has not appeared, we are to deny that He, "the rightful Heir," will ever establish it. Would it not be more prudent and wise to ponder over *the reasons* assigned for its postponement, Props. 66–68? (2) That David's throne was "in dust," and to raise it up would be "absurd." The absurdity is not in the promise of restoring a fallen throne, but in *the supposition* that the throne of a Kingdom is necessarily confined to a certain chair or seat. (3) Referring to Winthrop's Lectures, where it is stated (as all Millenarians hold), that risen, changed, glorified saints are rulers and princes in this Kingdom (comp. Prop. 154), and that it is of heavenly (being Theocratic) origin, established under heavenly power, it is replied,

that this involves a contradiction, because David's throne was *not* of heavenly origin, and risen saints were not its princes. This objection (more fully answered in succeeding Propositions) is set aside by the simple fact that the Theocratic-Davidic rule was *of heavenly origin* (Props. 28, 31), for God chose David, adopted his throne and Kingdom, calling it "*His throne,*" and gives it as an inheritance to the Seed selected by Himself, to which Seed He unites Himself in *the strictest Theocratic relationship;* and the re-establishment at the Sec. Advent is *not* by earthly *but heavenly power,* being done by Christ and His saints. The predictions of David, in the very nature of the case, imply an immortal Ruler. Change in the officials and government of a Kingdom does *not* destroy its identity, provided the regular succession (a descendant of David's), the nationality (restored Jewish nation), and locality (Palestine) are preserved. (4) Jesus refused to be made King of the Jews; now if the rightful heir and the covenant required it, He would have acceded to the wishes of the Jews. This objection overlooks the reasons assigned under Props. 57, 58, 65, 66, 67, and 68, that the nation, in its representative men, rejected Him and that the Kingdom was *postponed.* But a small and feeble proportion of the nation desired to make Him King; the *leading, ruling class* were persistent in refusing Him as the Messiah. (5) At His death Christ said "It is finished," and as many centuries have passed since that declaration and David's throne has remained vacant, it is evident that it will never be claimed in a literal sense. Here certainly *is* faith! If such argumentation (does it deserve to be called such?) can be admitted, *then,* as infidels do, we may deny all that is future, under the plea that "it is finished." The writer overlooks the plainly stated fact, that "*the times of the Gentiles*" (Prop. 66, etc.) must intervene before the claim is again made and realized.

Fairbairn (*On Prophecy*) reiterates some of the previous statements, insists upon the covenant being "figurative and symbolical," saying: "that He was destined to occupy the throne and Kingdom of David, meant simply, that He was, like David, to hold the place of King over God's heritage, and to do to the full what David could do only in the most partial and imperfect manner—bring deliverance, safety, and blessing to the people of God." If this was *all* that is meant, *why conceal it* then under a form of expression which *deceived* the Jewish nation and the Primitive Church? *Why* identify it with a restored fallen throne and a restored punished Jewish nation? *Why* so concisely link together David's throne, Kingdom, people, land, and explain that it is only to be realized when the same shall be restored from a downfallen, ruined, and desolate condition continued on through the allotted "times of the Gentiles?" The idea of Fairbairn's *is far* from exhausting its meaning, and the identification of the promise with other things (as e.g. the rebuilding of ruined, desolate cities, etc.) forbids such a transformation. The reasons that urge Fairbairn to the conclusion presented, are mainly two: first, that no other fulfilment than this can be found to have taken place, and, therefore, this one must be accepted to meet the necessities of the case; and secondly, that for Christ to descend from heaven and occupy David's throne as literally predicted would be a lowering or degrading of His dignity, position, etc. As to the first supposition: it is sufficient now to say that the non-fulfilment of the literal sense does *not prove* it to be false. Wisdom suggests that we *first* ascertain, before condemning it, whether it is not part of the Divine Purpose *to postpone* its fulfilment, just as He has postponed the restoration of the Jews. It took a long time before the Seed promised came and before His coming the non-fulfilment of what afterward literally occurred, was no reason to spiritualize the promise away; and so again, it may require a long period before the remainder is fulfilled. The truth is, that in considering this subject the Scriptures which teach the delay, the postponement, *are not allowed to testify.* (Comp. e.g. Props. 54–68). These essential witnesses, showing that delay, or postponement, is reconcilable with God's promises, *are not admitted,* and, of course, the view entertained must be one-sided. As to the second supposition: We are willing to accept covenanted promises and predictions *as written,* without setting ourselves up as a judge to decide whether they agree with *our* sense of proprieties, or *our* notion of the fitness of things. (Comp. Prop. 203, where this objection is considered.) The Jews did this at the First Advent, and they made *a fearful mistake.* Those who, honestly but mistakenly, speak so degradingly of this throne and Kingdom forget that it is *a Theocratic* throne and Kingdom (Prop. 31), and they might just as well write of God lowering His majesty, etc., *when He condescended* to act in the capacity of earthly Ruler over the Jewish nation. Even if we had no Scripture to show that such a reign was *an exalting* of the Humanity of Jesus, that it stood intimately related to *the perfection* of His work as Redeemer, that the Redemption of the saints, the Jewish nation, the Gentiles, the race as a race, and the groaning, sin-cursed world, is embraced in it (comp. e.g. Props. 196, 197, 200, 202, etc.)—even if these glorious and ennobling things were not recorded, we would not permit our faith in such promises to

waver, but with these added it would be folly for us to deny them. The misapprehension here probably arises from thinking that Jesus must lower Himself to be "a King on the earthly model of David." He was a Son of David's, but yet far more than a Son, even David's Lord (being God-man—i.e. having in His own Person the real Theocratic Rulership united), and hence the promises (while including as a central point the restored Davidic throne and Kingdom) in view of His immortality, His attendant Rulers, the greatness and power of His administration, the extension into universal dominion, the splendor and majesty of His person and surroundings, the Supernatural exerted and manifested, the wonderful works performed, have the same Theocratic-Davidic throne *immeasurably augmented and glorified*—to subserve certain purposes—when once occupied by this august Theocratic Personage. Prophecy unites in asserting *the greatness* of this reign in exulting strains. It is not in *our* place to say that these things *cannot* take place without Christ's descending to the level of an earthly monarch, or without a diminution of His majesty, lest, peradventure, we be found underrating, disparaging, despising, and even sneering at *His glory*. God's work is "*a strange work*."

Then there are others (as e.g. *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1861, Art. 5) who acknowledge that such a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom is promised, was entertained by the Jews, etc., but utterly reject it on the ground of its being *Jewish* imagination, partialism, and national pride. The prophetic descriptions are indeed sometimes grand, but merely poetic; sometimes sublime, but altogether human. (Every writer of this kind is very careful not to inform us *how* "Jewish partialism and pride" could conjoin with this so much that is humiliating and degrading to the nation—as e.g. the long fall of the nation, remaining under Gentile domination, etc.—preliminary to the Kingdom.) We give one extract, taken from the review mentioned, as illustrative of *the spirit* of those who speak of this matter as "a Messianic fiction," or as "a Christianized Messianic expectation." Thus, the writer declares the Apocalypse "proclaims to all ages the intense reality, the frenzied fanaticism, the splendid superstition, and Berserker transport, of one great dreamer of this glorious vision, the St. John of Patmos, the author of the Christian Apocalypse." From persons who treat the reign of Christ and of His saints in this condemnatory strain, no favor need to be anticipated in behalf of *covenanted* promise. To them it is simply an idle dream or Jewish enthusiasm.

Eminent men (as e.g. Lange, *Bremen Lectures*, Lect. 8, p. 242) make the Theocracy a figure or type of a concealed, invisible Kingdom in the church. But the reader can readily see that this is disproven by the predictions that *the same kingdom overthrown* shall be re-established; by its *covenanted relationship* which forbids any such transmutation; and even by the fact that no correct antetype exists if such an invisible Messianic Kingdom is admitted, for the one was a *real* outward Theocratic Kingdom, and this one is invisible and hence unrecognizable; the one had God an accessible Ruler to consult in cases of difficulty, this one has a God not thus accessible, etc. But we need not repeat what has been said previously.

Obs. 4. No sophistry in spiritualizing, symbolizing, or typicalizing *can transmute* the promise of the Davidic throne and Kingdom into something else, as e.g. into the Father's throne, the Divine Sovereignty, the Kingdom of Grace, Gospel Dispensation, etc., for the simple reason that *the identical* throne and Kingdom, *now overturned, is the one that is promised to the Messiah to be re-established* by Himself, as e.g. Amos 9 : 11, Acts 15 : 16, Zech. 2 : 12, Zech. 1 : 16, 17, etc. (with which compare Props. 33, 122, etc.). The Theocratic crown *cast down*, the Theocratic throne *overturned*, the Theocratic Kingdom *overthrown*, is *the* crown, throne, and Kingdom that the Christ *is to restore*. These *belong* to Christ by "*right*" (Ezek. 31 : 25–27), and will be "*given to Him*" (Prop. 83). These, too, are *linked with* a restoration of the Jewish nation, Jer. 33 : 14, Micah 4 : 6, 8, etc. (Props. 111–114). These *facts*—the existence of the throne at one time, its non-existence for a period, its restoration again, its connection at the restoration with the ancient people and land that formed the original Kingdom—*these facts*, as well as many others that will be brought forward, indicate, as *fully as language can possibly express it*, that the ancient faith in covenanted language *must not be discarded* through Gentile "high-

mindedness." The entire tenor and analogy of prediction *unmistakably proves this;* and, therefore, without an express declaration to the contrary, we ought not, dare not, *change the sense* that is given. Let men ridicule and sneer at our infirmity; it is the sense *contained* in the language, and we can *wait* for God's own time of vindication and verification.

Obs. 5. The Divine nature of the Davidic Kingdom is admitted by Storr, Fairbairn, and others. So that our opponents confess, what has already been proven (Props. 28, 31, etc.), that David sat upon "*the throne of the Kingdom of Jehovah.*" It was truly *a Theocratic Kingdom;* and this *Theocratic basis* is the reason why God takes such an interest in its re-establishment. It is Christ's "inheritance," because it is *Theocratic;* and it is this Divine aspect which makes it, as represented, *worthy* of the Son of Man.

Obs. 6. Adhering to the Primitive faith we can consistently explain, what Reuss (*His. Ch. Apos. Age,* p. 32) finds, from his standpoint, a difficult matter, viz.: "that the predictions and hopes of the prophets are *invariably associated* with *the earthly and political* existence of the nation, and that they *never,* in their most ideal representation of the future, break through the circle of conditions belonging to that existence." These are *honest, frank* words, and we firmly hold to them, asking, *Why seek to break through that circle of conditions now?* Do they not still exist in *the Theocratic* ordering? Does the calling of the Gentiles *alter or invalidate them?* We shall presently see, in the preaching of the Kingdom, etc., that the covenanted relationship of the Jewish nation *imperatively* demands it.

Obs. 7. This feature again reminds us that "*the keystone* of the whole system" (i.e. Millenarian) is not to be found, as Prof. Sanborn (Essay on Mill.), in the pre-Millennial Advent (however indispensable), but *in the covenants.* The promises are not in the Sec. Advent, but in the covenants and prophecies based on them; the Advent being only *the necessary means* toward their accomplishment.

Obs. 8. Many persons, aside from infidels who ridicule this Davidic throne and Kingdom, and the precious promises linked with them, through mistaken zeal, or a conscientious desire to vindicate the Word spiritualized, or mere passion engendered by controversy, employ *the most slighting* language respecting this throne and Kingdom. They insist that it "*must be*" spiritually comprehended, or else it is utterly unworthy of belief, being "*carnal,*" "*fleshly,*" etc. They gravely tell us—overlooking its Theocratic basis founded by God Himself—that it is *impossible* that *such* a Kingdom should be manifested, because of Christ's relationship to the Almighty.

If it "*must be,*" *why* does not the grammatical sense sustain them, and *why* are they left to *infer* it? *Why* do they practically ignore the Humanity of Jesus and lay all stress upon the Divinity, not noticing that this Kingdom is given to David's Son, the Son of Man by covenant, and that the Divine is superadded to the Human, thus rendering His reign more exalted, glorious, and necessarily Theocratic? *Why* do they not observe, what all the prophets declare, that the Davidic is used as the leverage or foundation of Christ's world-wide dominion? *Why* not see that this Kingdom is *one exclusively of prom-*

ise, and is given to the Man Jesus, and has no reference, *as covenanted*, whatever to the Divine Sovereignty lodged in the Godhead? *Why* not notice that this Kingdom is Divine as well as Civil—*a perfect, complete Theocracy?* If these, and kindred points, were observed, it seems to us "impossible" for a student of the Word, who reverently approaches it and earnestly desires its teachings, to speak and write *so disrespectfully* of the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, or to denounce as "impossible" the Theocratic arrangement that God has mercifully acknowledged. Even if influenced to dissent, the same ought to be expressed in guarded language, not denunciatory of that which Holy Writ contains in its grammatical sense. Prudence, to say nothing of higher motives, dictates this course.

Obs. 9. The extremely guarded language of Scripture on this point, so as not to conflict with the covenanted promise, should lead the student to reflection. Thus e.g. in Rev. 3 : 21 two thrones are mentioned, the Father's throne and Christ's throne, and these are distinguished the one from the other (Prop. 117). In Christ's typical triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when the people exclaimed (Mark 11 : 10), "*Blessed be the Kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest,*" Jesus, instead of rebuking *the identification* of His Kingdom with the restored Davidic, virtually allows it by defending the disciples against (Luke 19 : 39, Matt. 21 : 15, 16) the displeasure of the Pharisees. In John 18 : 33, Jesus, in virtue of His Theocratic position, does not deny the affirmative of Pilate's question, "*Art Thou King of the Jews?*" although the circumstances might involve *the charge of treason* against the Roman power. In Matt. 19 : 28 the time of setting up the Kingdom is specified, etc. And thus through all the Scriptures, as will be shown hereafter, there is a carefully drawn distinction between what belongs to Jesus Christ because of His relationship as God, and what pertains to Him by promise, by right, by inheritance, by the redemptive work that He is accomplishing because of His Messiahship *as David's Son*, the promised Theocratic King.

Obs. 10. Having all along the literal, plain grammatical sense in our favor —a sense that excited faith and hope in multitudes of Jewish and Christian hearts—the reader ought reasonably to expect that we should constantly lay stress upon this admitted fact. There is no difference of opinion as to what meaning the words in their common usage convey; *this is conceded*, but the question is sprung, whether this sense is to be received or another is to be entailed. Considering the matter settled against a literal sense from its non-fulfilment, *is unworthy of a believer*, for God's sayings (as even unbelieving Jews have asserted, e.g. in professing to receive the Old Test. on the ground of its being God's Word) are to be received simply on the ground of their having *been given* by the Almighty. This matter of interpretation must be decided from a higher position, viz. : by direct reference to the Word itself (Props. 4 and 9), and just so soon as God declares that the grammatical sense is the one *not* intended, then, and *only then*, other engrafted senses may be tolerated.

Obs. 11. Regarding the intensely warning predictions that at the very time this Kingdom is to be re-established at the Sec. Advent (Props. 66, 74, 121, etc.), the nations of the earth shall have *so little faith* (Props. 177–180, etc.) that they shall stand arrayed against the King—disbelieving the promises pertaining to Him—it is *prudent and wise* to avoid that

prevalent spirit of unbelief taking this predicted direction in avoiding the literal and substituting another sense. We feel disinclined to foster such an antagonistic spirit, lest we too should receive the censure (Luke 24 : 25), "*O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken;*" and lest we become of those who, by insidious interpretation, *pave the way* for an utter denial of Christ's claims as David's Son and Theocratic Heir. Let the motive of denial be prompted by the best intentions, its fruit, if in opposition to the Divine Will, will result in evil.

It is sad to see the frailty and perversity of human wisdom in the things of God. The Jews believed in this restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, but overlooked the foretold sufferings, death, etc. of the Messiah; the Gentiles acknowledge the sufferings and death, but ignore the Davidic throne and Kingdom, the promises literally understood. The Theocratic-Davidic inheritance of Jesus is but rarely mentioned; it is scarcely ever heard in preaching or praying; it is deemed of so little importance that Christian teaching hardly refers to it; and when reference to it is made, it sounds a note of discord in prevailing systems of theology. Let us ponder: *ought* promises so solemnly given, so constantly presented, so literally reiterated, so preciously confirmed, to be passed by *in neglect*, and even *in silence?* *Ought* they to become the objects of ridicule and reproach? No! to ignore them, or to mock them, is indicative of *serious* doctrinal defect.

Obs. 12. The assumption that David's throne and Kingdom must denote some other throne and Kingdom in the third heaven never meets the contradictions that it involves, viz.: that David's throne, etc. was never in heaven, never extended over another world, and is not fitted from its *alleged* "fleeting earthly" condition to designate an eternally existing throne, and that if logically carried out (from which, however, our opponents recoil), then David's throne being "the Father's throne," where Christ is, David himself (for the throne is expressly identified with him) must also represent the Father! Who would be so rash as to adopt such an interpretation? and yet simple consistency demands it.

If the throne and Kingdom is typical, why not David also, with whom the same is *constantly cojoined?* But more than this: if only an enthronement in heaven is meant, why not say so at once, without leading multitudes into self-deception? Can any reason be assigned why such a matter, if contemplated, should be disguised under language eminently calculated to mislead? Would such a procedure be consistent with the professions and honor of the God of mercy and love? Why, if only this enthronement is denoted, express it in words, which fairly includes the idea of *a perpetuation* of the throne and Kingdom of David *here on the earth?* That this idea is contained in it no one denies, and so prominently too that David and his descendants, the Jews down to the First Advent, the disciples of Christ, the apostles (as e.g. admitted by Knapp, Fairbairn, etc., "up to the very eve, Acts 1 : 6, of Christ's departure"), and the early church, *all* entertained it. This assumption passes over this general, universal belief as if it were of *no moment*, and carefully avoids, as a tender point, all allusion to it; but we insist that it must be honestly met and candidly explained. This, we apprehend, will be a difficult task, seeing that the true church, the pious of centuries, and even the inspired of God, and men sent out to preach, are included *in such a faith;* and if held to be in error, then He who sent those messages must, in a great measure (owing to the grammatical sense containing it), become responsible for the introduction and perpetuation (for where is the reproof or denial?) of such alleged error. There is no escape from this dilemma; and alas, this is seen and felt by the infidel schools now in existence, who, fortified by the prevailing authority of believers, reject everything "*Jewish*" as untenable, pointing with delight to the doctrinal attitude (now so antagonistic to the church's present position) of the Primitive Church on the subject of the Kingdom (trusting in the literal sense of the promises), as an indication of gross error. Thus professed believers of the Word from assumptions plunge into strange inconsistencies, charging the entire ancient church with erroneous doctrine in *fundamental* things, and furnish the weapons, manufactured to hand, for Strauss, Baur, Renan, Parker, and others. The expectations and hopes of the ancient worthies are given up to derision and scorn, and the result is

that it recoils back upon the Bible itself, which in its language expresses and favors the same. The apologies tendered, which invariably reflect upon and lower the intelligence, etc., of the faithful, only make the inconsistency and antagonism more glaring. It is high time for reverent, intelligent piety to see this abuse of the Word, and aid in restoring its proper and faith-inspiring use.

Obs. 13. In the objections made to the Apocalypse by Schott and others, one is based on the fact that the royal dignity and honor is assigned to Christ as *the Son of David.* In addition to the arguments produced by Prof. Stuart (*Com.*) and others against the validity of such an objection, the strongest of all is found in this: that the covenant relationship of Jesus requires, *as confirmatory and essential,* just such references (Rev. 3 : 7, and 5 : 5, and 22 : 16), because as the predicted Seed of David He inherits David's throne and Kingdom, and hence his personality, as covenanted, must be distinctively observed. It is, therefore, both *reasonable and requisite* to find them in such a book.

The outgrowths of spiritualizing these promises run into the most painful evidences of complete ignorance of covenanted promises. The most extravagant and foolish vagary is found in Davis (*Seven Thunders*, p. 151 and 153), who makes Christ, at His Second appearing, "an American." This is equalled by several writers, who, also ignoring Christ's Davidic relationship and inheritance, make the Fifth Monarchy or Kingdom of Daniel the United States, (as e.g. Berg, etc). Such outrageous interpretation, violating the covenants and the general analogy of the Word, are not worthy of a serious rejoinder.

Obs. 14. The fulfilment of the covenant promises implies, in view of this restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, that the Messianic Kingdom is *a visible, external* Kingdom, not merely spiritual, although embracing spiritual and divine things. Its visibility, and a corresponding acknowledgment of the same, is a feature *inseparable* from the language of promise (comp. Props. 117, 112, 122, etc.).

Obs. 15. The covenanted Davidic throne and Kingdom, allied as it is with the Jewish nation (particularly with Judah and Benjamin), necessarily requires, in order to a future restoration, *a preservation* of the nation. This has been done; and to-day we see that nation wonderfully continued down to the present, although enemies, including the strongest nations and most powerful empires, have perished. This is not chance work; for, if our position is correct, this is demanded, seeing that without a restoration of the nation *it is impossible* to restore the Davidic Kingdom. The covenant language, the oath of God, the confirmation of promise by the blood of Jesus, the prophetic utterances—*all,* notwithstanding the nation's unbelief, requires *its perpetuation,* that through it finally God's promises and faithfulness may be vindicated. God so provides that *His Word* may be fulfilled. Every Jew, if we will but ponder the matter, that we meet on our streets is a living evidence that the Messiah will yet some day reign gloriously on David's throne and over his Kingdom, from which to extend a world-wide dominion.

PROPOSITION 53. *The genealogies of our Lord form an important link in the comprehension of this Kingdom.*

This is seen already from what preceded. A throne and a kingdom is to be given to a promised son of David, a regular descendant of Abraham's. It is his by right of inheritance. He is the royal Theocratic heir. Hence without such a genealogy something *essential* would be lacking in the chain of evidence.

Obs. 1. This link is purposely supplied, and with *special reference* to these covenants. This is observable in Matthew commencing his table by asserting that Jesus was "*the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,*" i.e. both covenants, the Abrahamic and Davidic, were thus realized in the person of Jesus Christ. Also in designating "*David the King,*" and omitting it in the descendants; the same expression is significant only when the royal covenant which made David's throne and Kingdom sure is taken into consideration (comp. Judge Jones's "Notes" on Matt., ch. 1, for some excellent suggestions). The Kingdom is covenanted to a legal descendant, and this legal descent is clearly traced, showing the legal, divine right of Jesus to the Theocratic throne and Kingdom.

Ebrard (*Gospel His.*, Div. 2, ch. 1) says of Matthew's genealogy: "In v. 16 it is described as that of *Joseph*. From this circumstance, as well as from the fact that it commences with Abraham; from the stress laid upon King David; from the frequent reference made to persons or events of theocratic importance; and lastly, from the division in three periods, the central one being that of *the theocratic line* of kings—we may clearly discern the intention of the author: not to give *the natural* pedigree of Jesus, but to prove that *He had a right to claim the theocratic crown*—an intention in *perfect harmony* with the general character of the Gospel. We have here also the true key to all the supposed difficulties." (It will repay the student to see how Ebrard applies this "key" in the solving of difficulties. He makes the genealogy of Luke to be that of Mary, giving the natural progenitors.) Lord Hervey (*The Genealogies of our Lord*) and Mill (*The Mythical Interp. of the Gospels*, ch. 2) hold that both genealogies are those of Joseph; the one (Matthew's) exhibiting *the legal* descent of the Christ from David; the other (Luke's), His *natural* descent through Nathan. Ernest von Bunsen (*The Angel Messiah*) takes the ground "that Jesus was not really a Jew by extraction. The descent of David from Caleb, the Kenezite, and thus from non-Hebrews, points to a connection with 'the strangers in Israel,' and this is confirmed by four female ancestors being non-Hebrews" (so also M. D. Conway in *Cin. Commercial*, May 31st, 1879). But suppose all this were admitted, it does not effect His descent whatever, provided there is a continuous intermingling of Jewish blood. Besides, these objections overlook the fact that such engrafted ones were by the Hebrew laws fully incorporated, and recognized as legal members of the nation.

Obs. 2. If the Saviour was merely to descend from David, to take human nature in that line for the purpose of redemptive work at the First Advent, and then that was to be the finale of the matter, *why* lay so much stress on descent from *the royal line?* Does the mere notion of identification meet the point why one table should be exclusively given to designate

His legal right to the throne? This certainly must have some *very significant* meaning, for God does not put His descent in such a form without some weighty reason underlying it. If we accept of the covenant just as it reads, without alteration or substitution of sense, then *a forcible reason* appears for being so minute. On the other hand, if David's throne is God's throne in heaven, no satisfactory reason can be assigned for so strange a peculiarity. What difference, on the latter supposition, was it then, whether Jesus was, or was not, *the legitimate Heir* to David's throne, if He was *never* to occupy it? Why should *special* stress be laid on that which, if we are to credit the multitude, God *never* intended to fulfil? We, therefore, hold that there is a solid, sublime reason why those tables, so uninteresting to many, are given, viz.: not merely to identify Jesus as the Saviour, but to identify Him as the One, *the Messiah*, who has *the lawful right* to David's Theocratic throne. The throne is not typical, not representative, not symbolical, but *actually and really covenanted* to this Heir, and hence the tables truthfully and actually show how by course of descent *He is the rightful Heir* (comp. Prop. 122).

Clelland (*Bib. Sacra*, Ap. 1861) denies that the promise to David concerning his seed (2 Sam. 7 : 12 ; Acts 2 : 30 and 13 : 23 ; Rom. 1 : 3) demands for our Lord *a natural descent* from David through His mother Mary. His reasoning, highly speculative, is satisfied with a simple humanity, supernaturally attained, and the relationship to David established through Joseph as a legal son. Thus, being the seed of David according to the flesh, means only, according to this writer and others, to be legally regarded as David's Son, but not virtually or naturally. This is an error *specifically* contradicted by the Scriptures, which expressly declare that this seed shall spring out of his loins, etc. Our position is sustained by the Word, which requires *a natural and legal descendant* according to the covenant and promises. Men may think, honestly, to exalt Jesus by such theories, but they virtually degrade Him as *the covenanted*, predicted Christ. We turn from such writers to others, who refresh us by maintaining a Scriptural attitude. Thus Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 279) remarks: "The difference between the two genealogies is most easily explained by referring to the particular object which each evangelist had in view in commencing to write. It was the main object of Matthew, when he composed his Gospel, to demonstrate that Jesus was the Messiah promised in the Old Test. ; it was, accordingly, incumbent on him to furnish the evidence that Jesus was *the lawful heir and successor* to whom the royalty of David belonged, and that the fundamental prophecy in 2 Sam. 7 was thus fulfilled. In accordance with his leading design, he necessarily showed the legal connection (derived from the laws of inheritance) of Christ with the house of David in the line of Solomon. If this descent, although fixed by the laws, did not coincide with Christ's descent after the flesh, the latter was passed over, and the former was set forth as entitled to recognition. As Luke wrote for Christians who proceeded from the Gentile world, no necessity existed for giving prominence to that line of succession which was valid in law in a theocratical point of view ; it was, on the contrary, far more important, in accordance with his main object, to set forth Christ's true descent *according to the flesh.*" We affirm, in the light of covenant and prophecy, that *both* tables are a necessity—hence given—in order that *both* the natural and the legal descent be presented, for *both* are claimed as pertaining to the Messiah. We reproduce another: "Greybeard" (Graff), in his "*Lay Sermons*," No. 94, says: "Matthew, writing of Christ as *the rightful heir* to Abraham's land and David's throne, very properly reproduced the lineage of Joseph, the lawful husband of Mary, while Luke, in portraying His history as the seed of the woman, traces the genealogy of His mother not merely to Abraham, but to the first human pair. Lest the captious take exception to this construction as involving a fraud on the part of Matthew in order to establish His Lord's rightful heirship *as a descendant* of David, it must be observed that the genealogies of both Joseph and Mary unite in David." In a footnote he adds, respecting Luke's: "In reading this passage it will be observed that the words 'the Son' (being in italics) are merely supplied, and do not appear in the original text. Joseph was the son-in-law of Heli, not 'the son.' In that sense he was of Heli. So (in the 38th verse) Adam was of God, but not 'the son' of God. No human being ever was the *the son* of God until after Christ's resurrection, Luke 3 : 23-28." So Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com.* Luke, p. 63)

says : " The often-contested descent of Mary from David is raised above all possibility of refutation by the genealogy of Luke. The Lord Jesus was therefore naturally, as well as legally, descended from David ; and this descent is with perfect justice made prominent by both Peter and Paul (Acts 2 : 30 ; 12 : 23 ; Rom. 1 : 3 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 8) ; while Jesus designates Himself the Son of David, Mark 12 : 35-37."

Obs. 3. Without entering into a discussion of the genealogies, which is ably performed by others,* it is sufficient to confine ourselves to the fact, fully admitted, that Jesus, according to Matthew, is a legal successor to the throne of David. Lord Hervey and others show this ; for His descent is traced through a line of kings or their legal descendants, whilst Luke's table proceeds more on the principle of tracing His descent through progenitors who were the paternal stem of Him who was the heir. By this, and other considerations, the anomalies of the two pedigrees are fully explained. Now, seeing that the promise has been *so literally* fulfilled in Christ's descent, in His being the legal Heir to the throne and Kingdom, we hold that such a fulfilment gives us *the strongest* assurance that *the remainder* of the promise will likewise, in God's ordering and time, be realized.

This descent from David was not called into question during the life of Christ, and for some time after His death it passed unchallenged, although most conspicuously affirmed. It was long after that it was questioned by unbelievers ; it has been attacked by the English, French, and German infidels ; and more recently it has been repeated by Renan and others, that Jesus is not descended from David, but that He endeavored, in order to carry out His purposes, to make the impression that such was His descent. Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 217), as usual, sets himself up as infallible judge, and elevates mere conjectures into facts. To make out that the family of David was extinct because Asmonean princes ruled ; to attempt to prove the same because Herod and the Romans did not dream of such a representative of the ancient dynasty living ; to speak of " innocent frauds," of his birth at Nazareth, etc., is simply indicative of a preconceived prejudice and a desire to prejudge the case. But when he tells us that Jesus " never designated Himself with His own lips as the Son of David " (over against His quotations and accepting of the name, as e.g. Matt. 9 : 27 ; 12 : 23 ; 15 : 22 ; 20 : 30-31 ; Mark 10 : 47, 52, and 12 : 35-37 ; Luke 18 : 38), we instinctively feel a spirit of dislike and hatred to the truth underlying such statements. To all those objections it will suffice to say : (1) That a pedigree regularly presented at a time when genealogical tables were carefully kept, and passing by unchallenged and unprotested even by the bitter enemies of Jesus, must be taken as better evidence of truthfulness than the mere conjectures of later ages ; (2) That if there was a discrepancy or untruth, as alleged, the Jews would only have been too glad to avail themselves of the same ; (3) that the apparent disagreement between the two pedigrees has been reasonably and satisfactorily explained by those (note 1) who have given the subject special attention ; (4) the claim set up by Jesus is confirmed by His words, life, works, death, resurrection and exaltation ; (5) if the first link in the chain were missing, the rest could n t be attached to it, but seeing a necessary connection, promise and prediction verified, the matter of descent assumes its due importance in a completed chain of evidence to the Messiahship. It may be well to observe here that Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 392), correctly noticing that the genealogy of Jesus was given " to prove the right of Christ to the title of Messiah" as the promised Son of David, and that great stress was laid upon His humanity, then adds,

---

* See Lord Hervey's *Genealogies of our Lord*, the commentaries of Olshausen, Lange, Meyer, etc., Smith's *Bib. Dic.* and *N. Test. His.*, Kitto's *Journal of Sac. Lit.*, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, *Evang. Review*, vol. 4, p. 168, *Bib. Sacra*, vol. 18, p. 410, *Meth. Quart. Review*, vol. 11, p. 593, and the writings of Beeston, Cochrane, Green, Horne's *Introd.*, Gresswell's *Diss.* Morris, Sympson, Birks, Watson, etc. Numerous writers have more briefly but satisfactorily referred to the same, as Judge Jones (*Notes*), Dr. McCosh (*Christi.* and *Positiv.*), Farrar (*Life of Christ*), Kurtz (*Sac. His.*).

that it must have had little value in the estimation of those who made Him divine. This is not correct so far as the Primitive Church is concerned, for they clearly and distinctly announced their faith and hope in the promises made to the Son of Man, and hence in David's Son as the promised Theocratic King. (Comp. Props. 81–83, and 74–78). It was later, under Alexandrian and Popish influence, that the Humanity was ignored in a great measure for the Divine.

PROPOSITION 54. *The preaching of the Kingdom by John, Jesus, and the disciples, was confined to the Jewish nation.*

This *necessarily* follows as a sequence from preceding Propositions (as e.g. Props. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 31, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49). It is plainly stated in Matt. 10 : 5, 6 and 15 : 24, etc., "*Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, as ye go preach, saying: the Kingdom of God is at hand.*" "*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*" These, and other intimations, are sufficiently distinctive of the fact.

Obs. 1. The special covenant to Abraham and renewed in David, the election of the nation, the very nature of the Kingdom — Theocratic-Davidic—allied with the Davidic throne and Kingdom, and hence the confinement of the Kingdom in its re-establishment to the descendants of Abraham in their national capacity, *demanded such a restriction* of the distinctive offer of the Kingdom to the Jews. It could not possibly be otherwise, unless God *violates* His solemnly pledged Word. So carefully does the Sacred Record guard this restrictive feature—*necessary* in the very nature of the case—that the only time Jesus left the Jews for Samaria, John *apologizes* for the same by urging its necessity (John 4 : 4), informing us, "He must *needs go* through Samaria," i.e. His direct route lay through it.

Obs. 2. For some reason, a decided and exclusive preference is given to the Jewish nation. *Why is this?* If, as persons now so confidently assert, there is nothing in being a Jew, a real descendant of Abraham's, how comes it at this crisis, that, when the Kingdom is preached, express charges and admonitions are given *to avoid* the Gentiles? Simply and solely because by the promise made to Abraham, by their previous Theocratic relationship, and by their national adoption in the Davidic covenant, the Kingdom that was preached, viz. : the restoration of the Theocratic-Davidic, *belonged, as per covenant, exclusively* to them. It would have been a violation of God's oath to have passed by these covenanted people and to have turned to Gentiles, with whom *no special* covenant was thus made. This procedure of John, Jesus, and the disciples, in accordance with sacred covenanted relationship (but the subject of ignorant and unbelieving ridicule), *teaches a fixed, fundamental truth*, which must by no means be overlooked, viz. : that the regular lineal believing descendants of Abraham—the nationality of David—with those adopted (Prop. 29) by them, were entitled, *by covenant*, to this Kingdom. Hence the Kingdom was preached to them—tendered to them individually and nationally, and

it was left to their choice to accept of it or to refuse it, because it was also in the Divine Purpose to bestow it upon "*a willing people*," to the descendants of Abraham and those adopted, who made themselves *worthy of a Theocratic Kingdom* by faith, obedience, and holiness. The offer of the Kingdom is not in violation of but in unison with free moral agency.

Obs. 3. Even after the call to the Gentiles was made out, the apostles still affirmed this covenanted position of the Jews, so that Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13 : 46) said to the unbelieving Hebrews : "*it was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you.*"

The explanation usually given does not cover this necessity, viz. : that the necessity arose because Jesus commanded His disciples to preach, " beginning at Jerusalem," and it was solely to fulfil the command that this was done. Now, aside from Paul (Acts 9 : 20, 21), not having fulfilled the command, let the reader consider *why* the command itself was given ; in that lay the necessity, the injunction of Jesus only manifesting it as existing. This can be none other than the one already asigned by us in Obs. 1 and 2. It is given by Peter (Acts 3 : 25, 26), and by Paul (Rom. 9 : 4), and because of it an express revelation in reference to the Gentiles was needed and bestowed.

Obs. 4. Even the instructions imparted in a more private way, and the mercy extended to Gentiles by Jesus, teach and enforce our Proposition. Keeping in view, as will be presently explained, the peculiar position of Christ, that *He foreknew* the rejection of this Kingdom by the Jews and the subsequent call of the Gentiles, it seemed *eminently suitable in Him to exhibit His foreknowledge of the fact*, and also His interest in and sympathy for the Gentiles. But He does not do this *by sacrificing* the covenanted relationship of the nation ; He only confirms it in a striking manner.

Let us take the examples recorded, and illustrate this feature. Take the Syrophenician woman (Matt. 15 : 21-28 ; Mark 7 : 25-30), and when she first addressed Him for mercy, " He answered her not a word," and when besought to send her away by the disciples, answered, "*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel ;*" and then added, when the woman in her faith worshipped Him, "it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." Thus far He kept this covenanted relationship in view, and expressed it fully ; but also foreseeing that this, the children's bread, would be freely given to others in response to their faith, so *now* in the plenitude of His mercy and power He also, as *an earnest*, responds to the faith of the woman. If we refer to the centurion (Matt. 8 ; 5-13), the mercy extended to him had direct reference in the mind of Jesus to the foreknown rejection of the Kingdom by the Jews and the introduction of others ; for keeping in view His exclusive mission, He remarks, as *explanatory* of His course, "*that many shall come* from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven, but *the children of the Kingdom* shall be cast out into outer darkness." Thus predicting the rejection of His offer, and the subsequent call of the Gentiles. So with other cases briefly mentioned, intimations of the same kind are given, and when they are lacking (as e.g. comp. Luke 7 : 1, etc., who does not state the language that Matthew does), we may rest assured, from the examples adduced, that brevity alone has excluded them. The peculiar case of Zaccheus shows that by his faith, charity, and joyful recognition of Jesus (Luke 19 : 1, etc.), he was *adopted* into the covenanted relationship, for the precise language is : "*this day is salvation come to this house, for so much as he also is a son of Abraham,*" thus wonderfully foreshadowing, *after* He had foretold His own death, *the future adoption* of Gentile believers ; and to make this the more striking, indicative of Divine inspiration, appends the parable of the nobleman and Kingdom (comp. Props. 108-110). Even in the memorable interview with the Samaritan woman—closer related to the Jews than others—and which, as we proceed in the argument, will be found to be based on the then unrevealed but still predicted purpose of God respecting Gentile worship, etc., He forgets not His restricted mission. For while partly unfolding to the woman and Samaritans this important feat-

ure coming, dependent on the foreknown fall of the elect nation, He presents that remarkable declaration (which some critics denounce as so excessively "*Jewish*" that it becomes "the dead fly in the ointment," but which, as we see, is *pre-eminently* suitable to fall from Christ's lips)—"*Salvation is of the Jews.*"

Obs. 5. Origen (*De Princip.*, ch. 1, s. 22) first (and he has been largely copied) endeavors to break the force of our Proposition by saying that the Saviour came *not specially* to the "*carnal*" Israelites, "for they who are the children of the flesh are *not* the children of God." Thus by a deliberate *perversion* of Rom. 9 : 8 he endeavors to make out a sense which the passage cannot possibly bear. Isolated, torn from its connection, the Scripture may be employed in a dishonest way, while in its orderly relation it strongly affirms our position. What children of the flesh are alluded to? *All* the children of Abraham, or *some* of them, or *none* of them? The answer is, that *some* of the children of Abraham were not identified with the covenanted relationship, viz. : Esau and his descendants; these are the children of the flesh purely, but some of the children were thus under covenant, viz.: Jacob and his descendants, and *these of the flesh were not of the flesh only, but the children of promise.* But they could not be the latter unless they *were also* of the former, and it is *this union of the two* that makes them to differ from the mere children of the flesh to whom the promise was not given.

This important point needs some additional remarks. The apostle's argument does not proceed on the ground that because they are the natural descendants of Abraham they are rejected (for that would prove too much), but that *even out of those born to Abraham some are chosen and others not;* and that, in view of this distinction made by God Himself, He can in His sovereignty even yet, and does, reject those who reject Him. The apostle's reasoning sustains the doctrine of election in Abraham's line in a certain direction and within marked limits. Origen here laid the foundation upon which a multitude—ignoring the express declarations to the contrary—have *thoughtlessly* built, deeming it trustworthy, and being deceived by the mere sound of words. Origen, however, can be recommended for his candor and consistency, by which, from such a position, he *continues* to spiritualize until he finds spiritual counterparts for the Egyptians, Tyrians, Sidonians, etc., paving the way for Swedenborg and others.

Obs. 6. This exclusive mission to the Jewish nation, viz.: the direct offer of the Kingdom to them and to no other nation, removes at once *the arbitrary* constructions put upon this so-called "Jewish Partialism" by commentators and others.

Thus e.g. Dr. Alexander (*Com. Isa. Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 8) tells us that "their national pre-eminence was representative, not original;" "symbolical, not real;" "provisional, not perpetual." Such language is based, in view of their rejection for a time and the call of the Gentiles, on *an entire misapprehension* of the covenanted relation and election this nation sustained to God. This nation was singled out and chosen from all others (Prop. 24, etc.), and certain blessings were covenanted to it (Prop. 49), and in such a form that while individuals of the nation and even the nation itself might reject them, yet ultimately by a wise ordering and provision, in gathering out a selected people and in the manifested judgments of the Messiah, these blessings shall be manifested through the basis of that nationality *because of its relationship* to the contemplated restored Theocracy. Hence this national pre-eminence, thus even observed by Jesus and His disciples, was *original and real*, being founded on the covenants, and although now for a time (during "the times of the Gentiles") nationally rejected, yet the *perpetuity* of this covenant relationship is manifested by the oath of God, the assurances given of its fulfilment, the continued preservation of the nation, the predictions of its future restoration and pre-eminence, and the necessity of Gentiles being engrafted into "the commonwealth of Israel" and becoming the adopted "children of Abraham" in order to receive the promises under the covenants.

There seems to be in some writers a confounding of the provisional in the Levitical economy with the things established by the covenants; and, what is still more misguiding, having in their own minds the Kingdom of the Messiah already existing without a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, they, with this veil over their eyes, must, of course, discard the most solemnly covenanted arrangements of God, and place, with Gentile "high-mindedness," the Jewish nation, to which pertains the covenants, in an attitude of inferiority. Ignoring the express covenant language, and mistaking the Kingdom itself--two fatal doctrinal mistakes—this prohibition of Christ's not to go to other nations is to such writers either a very tender or a very difficult subject to explain, so that they pass it by or gloss it over in the fewest possible words, or else totally refuse to allude to it as something to them utterly inexplicable. Strauss and other unbelievers object to Jesus sending His disciples only to Palestine, and not to Phœnicia, Egypt, Greece, Italy, etc., but such an objection has *no force* when viewed from the covenanted standpoint. It has only propriety and pertinence when it is assumed that the modern notion of the Kingdom was the one preached. Therefore the usual replies given to Strauss do not meet the objection fairly, as e.g. Ebrard (*Gosp. His.*, p. 333), which is insufficient, limiting this exclusive preaching of the Kingdom to a "ground of prudence," and then in order "to form in Judea a centre and starting point for the new Kingdom."

Obs. 7. If the Kingdom of God is really what the multitude affirm it to be, viz.: the Church, or the reign of God in the heart, etc., what consistent and valid reasons *can possibly* be assigned for its being thus restricted *nationally* to one people? It seems strange that intelligent theologians fail to see that none, on their hypothesis, can be given.

Even Millenarians, who adopt the prevailing Church-Kingdom theory (as preparatory to the final Messianic Kingdom), involve themselves in difficulties. Thus Olshausen informs us: "We cannot suppose that in this (restriction) Christ was accommodating Himself merely to the weakness of the disciples, but rather to the demands of the times, and the immediate destination of the twelve" (*Com.* Matt. 10 : 5). And this, in place of the "*everlasting covenant*," is offered as a reason to infidelity. No wonder that unbelievers revel in this accommodation theory to "the demands of the times." Olshausen adds another conjecture: "It was necessary, first of all, to prepare in the nation of Israel a hearth to receive the sacred fire, and to keep its heat in a state of concentration." These surmises show an evident seeking for, and manufacturing of, a reason, which by no means covers the question; for, even admitting these doubtful suppositions, why alone select the Jewish nation (that rejected Christ, etc.), and not others? Why should the times demand this exclusiveness, if a mere spiritual apprehension was concerned? The response, alone affording a solid reason, always follows: *the covenant and covenant relationship made it necessary.* Barnes (*Com.* Matt. 10 : 5, 6) has much to say about the Samaritans, but waives the plain (but to him, with his Church-Kingdom view, knotty) question, by saying: "The full time for preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles was not come. *It was proper* that it should be first preached to the Jews, the ancient covenant people of God, and the people among whom the Messiah was born. He afterward gave them a charge to go into all the world." "They (the Jews) *had been* the chosen people of God; they had long looked for the Messiah; and *it was proper* that the Gospel should be first offered to them." This is all that he has to say, basing the restriction upon *proprieties*, and *not*, where the Bible places it, upon the covenanted promises and their national identity with the Davidic people over whom and in whom the Kingdom was to be established.

Obs. 8. The difficulty that theologians, who endorse the prevailing Church-Kingdom theory, are under to reconcile this preaching of the Kingdom *exclusively* to the Jewish nation with their own system of belief, is indicative of a serious flaw, *a fundamental doctrinal defect*, in the same.

The difficulty is found in a multitude of writers. It may be both interesting and profitable to give additional illustrations. Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 154) thinks: "The difficulty can be solved by supposing, first, that Jesus was often obliged to use the language of His hearers in order to be more easily understood; next, by remembering

that the blame cast upon the heathen was well deserved, and that it does not imply praise of the Jews; and lastly, by admitting that in His wisdom Christ designedly drew a narrow circle for His disciples in their first mission of evangelization." The reader may well ponder such a circuitous and accommodating way of giving *no* reason why Jesus "in His wisdom" "drew a narrow circle for His disciples." Fairbairn and others try to evade this restrictive mission, this confinement of the preaching to one nation, by saying that Christ before His ascension said that they were to be His witnesses at Jerusalem, and then preach the Gospel in all the world (Obs. 3, note 1). This does not remove the obstacle to their view; it is in fact *no answer* to the question, because, as we shall show, the reasons for the removal of this restriction are also given and recorded. Christ gave His command to go to other nations *after* the postponement of the Kingdom and calling of the Gentiles was fully determined; and even when the command to preach to all the world was given, such was the decided influence of this restriction upon the minds of Jewish believers that it was only made manifest *after* the day of Pentecost and *after* special revelation and council held, *how* it could be removed. Such writers fail to answer why the exclusive mission was first given, and shielding themselves under what afterward, for well assigned reasons, took place, do not see that the final removal, instead of explaining, only makes the restriction *the more* conspicuous. Dr. Neander (*Life of Christ*), not satisfied with the common view entertained, tells us that Christ's ministry was confined to the Jews, and that before the truth could be offered to the heathen it must be "fully developed in the disciples," etc. It follows then that the truth partially developed (contained in "the husk") was good enough for the Jews, but not for the Gentiles. Besides this, Neander flatly contradicts himself; for what must we say to such an announced full development in the disciples, taken for granted to meet a contigency, and his repeated assertions in other places (some of which we have already quoted) that the disciples and apostles had only "the germ" which was afterward to be developed in the church—that they could *never entirely* divest themselves of "Jewish forms" and "Jewish prejudices." Explanations like these amount to nothing; they are simply conjectures worked out by a preconceived theory. Neander endeavors to guard his explanation by stating, what is emphatically contradicted by the Record, viz.: that the disciples could not infer from this restriction that the Samaritans and heathen were to be excluded from the Kingdom of God. It is surprising that such an assertion can be made in the light of the *most positive prohibitions* to go to the Gentiles. That such was their opinion or inference, derived from a specific covenanted relationship and confirmed by the language of Jesus, *is evident* from the special vision vouchsafed to Peter to indicate the call of the Gentiles, and from the apostolic meeting when the question of the call was discussed. Thus able men pervert Scripture, in endeavoring to bend it, honestly meant, to a favorite theory.

Schmid (*Bib. Theol.*, p. 54) misses the historical connection, and entirely overlooks the covenants, when he affirms: "His only reason for limiting His own operations, and at first those of His disciples, to the Jewish nation, was to gain a firm foothold and starting point for His entire scheme." He assigns the cases of the centurion and of the Samaritan woman (Obs. 4, note 1) as proof. These exceptional cases only prove that the foreknowledge of Jesus *anticipated* the final result of His mission, and gave a foretaste of hope to the Gentiles. In addition to what has been said, see our next Proposition for a reply to Schmid. Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 213) thinks: "If, in other cases, He *seems* to forbid His disciples to go and preach to them (Gentiles), reserving His Gospel for the pure Israelites, this also is undoubtedly a precept dictated by circumstances, to which the apostles may have given too absolute a meaning." The Record as it stands is sufficiently satisfactory and consistent with both what precedes and follows; there is not anything "seeming" about it. For, "the absolute meaning" is *a necessity* grounded in the preceding covenants: the circumstances dictating such "a one-sided" mission, are found in the election of the nation; the disciples, instructed by Jesus and conversant with the covenants, are better qualified to express the idea fairly than Renan, who cares very little for both. Indeed, if the mission of John, Jesus, and the disciples had been made indiscriminately to Gentiles and Jews, what would have become of God's covenants made with Abraham and David? What would God's solemn affirmation then be worth? Let *the analogy* of Scripture answer, why such a restriction was laid in the preaching of the Kingdom, and the reply comes clear and distinct, that it was *conditioned by covenant promises* which belonged *exclusively* to the seed of Abraham and the people of David. If this prohibition were lacking, this exclusive turning to the one elect nation were not exhibited and recorded, then *an important and essential* link in the golden chain of Divine Purpose were also missing.

Obs. 9. The reader will bear in mind that the message of the disciples—a peculiar and distinctive one—to say "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand" *was not addressed by them to any Gentile.* The same is true of John, and also of Jesus, who carefully avoided it in His address to Gentiles (Obs. 4, note 1). The reason is, as we have seen, that the Kingdom *belonged to the Jews,* and until the call of the Gentiles was entered into on account of Jewish unbelief, the message *pertained to the Jews* and those adopted as Jews.

Obs. 10. The Kingdom was ultimately to be extended from the Jews so that it would embrace the Gentiles also, as indicated plainly by the prophecies (Prop. 30). This opinion was held by the Jews, as the titles given to the Messiah showed (e.g. Mac. 2 : 7, 14, "the King of the World"). But this ordering did *not interfere* with the Davidic covenanted basis, or with the predicted (on this account) supremacy of the nation (Prop. 114).

Obs. 11. Some writers, anxious to find some basis for their idea of the Kingdom, and consequently that it also was preached to the Gentiles, *assume* that the mission of the twelve was exclusive, but that of the seventy was general, including the Gentiles. But this, as we see from the covenanted position of the nation, would *be contradictory and fatal* to the truth.

Advantage is taken of the omission in Luke 10 : 1, etc., of the exclusive injunctions elsewhere recorded, and a hasty, desired deduction is made. Thus e.g. Dr. Killen (*Old Cath. Church,* p. 5) remarks that "the seventy symbolized His regard to the whole human race," an opinion derived from some tradition that the inhabitants of the earth were divided into seventy nations, speaking seventy languages, etc. It is surprising that so careful a writer as Olshausen (*Com.* Matt. 10 : 5 and *Gen. Introd.* to Paul's Epistles) makes the ministry of the seventy "also directed to the Gentile world," and "these seventy appear as the representative of the whole Gentile world." Now there is *positively nothing* in the Record to lead to such an inference; more than this, the statement of Luke, carefully considered, teaches the exact reverse. For these seventy were only to go to the places "*whither He Himself would come,*" and therefore *not outside* of Christ's own mission; the message was the same that the twelve delivered, and Jesus would *not contradict* Himself in the injunctions covering the same; the nighness of the Kingdom to the people preached to (as we shall show, Props. 57–59, etc.) indicates the Jews; the denunciations against Jewish places only and the lack of any mention of Gentiles visited, shows the restrictive character of the mission; the fact that the call of the Gentiles had to be made the subject of special revelation, that the seventy were Jews with Jewish ideas of covenanted relationship, looked for the restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, etc.—these things afford *ample evidence* of the restrictive nature of their mission corresponding with that of the twelve. If there was anything symbolical in the number chosen, then it would be better, as many do, to make the twelve representative of the twelve tribes and the seventy of the nation, either through the number of the Sanhedrim, the Elders of Moses, or the family of Jacob.

PROPOSITION 55. *It was necessary that Jesus and His disciples should at first preach the Kingdom as nigh to the Jewish nation.*

That the Kingdom *was nigh* to the nation is distinctly stated, Matt. 4 : 17, Mark 1 : 14, 15, Luke 11 : 20, Matt. 12 : 28. The covenanted Theocratic Kingdom was overthrown ; at the appearance of the promised Davidic son, who should inherit the Kingdom, it was *absolutely requisite*, in view of *the covenanted relationship* of the nation to this Kingdom, to offer it to the Jews for their acceptance. This *was done* by John, Jesus, and the disciples.

Obs. 1. Jesus Himself tells us (Luke 4 : 34) that He "*must preach the gospel of the Kingdom, for therefore am I sent ;*" and He must preach it as nigh—*within reach*—to the elect nation, for to it the promises are given. The reason why Christ did this, is assigned by Paul in Rom. 15 : 8, viz. : because He was "*a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God to confirm the promises made to the Fathers.*" Now the Kingdom is *specifically* promised to the nation, and to meet the conditions of the promise and to confirm them, it was necessary (Paul and Barnabas keep up the spirit of this feature even later, Acts 13 : 46) to tender the Kingdom to its acceptance.

Obs. 2. If Jesus came to fulfil the law and the prophets, if He came as the messenger of the covenant, the One through whom the covenants were to be realized, *then* it follows as a natural sequence that He could not otherwise but *offer* this Kingdom to the nation, for that nation was composed of the covenanted people, only conditioned—as found stated in the prophets, in the preaching of repentance, and in the future predicted repentance of the nation—by its *national repentance and acceptance* of the tender made.

Obs. 3. Hence the Kingdom was *offered as nigh, on the condition of repentance* annexed to the tender. The proclamation of nighness was involved in the fact (to be made plain hereafter) that, as a certain number of elect are contemplated as requisite to the establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom (former experience teaching that otherwise it could not be sustained), that number, in case of national repentance, would have been speedily obtained. But owing to the rejection of Christ, the number of inheritors must now be obtained in a different and more gradual way ; and consequently *the nighness of the Kingdom is conditioned* by the national action. Coming to such a people so peculiarly related by covenant promises ; coming in behalf of the covenant itself, any other style of preaching the Kingdom would have been out of place ; inconsistent with

His own Mission, with the relationship of the people, and with the predetermined number of "*willing people*" to be obtained previous to its re-establishment. In the very nature of the case and of past experience, the covenant required the offer of the Davidic-Theocratic Kingdom, while a moral fitness for the same demanded a previous repentance.

Barbour (*Three Worlds*, p. 121), influenced by his invisible spiritual Kingdom theory, says that the Kingdom was offered to the Jews in a "*shadowy sense.*" Never! the covenants, preaching, etc. all forbid it. It is strange that Schenkel's accommodation theory is so largely prevailing among believers, when so derogatory to fundamentals.

Obs. 4. It was left, we find, to the moral freedom of the representative men of the nation to receive or refuse it. The phrase "*nigh at hand*" is indicative of a tender, which, if necessary, can be withdrawn. The phrase is purposely chosen, pregnant with meaning, and, in view of the power of choosing, leaves a degree of indefiniteness about it, which is materially heightened by its dependence on the preceding "*repent.*" For *what then if they do not repent?* In that case will they notwithstanding *receive* the Kingdom, or will it *still* be nigh to them? Leaving following Propositions to answer these questions, let it now be suggested (what so many entirely overlook) that the exact reversal of this formula would be, If you do not repent, the Kingdom will be *far from you; now* it is nigh, within reach; *then* it will be distant, removed, postponed. Alas! how fearfully true this became: *nationally nigh, then nationally distant.*

The *conditionality* of this matter is apparent from the call to repentance and the unfortunate result. God never violates moral freedom in His purposes relating to the nation. Jesus, with full purpose of fulfilling, and yet foreknowing the sad result, employs the only language adapted to their free agency. Such expressions as "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life," "would not have this man to reign over us," "ye would not," "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not," and kindred ones unmistakably indicate the power of choice. If not, where is human responsibility? The Saviour, therefore, in offering this Kingdom as *nigh* to them, addresses this power of choice, this capacity (we are not concerned with the question of natural or acquired, but only with the fact of actual possession), of making a suitable selection; and in view of the possibility of making a proper choice, exhibited in repentance, preaches, "*Repent, for*" (if you do so) "*the Kingdom is nigh at hand,*" i.e. the Kingdom already covenanted to you, and nigh to you in view of such a relation, will be given to you. But if you make no such a choice, if you refuse to repent, *then*, of course, this Kingdom is not nigh to you. Strange that so many theologians overlook the conditionality on which all hinges, and affirm (as Neander, etc.) that the Kingdom was established. The Primitive Church, taught by inspired men and their immediate successors, held to no such absurdity, but maintained in this matter a logical consistency.

In view of this conditionality, Jesus comes in a state of poverty, in order that the moral appeal to repentance may be fairly tested. Had He come rich, loaded with honor, etc., the Jews would have been influenced by selfish, improper motives. Hence the Theocratic King, to test the nation, comes in humble circumstances.

Obs. 5. It has already been shown (Props. 19, 20, 21, 22, 38, 39, 40, 43, etc.) *what* Kingdom was preached, *how* the Jews and disciples understood it, and *hence* that the people were aware of the Kingdom that was offered to them. If we are to credit the multitude, Jesus tendered a motive, held out an inducement, for repentance, *which the nation misapprehended and could not understand.* Those few, then, that did repent were influenced by mere "Jewish prejudice" and "Jewish partialism." Thus the prevailing Church-Kingdom theory *degrades* the early preaching of the Kingdom from every point of view (comp. Props. 42–44).

Let it again be noticed that Jesus employs *the very phraseology* in vogue among the Jews indicative of this restored Davidic throne and Kingdom. Thus, to point out a single example which Neander (see Prop. 42, Obs. 6) and others attempt to make contradictory to Jewish expectations, viz. : the Sermon on the Mount. Now, keeping in view the Jewish ideas of the Kingdom and the phrases in common usage expressive of the same, the promises pertaining to "the Kingdom of heaven," "the meek shall inherit the earth," "fulfilling the law and the prophets," "the least and great in the Kingdom of heaven," "Jerusalem the city of the great King," "thy Kingdom come," "the Kingdom of God"—these are all of a nature to impress the Jewish mind (as the result proves), that our Saviour alluded to the *Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom* as covenanted to the nation. It was, under the circumstances, simply impossible for the Jews to entertain any other view. The naked fact that they thus understood Him and were not corrected in their comprehension of the Kingdom, *is evidence* that our position is the only tenable one ; for otherwise, knowing *the grammatical sense* of the covenants and *how* the same was held, Jesus would not be performing His mission worthily if it led to *the indorsement* of error, confirmed by His own language. Let the reader reflect : *How* could He ask them to repent, and on condition of such repentance offer them a Kingdom *contrary* to the universal expected covenanted one, *without* a suitable explanation ? Common honesty required it. *How* could He urge repentance on the ground of something which they utterly misapprehended ? Common charity forbids such a notion. Questions like these, involving the gravest of charges and reflecting upon the character of Teacher and hearer, must *first* be satisfactorily answered *before* we can give up the precious covenanted Kingdom.

Obs. 6. It is wrongly stated by Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 147) that the expression "Kingdom of heaven" in the formula "restricts the idea to a coming period or place, to a state of things *different* from that in which humanity at present exists," and objects to it therefore (through his modernized Church-Kingdom view) as "a less comprehensive form" than that of "Kingdom of God," and attributes it as belonging "originally to the Jewish Theology, which assigned the idea of the Kingdom of God absolutely to the sphere of final or future things." This is *a misapprehension* of the phrases ; for we have shown (Prop. 45) that they are *convertible*, that all of them were used by the Jews to denote *the restored Davidic rule under the glorious Messiah*, David's Son, and that they were employed by the first preachers *without explanation according to common usage.* This makes the phraseology "*Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,*" the more significant to a Jew, and the motive for a speedy repentance the stronger ; for then, if penitent, the long-cherished hopes excited by covenant and prophecy might at last be realized.

The time selected for this preaching of *national repentance* was, humanly speaking, favorable, and the refusal to repent, under the circumstances, increases the guilt of the nation and evinces the power of depravity. While with Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 39) we object to the theory advanced by some, "that the Jews during the exile, through the influence of the Babylonian and Persian civilization, underwent a complete metamorphosis" in religious matters, yet it must be admitted that the captivity and partial restoration produced changes—changes, however, which, instead of destroying, *only developed* the distinctive and characteristic traits of Judaism. Among the latter, a more steady and persistent attachment to and expectation of a coming King in the restored Kingdom by which they should be nationally exalted, according to the prophets. This produced an intense (and in many a selfish) exclusiveness, as evidenced by history. The sorrows and trials of the nation, the long-continued submission to Gentile domination, had more and more directed faith and hope to the covenants, so that, as far as the national situation was concerned, the time was favorable for such preaching, but *the repentance* urged, *the moral preparation* required, was too much for its representative, leading men.

Obs. 7. The reader is reminded that this preaching of the nighness of the Kingdom, this offer of the Kingdom to the Jews at the First Advent on

condition of repentance, is the *key* to the commingling of the Advents of Christ (Prop. 34). It could not be otherwise. It being predetermined as eminently suitable to tender this Kingdom at the First Advent of Jesus, the Messiah, and it being also foreknown that it would be rejected, the matter is so guardedly presented as not to interfere with the free moral agency of the nation, and as not to be opposed to foreknown fact. Yet both the rejection of the Kingdom at the First Advent, and the subsequent obtaining of it at the, now understood, *Second Advent* of Christ, *are unmistakably predicted.* Hence, too, in view of this offer and rejection, the prophets pass on and describe more repeatedly and vividly the scenes connected with the Second Advent.

Obs. 8. The reader, from what has been said, cannot fail to observe that this Kingdom, thus brought nigh by the offer made by Jesus and His coadjutors, is *the same* Kingdom predicted by the prophets (Prop. 35). There is only *one* Kingdom covenanted, the prophets describe but *one,* the Jews believed only in *one,* the disciples knew and preached only *one,* viz.: *the covenanted Theocratic-Davidic.* Jesus, coming to fulfil what the prophets predicted, the covenant demanded, could not preach any other Kingdom than the one described. Hence in His teaching He appeals to the prophets and appropriates their predictions to Himself (but only in so far as not to make the false impression that under Him the Kingdom was *already* established), as e.g. in Mark 12 : 10 He refers to the stone of Ps. 117, and applies it to Himself. This would naturally suggest the Stone of Dan. 2 : 34, 45, and the inference follows that, *although rejected,* He is the Head of the coming Kingdom, and through Him the God of heaven will yet set it up. So also Matt. 22 : 24, Luke 4 : 18, 19, etc.; and He does this to make the rejection of Himself *the more inexcusable* in them.

Obs. 9. Writers in abundance censure Millenarians (as e.g. the Primitive Church) for believing in *the restoration* of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom under the Messiah, on the ground of its "earthly relations," "carnality," etc. They do not pause to reflect that, owing to its *Theocratic* nature, *it cannot be set up* without a suitable moral, spiritual preparation in the hearts of those who are to experience its blessings. The proof is found in this first preaching, in its being brought nigh on condition of repentance, in its being offered solely in view of a proposed change of character. Those who inherit it as kings and priests must be among the penitent (Prop. 91); the nation itself before it can enjoy its restoration must be converted (Prop. 113). Therefore, seeing *how* it was proposed at the First Advent to the nation, and *how* it is offered to us now conditionally on repentance and faith in Christ as a future inheritance, it becomes thoughtful, reverent men to be *extremely cautious how* they write concerning it.

PROPOSITION 56. *The Kingdom was not established during the ministry of Christ.*

This necessarily follows from the preceding; for *no such* a covenanted Kingdom as promised, *no such* a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom as predicted *appeared.* He (Luke 19 : 11-27) had to leave before he would receive (Prop. 83) the Kingdom.

Obs. 1. The men who were *the preachers* of this very Kingdom, and who, above all others (especially modern theologians), ought to have known whether it was instituted or not, *had no knowledge* whatever of its being thus erected. These persons, *preachers,* and singled out to be *witnesses* to the truth, *are more reliable,* vastly more, in their belief and testimony, than theologians with their spiritualistic and philosophical conceits concerning the Kingdom and its "husk" envelope. Is it conceivable, can it be credited, that *such special chosen ones;* upon whose testimony the faith of others was to be founded, should, *after* their own preaching, *after* all their private and public instruction for several years, and *after* the particular "*forty days*" (Acts 1 : 3), "*speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God,*" be ignorant of the fact (if it be as alleged) that a promised Kingdom was (as eminent theologians now gravely inform us) *actually* in existence? No! such a supposition is *damaging, fatally so,* to preachers and Teacher, and *cannot possibly* be entertained.

Theologians, to carry out their Church-Kingdom theory, assert that Jesus established the Kingdom during His life. Thus e.g. Ebrard (*Gosp. His.,* p. 135) says: "Jesus manifests Himself in Galilee as Rabbi, announces that the Kingdom of God *has come,* and seeks to make men disciples, or members of that Kingdom." The formal organization of the same he places in the selection of the twelve, the very persons (see next Obs.) *who knew positively nothing* of Ebrard's Kingdom. Jesus nowhere declared "that the Kingdom of God *has come*"—this is *added* to the record to sustain a preconceived notion. The utter inconsistency of Ebrard will appear more distinctively if we quote him (p. 243) respecting the use of the Parables: "He (Jesus) explained to them (the twelve) that the whole nation was not yet in a condition to understand the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and that He selected the form of parables, that His preaching might be unintelligible to those who were not yet mature, and so act as a stimulus and provocative to future inquiry; *while to the disciples, to whom he explained the parables, it was a revelation of saving truth.*" See next Obs. and continued argument; we may well ask, How, then, if thus explained, could they *misapprehend* the Kingdom, especially when formally established, as he says, by their call?

Obs. 2. The apostles, the best judges in the matter, *knew nothing* about a Kingdom set up; and therefore, *consistently* with covenant and prophecy, with former preaching and instruction, with desire and hope ask, Acts 1 : 6, "*Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?*" The reply of Jesus *confirms* their view of existing facts; for instead of telling them that they were *mistaken* in their idea of the Kingdom, that the Kingdom already existed, etc. (according to the Alexandrian

formulas), the answer, referring to the "*times and seasons,*" implies on its very face that *they did not misapprehend* the nature of the Kingdom (comp. Prop. 43). They, like Joseph of Arimathea (Mark 15 : 43), "*also waited for the Kingdom of God.*"

Commentators frankly admit the views of the apostles. Thus e.g. Bloomfield *loci* says that the word rendered "restore" "signifies properly to restore anything, which has suffered change, to its former state ; and it is not unfrequently used (as here and in Matt. 17 : 11 and Mark 9 : 12) of restoring a ruined kingdom or government to its ancient form, and there is usually implied some improvement upon that." He admits that the apostles "thought that Christ would then restore the Kingdom of Judea to its former consequence," etc. Thus Barnes *loci*, Olshausen, and other commentators. To make this, as Lightfoot (so Barnes, but footnote to Olshausen, p. 176, A. E.), a question asked in indignation against the Jews, as if it meant "Wilt Thou confer dominion on a nation which has just put Thee to death?" is so far-fetched and unworthy of serious consideration that our opponents—even Barnes, who quotes him—reject it, saying : "The answer of the Saviour shows that this was not the design of the question." Dr. Increase Mather (*The Mystery of Israel's Salvation*, p. 130) gives the general Millenarian interpretation : "Christ did *not* say to them that there should never be any such restoration of the Kingdom to Israel as their thoughts were running upon ; only He telleth them that the times and seasons were not for them to know ; thereby acknowledging that such a Kingdom *should indeed be*, as they did from the holy prophets expect. Herein was their error, not in expecting a glorious appearing of the Kingdom of God, but in that they made account that this would be immediately." So Lechler, Lange's *Com. Acts, loci*, remarks : "The Kingdom, which is the object of their hope, is a Kingdom of Israel, a theocratic Kingdom, deriving its existence and reality from the Messiah, and intended to give liberty, greatness, and dominion to the people of Israel, who were at the time oppressed by a heavy yoke. The apostles believe that they are almost authorized by the words now pronounced by the Lord, to hope for an early restoration of this Kingdom." After rejecting Lightfoot's interpretation as not needing a "special refutation," and stating that the answer of Jesus, so "frequently" and even "grossly misinterpreted," refers to the time, he adds : "As to the fact itself, *the coming of the Kingdom*, and as to Israel's privilege with respect to the latter, they entertained no doubt ; and the Lord was so far from disapproving of such an expectation that He rather confirmed it by declaring that the Father had fixed the times. Now we know that neither a period nor an epoch can be affirmed concerning an event which is only imaginary. Those interpreters have altogether mistaken the sense, who maintain that Jesus here entirely rejects the conceptions entertained by His apostles respecting the Messianic Kingdom, for this is by no means the case. He did not deny that either their expectation of the appearance on earth of His glorious Kingdom in its reality, or their hope of the glorious future which that Kingdom opened to the people of Israel, was well founded ; He simply subdued their eager curiosity respecting the time, and directed their attention to the practical duties which they were to perform at the present period. Numerous testimonies of a similar nature could be given. Comp. e.g. Judge Jones's *Notes*, Alford's *Com.*, Bengel's *Gnomon of N. Test.*, Olshausen *Com.* etc.

Obs. 3. Jesus, before His death, declared the Kingdom to be still future (comp. Props. 58, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, etc.). Take e.g. one of His last utterances (Matt. 26 : 64) to Caiaphas, the High Priest : "*Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.*" This was taken from the prediction of Daniel, applied to Himself to occur "*hereafter,*" and was well understood by all Jews to refer to the Messiah and the Kingdom of the Messiah. The charge of blasphemy corroborates this view. This is so clear that even Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 331) says : "The high priest adjured him to say whether He was the Messiah. Jesus confessed it, and *proclaimed before the assembly the speedy coming of His heavenly Kingdom.*" So also a little later before Pilate, He reiterates this direct reference to His Kingdom as future, when He says (John 18 : 36) : "But *now*" (i.e. at present, during

this order of things) "my Kingdom is not from hence" (comp. Jones's admirable *Notes* on this verse, and see Prop. 109).

Obs. 4. The significant fact that our opponents cannot tell *when* this promised Kingdom was set up, although professing that it was established, is corroborative evidence in our favor. They cannot agree in the time, giving various periods (Prop. 3), although it is a Kingdom that prophets describe as so manifest, when re-established, that men shall see and rejoice in it. This Proposition is the more necessary, in order that these conflicting opinions may be presented to the reader—opinions, too, that never would have been entertained if *the grammatical sense* had not been yielded under the pressure of a spiritualistic Church-Kingdom theory. Some tell us that the Kingdom already appeared under John the Baptist, but this is disproven in Prop. 41, etc. Others locate the beginning of the Kingdom at the birth of Jesus; some place it at the commencement of His ministry; others, when He commissioned His disciples; some, at the confession of Peter; others, at His death; some, at His resurrection and ascension; others, at the day of Pentecost; and still others, at the destruction of Jerusalem. Here certainly is diversity, and this alone should, to a reflecting mind, suggest something *radically wrong* in a theory which is *utterly unable*, with any degree of unity, to show *when* so important a thing as a Kingdom is founded. Alas! how blind is man, when wilfully blind, or when allowing the blind to lead him.

Obs. 5. That no Kingdom, *as covenanted*, was set up, is corroborated by the entire tenor of the Gospels and Epistles, and forbids, if sheer inference is laid aside, the notion to be entertained. As evidence that those opinions have no weight, we point to the twofold work of Christ. The first work was to offer this Kingdom, on the condition of repentance, to the nation. This He faithfully performed, and in the act, at least, eliminated the elect, chosen ones from the mass. But as the result of this part of the mission was foreknown, there was, in consequence, connected with it (as a sequence) His second work to accomplish the Redemption (by the shedding of His blood), even of those who had been previously chosen, and of those who would be among the elect in the future, and this was performed through *the sacrifice of Himself*, thus making *provision* for the fulfilment of the covenants in "the age to come." This mission *positively forbids* the idea of the establishment of the Kingdom.

Provision was to be made in vindication of the majesty of moral law, by which not only sins could be remitted, but that those who obeyed the truth could be ultimately delivered from all the effects of the curse and become co-heirs with Jesus in the restoration of the forfeited dominion of Adam. This provision was accomplished by the life and death of Jesus, confirmed by His resurrection, established by His ascension and exaltation, thus sealing and making sure the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, through the fulfilment of which such a dominion shall be exercised. During this period of His mission, having those definite objects in view, intending the performance of a great and precious *preparatory* work, designing to make us inheritors with Himself of a coming Kingdom through the efficacy and resultant power of His sacrifice—during such a period there is *no room* for the Kingdom. No! *instead* of a Kingdom His work required humiliation, suffering, and death; *instead* of exaltation to power and Kingship, it was a veiling of power and kingly authority, an emptying of Himself, of honor and glory in our behalf. The two states are *in antagonism and cannot coexist* in the First Advent of the blessed Redeemer. This Lord and Son of David came to "suffer many things" instead of reigning; "it behoved Christ to suffer," so that the Father, instead of giving Him the

Kingdom predicted by Daniel, described by the prophets and covenanted in the sure mercies of David, gave Him the exceedingly bitter, sorrowful "cup" to drink for us. *Instead* of a Kingdom, He "was despised and rejected of men;" "He came to His own and His own received Him not," for "they all forsook Him and fled." *Instead* of reigning, He was betrayed, reproached, spit on, crowned with thorns, mocked as King, and crucified. Tell us not that David's Son reigned, *as covenanted*, during such trials. Any effort to unite the two is *a violation* of what the prophets have written and the Gospels have recorded, and opposed to express passages which teach us, among other reasons, *why Christ endured all this*, Phil. 2 : 6–11 ; Heb. 12 : 2 ; Rom. 14 : 9, etc.

And (which is a remarkable and decided proof that Scripture embraces a Divine, not human, Plan) that this humiliation, suffering, etc., of David's Son is, according to David's own predictions concerning his Heir, *a necessary prelude* to reigning as *an immortal Son of Man* on David's throne, and a requisite preparation to qualify Him *pre-eminently* for the lofty position of a universal Theocratic King. We are, therefore, abundantly sustained in our position by converging evidence taken from different points, while a mass of confirmatory proof remains still to be presented as we advance in the argument.

Obs. 6. This nighness of the Kingdom to the nation was evidenced not merely by the offer of the Kingdom, but by the tender of it in the person of Jesus Christ. He was the predicted King, the Son of David who should reign, and in virtue of this the Kingdom, in a manner, has come nigh in His Person, He being a representative of the Kingdom, or, rather, in Him it is lodged as in Divine royal right. So that, as the King of Babylon is called the Kingdom in Dan. 2 : 38, 39, so also the Kingdom was vested in Christ, but with this material difference (which many overlook), that whilst in Him as of divine and legal right it was *not then manifested*, the right, for certain reasons and purposes, was not then entertained and pressed *to an actual realization*. The Kingship was held in abeyance because of the foreseen result.

The Kingdom thus connected with the person of Jesus may serve to illustrate and explain some peculiar phraseology, such as is contained in the Kingdom coming nigh, upon, or among them. But as these passages will deserve a separate notice, we pass them for the present with the simple caution, that such language must not be pressed (as many do) beyond its legitimate meaning and application. While it is true that Jesus never denied, even in the face of death, His royalty, His Kingship, His divine and legal right to reign as covenanted, *yet it is likewise true*, that, foreseeing His rejection by the nation, and appreciating the work before Him to be performed, instead of urging His claim He veiled it, giving us only an occasional glimpse of it, and that when solicited by some (not the representative men of the nation), He refused to be made King.

Obs. 7. The reader will observe that there is not a single declaration of Christ's which asserts that the Kingdom was *then* in actual existence. It is simply *inferred* by others *against* covenant promise and prediction. One of the strongest passages from which such an inference is drawn is that of Matt. 12 : 28, "*But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom is come unto you.*" Leaving a full answer to follow in succeeding Propositions, we now only remark that in the establishment of this Kingdom (as predicted) the miraculous and supernatural (Props. 6 and 7) is required, and the miracles of Christ are *a foreshadowing and evidence* of the future fulfilment of the promises. To this evidence Jesus simply appeals, *as confirmatory* of the tender of the Kingdom made to them, of its sincerity and surety ; for His miraculous power exerted, evinced that the Kingdom *was nigh unto them*, both in the person of the King, although in humiliation, and in His possessing *the adequate power* to re-establish it, if they made the necessary choice.

Observe, also, that this language was addressed to unbelievers, to captious persons who rejected Jesus. Hence, the Kingdom is come unto or upon you, certainly does not allude in their case to *an actual* possession, but merely to its being *offered* to them. Again, as critics have often noticed, the phrase "is come" is frequently used to denote a drawing nigh, a divine purpose not then actually accomplished, etc., as e.g. Gen. 6 : 13; Isa. 60 : 1; Heb. 12 : 22, etc.

Obs. 8. Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 249), after telling us that Christ had an "apocalyptic theory" of the Kingdom (which, in another place, he defines to be a literal fulfilment of Daniel), adopts very much the prevailing view of the Messianic Kingdom by saying: "He often declared that the Kingdom of God has *already commenced* (?), that every man carries it in himself (?), and may, if he be worthy of it, enjoy it; that each creates this Kingdom (?) quietly by the true conversion of the heart," and then interprets the Kingdom to mean "the good," "the reign of justice," or, "the liberty of the soul." He gives as proof, Matt. 6 : 10, 33, Mark 12 : 34, Luke 11 : 2; 12 : 31; 17 : 20, 21. Such *a total misapprehension* of the Kingdom (which ignores express covenant and prediction) is fortified by the usage of eminent theologians. For the present, we only reiterate our conviction, that the disciples on the ground *were far better able to judge* concerning the Kingdom and what Christ declared respecting it, than Renan is prepared to do at this late day.

Obs. 9. Olshausen, Neander, Lange, and many others are compelled, in order to preserve consistency in their theory of a spiritual Kingdom, to make this Kingdom commence *somehow* with the First Advent. Now, while it is true that the Kingdom in a certain sense (Obs. 6) was in Christ, and brought nigh by Him to the nation, yet it is wrong and misleading to infer from this that *it was* established. *The contrary*, as held by the early Church, *is the truth.* It is in view of this *unwarranted inference* that such writers take the great and unauthorized liberty of changing the phrase "nigh at hand" into "now established," "now founded," "now already present," etc. Overlooking the Kingdom that is covenanted even under oath, and spiritualizing the promises, it is an easy matter to draw from Christ's language erroneous inferences.[1] Forsaking the expressly covenanted Kingdom for something else, introduces widely antagonistic contrasts. The most divergent theories are a natural result. Some of these have already been mentioned; others are presented in the following note.[2]

[1] We will allow some to speak for themselves, leaving the reader to ponder a certain undecisive tone. Storr (*Diss. On the Kingdom*) says, respecting this nearness, that the Kingdom was present and actually realized, because "Jesus being born (Matt. 3 : 2), the Kingdom in a certain sense (Luke 11 : 20, and 17 : 21; Matt. 12 : 28) was come," being promised to "the offspring of David;" and it could not commence until He was born, and then "the Kingdom had so far come that the King by whom it was to be administered was certainly present." From this he takes it for granted that it was thus "administered," never attempting to prove the main fact, never considering that the presence of one entitled to reign and the reign itself are not necessarily cojoined, and never noticing that a part of the covenant promise (i.e. the descent) he takes literally and the rest (i.e. pertaining to the Kingdom) he discards. Is it possible to base so important a matter as the founding of a Messianic Kingdom, upon so slight and inferential a foundation?

Schmid (*Bib. Theol.*, p. 244) remarks: "He describes the Kingdom of God as already begun at the then present time (Matt. 12 : 28; Luke 11 : 20, 21). The starting point of this Kingdom is the appearance of John the Baptist (Matt. 11 : 12; Luke 16 : 16); up to this time the Old Test. dispensation lasted. By Jesus in Matt. 11 : 11, contrasting the

Baptist with the members of the Kingdom of God, it may be perceived that the real commencement of this Kingdom is connected with His person." This needs no comment, its points having already been anticipated (as to the Baptist, see Props. 38-41); but may we not ask, Why this shifting of commencement from John to Christ, and then, as Lange (*Com.*) does, from the birth to the baptism, and from the baptism to the confession of Peter, or to the death, or to the resurrection of Jesus, or to the day of Pentecost, etc.? Is this not a sign of weakness? Von Gerlach (Lange's *Com.* Matt., p. 309) begins it at the baptism of Jesus: "At His baptism Jesus had, as the Son of Man, entered that new Kingdom of God upon earth which He Himself had founded." Strange procedure: the Son of Man founds a Kingdom and then afterward enters into it Himself! This theory is only a following of Augustine, who (*City of God*, B. 17, S. 8) speaking of His "dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth," remarks: "He took the beginning of His reigning from the river where John baptized," etc. The absurdity is so apparent that it needs no reply.

Van Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, p. 70), so also Thompson (*The Theol. of Christ*), tells us that the Kingdom is "something essentially present. When He comes, it appears with Him; it is already in the midst of those who are asking when it shall appear, Luke 17 : 20, 21." From this it is inferred, without noticing that if his argument is correct it will also hold true that when He leaves the Kingdom leaves with Him. A full reply to this favorite passage for inferential proof, taken from Luke, will appear under Prop. 110. It is only by confounding (Props. 79 and 80) the Divine Sovereignty with the specially covenanted Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom that such inferences are unjustly made. So Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 154) argues: "The Kingdom of God, which Jesus desired to make a reality, commences with his personal appearance on the theatre of the world. His Advent and the setting up of the Kingdom are one and the same thing, because He is the Head and the cause of the Kingdom, and the cause cannot exist without its effect." Then (p. 157) he asserts that for "a precise date for the commencement of the Kingdom," "that date is no other than the moment in which John the Baptist, the last and the greatest of the prophets, opened its doors, so to speak, by proclaiming to the world Him who was to realize its most cherished hopes," and appeals as confirmatory to Luke 16 : 16 and Matt. 11 : 11-14. Thus, when men forsake the covenants and the predictions which determine the nature of the Kingdom intended, do they blunder and pervert the simple truth—men, too, who are able instructors in many other things. Alas! it demands *just such men* to cause the church itself to drift into its predicted course of unbelief (Prop. 177); weak men, or persons of no ability and power, could not exert such an influence.

[1] Thus e.g. Storr (*Diss. on the Kingdom*), not satisfied with his own declarations (Obs. 9, note 1), adds: "After the death of Jesus, from the period of His resurrection and ascension into heaven, *that* heavenly Kingdom which the ancient prophets had predicted was entered upon by the offspring of David." "It follows, then, that the commencement of the Messiah's Kingdom, although in a certain sense it may be traced from His birth, yet properly is to be reckoned from His ascension into heaven. Which proves that a far different appearance was then given to the Kingdom of David, *which Jesus possessed after His death* and return to a new life; and that the throne of David became a far more exalted seat of majesty, from the time that it was occupied by Jesus." Here is simply one *assumption* built upon another, and the leading one is that in some sense Jesus really was on David's throne. (Comp. Props. 52 and 122.) Now if the Davidic throne (taking their own theory) is the Father's throne in the third heaven, how could the Son of man, during His natural life and previous to His exaltation, reign in the promised Kingdom? Does that exaltation in the third heaven *meet* the conditions of a Theocratic Kingdom covenanted to be here on the earth, or the predictions of the prophets in describing the restoration of *an overthrown Theocratic Kingdom in the land of Palestine?*

Dr. Bascom (*Sermons*, series 1, ser. 4), brings us to a climax. He informs us that the Kingdom (as delineated in the 110 Ps., called "the Creed of David") here described was witnessed in the covenant of redemption in Paradise, is from eternity and extends to eternity, and hence is not, as some assume, "a mere parenthesis in the Divine administration." This sadly mixes the Divine Sovereignty with the Kingdom *specially* covenanted to David's Son; it utterly ignores the Humanity of Jesus, the Theocratic-Davidic ordering, and what is promised to the Son of Man. But instead of answering Bascom, we leave one of his own class of interpreters—but far more able—reply. Van Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, p. 69) observes: "The Kingdom is something new. Since it drew near only in the fulness of time, it was not before found on earth. It is consequently not merely the continuation of the former thread, but the commencement of an order of things not before seen, Luke 10 : 23, 24, comp. Matt. 26 : 28." Leaving others to rec-

oncile, if they can, such opposite statements, it may be said that Oosterzee is right in saying that it is new," i.e. something to come, not existing just previously to the advent (Props. 37 and 38), but is certainly wrong in the assertion that it was "not before found on earth," as shown by Props. 25, 29, 31, etc. For it is *to be restored;* it is the restored Theocratic Kingdom; and it is "new," i.e. renewed (for the word "new" is often used, Prop. 50, in the sense of renewal), having also many "new" features added (as e.g. the rule of a God-man, of glorified and immortal rulers) that the Davidic Kingdom never possessed. But we will not anticipate coming Propositions.

Obs. 10. Here, at this preaching of the Kingdom as nigh at hand, so many stumble and fall into serious error (comp. Props. 38, 42, 55). Let us take Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*), illustrative of a large class, which rightly affirms that the idea of the Kingdom is fundamental, and then gives as a special means for comprehending the nature of the Kingdom the epitomized formulas, "the time is fulfilled; the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the Gospel." Thus far correct; but instead of looking at these formulas from the covenanted standpoint and from the Primitive view, he regards them entirely from *a modern* position. More than this: he overlooks the fact that the Jewish nation to whom this was preached *refused* to repent; the conditions then being altered and the preaching of Jesus also (which he never notices) being changed, he proceeds *on the assumption of repentance* and *the immediate* setting up of the Kingdom; and then to find this Kingdom nothing offered itself but the Church, or believers, as the Divine Sovereignty, which, of course, under such *an illegitimate process* of reasoning (leaving out the conditions, whether actually complied with, upon which the Kingdom was tendered) are elevated to the dignity of a Kingdom.

Obs. 11. The climax of unbelief in this direction is reached by Deprez (*John, or the Apoc. of the New Test.*), *a professed* believer. Admitting that the Kingdom was believed and preached as covenanted; confessing that it was not set up, as thus received, during the First Advent and since; informing us that the apostles and Primitive Church *universally* looked for the coming of this Kingdom, locating it at the Sec. Advent of Jesus, he then proceeds, in the coolest possible manner, to suggest that all such references to the Kingdom and Advent connected with it *are to be rejected as spurious*, as additions given under a gross misapprehension of the truth. This interpretation and remedy (indorsed by eminent men) is simply *a total perversion* of covenant and Scripture, *a fatal blow* at the integrity and authority of the Word itself. It follows, as a natural result, from three things, all of which are taken *for granted:* (1) that the Kingdom *now exists*, in a form so widely different from the expectations of the early Church and the descriptions of the Word, that it is impossible to reconcile them; (2) that the most solemnly given Scripture, viz.: the covenant (given under oath and the basis of the Kingdom), is to be *also ignored as incapable of fulfilment;* (3) and that Holy Writ, descriptive of the postponement of this Kingdom to the Sec. Advent, is not to have *any weight* in the consideration of this subject. In other words, Deprez, whether intentional or not, sets himself up as *the judge* of Scripture (what to receive and what to reject), *without allowing Scripture to testify in its own behalf.* If no such Kingdom exists now, certainly it is no more than simple justice demands to permit Scripture to assign *its reasons* for the same (comp. Props. 57–68).

Obs. 12. In the light of Scripture there is *no excuse* for the prevailing interpretations respecting the Kingdom, for, over against the meanings engrafted by man, there is *an abundance* to satisfy the reverent student that they are utterly untenable. Without attempting to forestall the proof that the following Propositions contain, it may be well to say that numerous passages directly affirm, or imply, our position. Take e.g. Matt. 26 : 29, Mark 14 : 25, and Jesus in the expressions "*until that day*" locates the Kingdom in the future, which is made more emphatic by Luke (22 : 18) saying : "*Until the Kingdom of God shall come.*" If the Kingdom already existed, such phraseology would be entirely out of place, but with our view it is *consistent and significant.* The general tenor of the Word indicates the same feature. Thus e.g. when Jesus speaks of entering into the Kingdom of heaven (Matt. 7 : 21, 22), its futurity is expressed by the phrase "*in that day,*" i.e., it is something not present to be realized at once. So also in the prayer "*thy Kingdom come,*" the futurity of which was believed in by the disciples, and which excited the petition (for the prayer was given in accordance with the well-known views of the disciples) just before the ascension, *Acts* 1 : 6. Thus in Matt. 19 : 28, Luke 22 : 29, by adopting the Jewish phraseology linked with the Messianic Kingdom, Jesus conclusively teaches that the Kingdom is future and not present.

Obs. 13. The distinctive preaching of Jesus, based as it is on the covenants, throws light on the vexed question pertaining to the relation that He sustained to the law. He observed the law Himself and enjoined it upon others, and yet intimated, in the destruction of the temple, etc., the abrogation of the Mosiac law. But we must carefully distinguish *when* the latter was done, viz. *after* the representative men of the nation had conspired against Him, and *after* He had revealed His rejection by the nation. We hear much about Jesus being no Jew in spirit, etc. Even believers largely indorse the language of Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 207), "Jesus, in other words, is no longer a Jew." "He proclaims the rights of man, not the rights of the Jew ; the religion of man, not the religion of the Jew ; the deliverance of man, and not the deliverance of the Jew" (comp. Prop. 69). Against all such inferential, cosmopolitan reasoning, we need only place one passage (Rom. 15 : 8) out of many : "*Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the Fathers.*" Hence His restricted mission, Prop. 54.

This deserves more attention. The preaching of Jesus indicates that He was a Jewish preacher to Jews. The covenants, the promises, the predictions all demand this, and hence His *exclusive* mission to the Jews. The cosmopolitan results are *invariably linked with*, first, a fall of the Jewish nation, and, secondly, with a recovery of the same nation. The Gentiles are reached and blessed through the Jews, for it is ever true that "*Salvation is of the Jews.*" Paul affirms, what simple consistency requires, that Jesus exercised His office of Messiah with special reference to the covenanted people, the Jews. He could not, with covenanted truth before Him, occupy any other position. Besides this, as the law was obligatory upon the Jewish nation, and had formed part of the Davidic institution or Theocratic rule, it was essential that the Heir, the promised Son of David, should, as Son of Man, render obedience to that law (until set aside) thus vindicating His fitness, sinlessness, reverence for God's appointments, and worthiness to be the Ruler on David's throne (comp. Props. 83, 84, etc.). What changes would have resulted had the Jews received Him, we cannot tell, seeing that God's Plan was determined *in view* of this foreseen rejection. The grace and mercy extended to Gentiles, as will be more clearly stated hereafter, through the unbelief of the Jews, does not alter Christ's Jewish

attitude or lessen His being "a minister of the circumcision." When the nation fell and the times of the Gentiles continued on, the Mosaic ritual was abrogated by the very force of circumstances. And it is a curious and striking exhibition of Christ's delicate feeling toward His own specific mission to the Jewish people, that, what Paul afterward so boldly proclaimed as no longer binding, Jesus only intimated in an indirect manner. He respected and honored His mission.

PROPOSITION 57. *This Kingdom was offered to the Jewish nation, but the nation rejected it.*

That it was offered in good faith we have seen—the mission of John, Jesus, and the disciples *being confined* to the nation. But the nation, instead of repenting and receiving the Messiah, conspired through *its representative men*, the chief priests, scribes, and elders, to put Him to death. The entire record of the Gospels shows how He was persecuted and finally crucified, as John 1 : 11, Luke 19 : 14, Matt. 16 : 21, Matt. 20 : 18, 19, etc. By this action they said : "*We will not have this man to reign over us ;*" by this conduct they evinced how *utterly unprepared*, morally, they were for *a restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom under the Messiah.*

If it be asked, Why this imposed condition of repentance? the answer is plain. Such a Theocratic Kingdom under the Messiah, with the accompanying elevation of the Jewish nation—*as covenanted and predicted*—cannot possibly be established without a suitable moral preparation. An exaltation to such supremacy and honor, unless previously prepared for it, would only have excited the pride, the selfishness, the arrogance, and ambition of the Jewish nation. The purity of the Kingdom intended, its design for blessing, the character of its rulers, the Theocratic idea itself—*all* demanded hearty repentance and true reformation. This feature will appear more evident when we see how God is raising up a repentant people for this very purpose, viz. : to establish it upon a basis of moral preparation in the persons of those who are associated with Him in government. Thus e.g. the account of Luke 9 : 60, which some denounce as "cruelty," and which others (Barnes, etc.) explain that "sentimentality" must give place to "decision" and "eternal consolations," can be more readily explained in the light of this conditioned repentance. The man was a disciple of Jesus, as evidenced by his asking permission. Now, as the offer of the Kingdom, the greatest of all things, was thus conditioned, and the preaching of this repentance nationally being very limited and urgent (in order to make the nation inexcusable), it was of *the highest moment and importance* to bring this testimony before the nation ; all other objects, for the time being, must give place to this one, so essential, *which could not be postponed.* Hence, under the circumstances, the charge to preach the Kingdom—a style of preaching which speedily, as we shall show—changed, the crisis having been passed.

Obs. 1. Nationally, through the nation's highest officials and council, the Kingdom was rejected on account of *the imposed condition,* repentance, although individual Jews repenting were received as believers. The Kingdom could not be erected, owing to its affiliation with the nation itself, requiring not merely *a few* who believed, but *a national moral regeneration.* The past history of the nation clearly taught the sad truth that, without such a moral reformation, *it was utterly unfitted* to bear *a Theocratic rule.* This it most painfully evidenced at the First Advent by crucifying its own promised Messiah. This was, when fully appreciated, a fearful crime. The great question with the Jew, after the Messiah was killed, was this : *How* could he under such aggravating guilt, slaying the covenanted David's Son, be saved from his sin? This it was that caused, under Peter's exhibition of this guilt, that anguish of heart, bursting forth

into the significant inquiry: "Men and brethren, what shall *we* do?" What they were to do—this key of knowledge given in mercy—was committed to Peter, as well as the other key pertaining to the Gentiles.

The modern Reformed Jews deny that the fall of the Jewish nation resulted from sinfulness. We leave them to assign the reason for their dispersion, etc., in the following resolution at a meeting held by Reformed Rabbins in Philadelphia, Pa. (quoted in *The Israelite Indeed*, Feb. No., 1871): "Resolved, That the fall of the Jewish state had not its cause in the sinfulness of Israel, but in the Divine purpose, manifested more and more in history, to send the members of the Hebrew race to all parts of the earth, for the fulfilment of their high mission, to lead all nations to the true conception and worship of God." Now, aside from the New Test. declarations (which they, of course, do not receive, and yet which are verified in *the literal fulfilment* of its predictions in their actual history), this is utterly opposed by Moses in his prophecies, by all the prophets, by the repeated confessions of the ancient Jews, and even by modern Orthodox. Many prayers of the Jews indicate the truthfulness of the same; and it is only a spirit of unbelief in the Divine Record, a virtual abandonment of God's own testimony and that of the nation itself in the past, that can lead to such unscriptural and unhistorical resolutions. Rev. Van Noorden (pastor Holland Pres. Ch., Chicago) has written some strictures on this untenable resolution, and among other things shows "that since the fall of Jerusalem the Jews as a nation never have influenced the nations to forsake idolatry, nor taken any active steps to lead the nations to the true conception and worship of God." History substantiates this, seeing that civilization, enlightenment, etc. came through the labors, etc. of Christians, and not through Jews, however individuals of the race may have aided in the same work. The entire resolution, therefore, is opposed both by Scripture and history, and its framers were unable to substantiate it by a single quotation from or reference to the Word of God.

Obs. 2. The leading reason assigned by the priests and Pharisees in council (John 11 : 47, 48) for putting Jesus to death (whom they hated for exposing their rottenness, and insisting upon repentance) was, that by acknowledging Him as their King, they should bring the Roman power upon themselves, which would destory "both our place and nation." Here certainly *was lack of faith in a Theocratic King and Kingdom.* And on this very charge was He arraigned before Pilate (Luke 23 : 2, 3); thus hatred causing them to choose *Cæsar, instead of* "*Christ, a King.*" Let the reader reflect: their guilt was aggravated by a knowledge of the covenanted Kingdom, of a covenanted Messiah in David's line able to protect against all earthly power, and hence their malignity was manifested in causing the death of One who gave all the predicted evidences of Messiahship, and *in taking advantage* of the very tender of this Kingdom to them in procuring His condemnation. Their knowledge of the covenants and prophets, their acquaintance with the works of Christ, made the rejection *the more deliberate and cruel.* Knowing the claims of the predicted Messiah, knowing that if He ever came He should be truly a King on David's restored throne—this makes the charge produced by them and their conduct in the matter *the more dastardly and inexcusable.* What was offered in mercy and love, they make *the basis* of accusation and death.

This condition of repentance, as essential to the bestowment of a Theocracy imposed, is *the key* to the private nature of Christ's miracles. Unbelievers ask why they were not more conspicuous, etc. The design was to give sufficient evidence to satisfy His claim to Messianic power and dignity; hence the miracles performed in connection with this preaching. If, however, on the other hand, He had publicly, like Moses, at Jerusalem performed miracle after miracle of an astounding nature, he would have precipitated the nation, without being *morally qualified*, into an effort (as even in His reserve was adverted to, John 6 : 15) to make Him King by force, thus bringing on a rebellion against the Roman Government. The exhibition of the miraculous was *graduated* by this condition of repentance. The delicacy of Jesus—foreknowing the result—in

avoiding, by withdrawal and retirement, to bring the nation into revolt against and conflict with the Roman Empire, is most admirable, and serves to explain a number of events in His life.

Obs. 3. Pressense (*The Redeemer*) has several chapters on "The Preparation for Christianity," and takes the position, as announced in his Preface: "In my view, that preparation consisted *solely in developing the desire of salvation.*" We apprehend that here is *a great mistake,* as plain fact proves. Thousands before the Advent desired salvation, but did not obtain it; *few* at the Advent entertained it so strongly that *they were willing* to acquiesce in God's mode of securing it, for the multitude rejected and crucified Christ, and by their very conduct showed that other motives, other desires, *were stronger* than those alleged by Pressense. The facts disprove the theory. If the nation had repented and received Jesus *as the Messiah,* then, and only then, would it be true, but as it did not, such a preparation is *imaginary.*

See e.g. what Mosheim, Neander, Killen, Kurtz, and others say of the actual condition of the Jews, sunken into degeneracy, divided into hostile parties, eager for Roman patronage, etc. The simple Bible truth is this: the Word predicts *the unsuccessful* nature of Christ's tender of the Kingdom, *the unbelief* of the nation, that He shall be despised, rejected, etc. The nation itself is suffering *continued* punishment for its unbelief. The desire for salvation was only such as wicked men now possess, viz.: a willingness to be saved in, and not from, their sins. A proper desire, excepting in *a few,* was not cultivated. Hence, many writers blunder when adverting to this subject, forgetting that both Advents, the First and the Second, are represented as finding the people arrayed against the Christ. For even at the time of the Sec. Advent, when Jesus comes again "unto salvation," we find that the world, instead of desiring salvation, will be in open hostility to the Messianic claims. Both Advents fall under *the same* Divine procedure, and we must look deeper than this for the real preparation. The secret of the matter lies in the Divine Purpose, foretold already by Moses, Deut. 33 : 21, who, instead of predicting a desire for salvation, prophesied *the unbelief and rebellion* of God's chosen people and their punishment until a period of trial had passed, and that, notwithstanding the same, God would gather out a people who shall desire, and ultimately participate in, this salvation. The Divine Purpose accommodated itself in the Plan of Redemption to these foreseen exhibitions of national depravity. The times of the Gentiles were introduced, not because of the desire of salvation previously fostered in the Jewish nation, but because (as Paul in Rom. 11) *of unbelief,* the veil over their eyes, their fall. The idea of there having been preparations going on and culminating at that period is indeed a correct one, as other writers have noticed (in language, facilities of intercourse, general peace, etc.), for prophecy indicates this; but it possesses a different aspect and must be placed on other grounds. The error of some writers consists in this: having no proper conception of another and coming dispensation here on the earth, in which salvation is to be realized, they make the faith, hope, and earnests of salvation *the* salvation itself, and under the influence of this misapprehension indulge themselves in corresponding laudatory flights, opposed alike to fact and the Word.

Obs. 4. This Kingdom was offered to the nation in good faith, i.e. it would have been bestowed *provided* the nation had repented. The foreknown result made no difference in the tender of it, so far as the free agency of the nation is concerned; that result flowed from *a voluntary choice.* The national unbelief did not change God's faithfulness, Rom. 3 : 3. It would be derogatory to the mission of Christ to take any other view of it, and *the sincerity and desire* of Jesus that the nation might accept, is witnessed in His tears over Jerusalem, in His address to it, in His unceasing labors, in sending out the twelve and the seventy, and in His works of mercy and love. It follows, then, that the Jews had *the privilege* accorded to them of accepting the Kingdom, and if the condition

annexed to it had been complied with, *then* the Kingdom of David would have been most gloriously re-established under the Messiah.

The question, How, then, would the atonement have been made by the shedding of blood? has nothing whatever to do with the sincerity of this offer, for "the manifold wisdom of God" would have been equal to the emergency, either by antedating to some other period, or by providing for it previously; or in some other, to us unknown, way. As it was, God's purposes, His determinate counsel, are shaped by what was *a foreseen voluntary choice* of the nation. God's mercy was willing to bestow, but the nation's depravity prevented the gift. That the Kingdom would have been established had the nation believed, is evident from Deut., ch. 32, 2 Chron. 7 : 12–22, Isa. 48 : 18, Ps. 81 : 8–16, etc. Dealing with facts, we are not concerned with contingencies. Compare Oosterzee's *Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 523, and Augustine quoted by him, and Augustine and Gregory the Great as quoted by Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 351.

In the programme of unbelief we find it asserted by the Duke of Somerset (*Ch. Theol. and Mod. Skep.*, p. 139) that "the disbelief of the Jews in Jesus was indispensable to the scheme of the atonement"—language even incautiously used by some believers. This is disproven by this tender of the Kingdom, by the prevailing tenor of the Word, and by the guilt of the nation not being compromised or lessened through such a fiction. It is unauthorized assumption. Paul's argument in Romans proceeds on the supposition that the nation had the power of choice, that it wilfully chose the evil, and that God in mercy overruled its fall for the salvation of the Gentiles. They stumbled and fell, not through necessity, and not because God's Purpose required it, but solely through their own unbelief; and God's Plan, as the Omniscient, embraced the same as a foreknown result, and made provision accordingly. This feature also meets a Jewish objection. Thus e.g. Levi (*Disserts.*, vol. 1, p. 120) says: "They (Christian Apologists) cannot produce one single, clear, unequivocal prophecy of the Old Test. which foretells a twofold coming of one and the same person as the Messiah," etc. This arises simply from the fact that, as this offer was to be made at the First Advent, the prophecies are guardedly (see Prop. 55, Obs. 7, and Prop. 34) given, and at the same time sufficiently distinctive to show that at the First Advent, as occurred, the Messiah would be despised and rejected (Isa. 55, Dan. 9 : 26).

Obs. 5. Able writers make incautious assertions relative to this period. Thus e.g. Oosterzee (*Theol. New Test.*, p. 32) on this point says: "The covenant act of the Theocracy thus founded was the lawgiving at Sinai; its seat the Sanctuary; *its end*, not the rising of the Kingdom, by which it was modified, *but the destruction of the Israelitish state;* its highest benefit, finally, was the appearing of Him who put an end to the wall of separation *between Israel and the nations.*" According to the express promises annexed by Moses (Prop. 26) to Deut. 32, its end was *not such* as Oosterzee states, for it was designed for blessing and not for such a destruction. The end alleged by him was brought about, not by the tender of a Theocratic Kingdom (much less by a Kingdom not then in existence), not by the appearing of Christ in itself, but is invariably attributed to *the nation's unbelief.* If we do not accept of the solution given by revelation, and put the fall of the nation *where* God places it, viz.: not in His purposing or designing it, but in *their own unbelief*, we introduce an antagonism into the Divine Plan, inconsistent with the universal ideas of justice and love, and invite, unnecessarily, the sneers of infidelity. Besides this, the end contemplated has not yet come; let the times of the Gentiles end, and let this nation again be restored, and then will the Theocracy be restored, and refute such fallacies.

PROPOSITION 58. *Jesus, toward the close of His ministry, preached that the Kingdom was not nigh.*

If, indeed, the covenanted Davidic Kingdom is offered, and that tender is rejected through unwillingness to repent, *then it follows*, from the foreknowledge lodged in Jesus, that it is reasonable to expect some such procedure. The statement in the Proposition is abundantly confirmed. Just *so soon* as the representatives of the nation met in council and conspired to put Jesus to death, *then*, released from the first part of His mission, *His style of preaching also changed.* Instead of proclaiming that the Kingdom was nigh to the nation, He now directly intimates and declares that *it was not nigh.* Matt. 21 : 43, "*The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof*," is already conclusive (as will be shown hereafter), confirmed as it is by other passages.

Obs. 1. The importance of this point, so much overlooked by commentators and theologians, will justify additional proof. Thus e.g. take the parable of the marriage of the King's son, Matt. 22 : 1–14, given just *after* (Matt. 21 : 43), He declared that the Kingdom should be taken from them, and we have : (1) *The Jewish nation* bidden but refusing the invitation (showing the sincerity of the offer, etc.) ; (2) if the invitation had been accepted, *the marriage would have taken place ;* but the invited guests refusing, *it was postponed* until other guests were furnished ; (3) the marriage (i.e. the enthronement to the Kingdom, comp. Prop. 169), the wedding (i.e. the inauguration blessings and privileges, the Kingdom being likened to a feast, Prop. 169), were *no longer nigh* to these invited ones ; (4) the marriage, the time when the guests are scrutinized, is (as commentators inform us correctly) at the Sec. Advent of this King, *hence postponed until that period.* Again : the parable of the Great Supper, Luke 14 : 15–24, has also reference to this fact. It was suggested by the saying, "*Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God*," i.e. in this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, for such was the meaning attached to the phrase. Jesus, in reply, expressively shows how this Kingdom was received. The persons (Jews) *specially invited* to this "great supper" (i.e. to the blessings of this Kingdom) *rejected* the invitation, for "they all with one consent began to make excuse," and other guests are to be invited, urged to come and enjoy it, whilst "none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper," i.e. *it was no longer nigh* to those invited. The calling of other guests now (still going on) takes the place of the first invitation—a new exigency and preparation being evolved—and the supper, until these guests are obtained (Prop. 65) *is postponed* to the Sec. Advent (Prop. 169).

The critical student may perhaps ask what Gospel do we follow in its chronological order. Our preference is Matthew (so Ebrard, *Gosp. His.*, as Calvin, Bengel, etc.), where Jesus declares His rejection shortly after the sending forth of the disciples to preach. But we can (with Wieseler and others) take Luke, or even any of the others (as we shall show in Prop. 187), with the same result. For this postponement of the Kingdom, so constantly ignored by Christian Apologists, is *a most powerful factor* in the criticism, both of the Gospel writings and the Gospel History. It conclusively proves that the great object of the writers, in all of them, was to show—(1) That Jesus was the Messiah ; (2) why the Messianic Kingdom was delayed ; when and through whom it shall be established. The idea of a postponement (even contained in the references to a future coming of Himself in glory, and which caused the question of the disciples in Matt. 24 : 3 respecting His future coming), must have singularly impressed the disciples, owing to their utter inability to reconcile it with His death. Without comment, they give us a complete history of the facts as they existed, and do not conceal the perplexity in which they were involved, owing to their having allied to the First Advent promises which are only to be realized at the Second.

Obs. 2. But we have more explicit announcements. Thus, Luke 19 : 41–44, in which is found : (1) Jesus weeping over the city ; (2) the things which belonged unto their peace, being rejected, were hid from them ; (3) the evil results of their unbelief, in being given over to their enemies and continuing under ther power ; (4) this great evil brought upon them because they appreciated not the offer made, because "thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." *Here, instead of a Kingdom, is presented a direful threatening of fearful incoming evils.* Again : in Matt. 23 : 37, 38, we have : (1) the rejection of His message, evinced by the treatment of those sent ; (2) Christ's earnest desire that they might receive it ; (3) but "they would not," indicating a voluntary rejection ; (4) then "*the house left desolate,*" no restoration being granted ; (5) and Christ's *withdrawal* from them for a time ; (6) so that, *instead of a Kingdom coming then to them,* dispersion and the destruction of the city is determined, owing to their unrepentant state.

It was in view of this rejection of the Messiah, this refusal to repent, that the sign of Jonah was specified by Jesus in Matt. 12 : 38–41. Persons have sought for an analogy between the sign of Jonah to that generation and that of the Son of man. Much that is unsatisfactory (by believers, who refer it to death and the resurrection, forgetting that Jonah was alive, etc.) and witless (by unbelievers, who ridicule it as a standing joke) has been said and written. Many confess their utter inability to see where the analogy is to be found. Thus e.g. a writer in *The Spectator* (and *Littell's Liv. Age*) for 1872 (Art. "Fred. Den. Maurice"), after stating that Maurice "admitted that he could not understand the analogy between Jonah's three days' burial in the fish and our Lord's three days' burial," adds : "He (Maurice) would not admit that he believed the Evangelist to have made a mistake, and to have attributed a fanciful analogy of his own to his Master." Maurice, professing himself unable to explain, was correct in rejecting the notion of "a fanciful analogy" concocted by Matthew. The preaching of this Kingdom on condition of repentance, and the refusal to repent, explains and enforces the analogy. The simplicity of the analogy has caused it to be overlooked. To realize its force we must place ourselves on Jewish ground in the position of the Scribes and Pharisees who demanded a sign. The Kingdom was offered ; a sign was required, by those unwilling to repent, against (v. 41, 42) all reasonable evidence already afforded. Jesus virtually and emphatically tells them that the *only sign* which they deserved is *the sign of unbelief.* Jonah was three days and nights in the fish's belly, owing to *unbelief,* so Jesus, for the same period, was in the grave because of *Jewish unbelief.* The one was evidence of unbelief, the other also, so that the declaration is equivalent to saying that the nation would *not* repent but be the means of Christ's death. This is confirmed by what immediately follows.

Obs. 3. The evidence on this point is strong and cumulative, and there are given even clearer exhibitions than the preceding. In Luke 21 : 31 is

something decisive, when apprehended in the light of the immediate context. After describing the destruction of the temple (v. 6, 20), the days of vengeance (v. 22, 23), the captivity and dispersion of the nation (v. 24), the treading down of Jerusalem "*until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*" (v. 24), the Advent of the Son of Man (v. 27), the approach of our redemption (v. 28), the signs of a coming deliverance (v. 28, 29, 30), the Saviour adds: "*So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand.*" At the beginning of His ministry, it was relatively nigh (as we have shown); the offer was simply conditioned by repentance; and being left to their choice, no long interval, as here intimated, must take place before it is nigh to them. Now, however, since His death was actually contemplated by the representatives of the nation, the offer is withdrawn, and the postponement of the Kingdom, its not being nigh to them, *is directly stated by an enumeration of certain events which are previously* to take place before it is nigh again. Let the reader examine these events, and he will find that *not one of them* occurred between the delivery of the prediction and the death of Christ; hence the Kingdom was not yet come. But more: *none of them* took place between their utterance and the day of Pentecost; hence the Kingdom was not established. This, in which all are agreed as to the non-occurrence of the events, is all that is needed thus far in our argument.

But in this passage and context we have more than this: two things may well call for consideration. (1) Let the reader reflect upon the Jewish idea of "the Coming One" and "the world to come," etc., and then notice that the questions of the disciples respecting His coming and the end of this age imply the notion of the introduction of the Messianic Kingdom. The reply indicates *no such* introduction, but a continued series of events, long continued (for this passage and Matt. 24 and 25 and Mark 13 contain an epitomized history of this dispensation down to the Sec. Advent), before the Kingdom again comes nigh. (2) Next, consider the events enumerated, and the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred thirty or forty years afterward; the captivity and dispersion of the Jews, the domination of the Gentiles over the city during the times of the Gentiles, etc., are mentioned, all of which are still in the course of fulfilment, and consequently (as we advocate) the Kingdom (which could only again be nigh "*when these things come to pass*") is still in the future. Comp. some excellent remarks by Philo, Basilicus (Judge Jones, of Philadelphia) in *Essays on the Coming of the Kingdom of God* (*Literalist*, vol. 3, p. 32). Jones says: "If it should be said that by '*these things*' we must understand *some* of these things, the answer is, that would be adding to Scripture, not expounding it; besides, it would not remove the difficulty, because we have no evidence that *any* of these things came to pass before the commencement of the present dispensation. If it should be said (as it sometimes is) that all these predictions relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, the difficulty remains, for certainly the present dispensation commenced long before that event. Not only had the Gospel been promulgated throughout the Roman Empire, but almost the whole of the New Test. was written before that event, and several of the apostles, among whom were James, Peter, and Paul, had suffered martyrdom. If it be said that (v. 34 proves) these things must have been fulfilled within the life time of the men then living, the answer is, that this verse must be interpreted so as to be consistent with the facts of the case." After mentioning the facts, he adds: "Besides, the Word translated *generation* signifies *race* in this place, as may be easily proved, and it was so understood by Jerome, who must be allowed to be a competent judge of the meaning of the Latin word *generatio*."

With this opinion agree Clarke and numerous other commentators, who read v. 34: "This nation shall not pass (i.e. be rooted out, etc.) till all these things be fulfilled." The idea being that the fulfilment is linked with the destiny of the nation, and that therefore, notwithstanding their scattering and dreadful persecutions, it would be preserved. As this verse is frequently employed against us, it will be well, in view of the frequent use made of the chapter containing it, to add some particulars to those given under another heading. To indicate the varieties of meanings attached to the passage, making it in full agreement with our views, we give the following: Jerome applies it either to the human

race or particularly to the Jewish ; Calovius, Mede, Dorner, Stier, Nast, Alford, Faber, etc., to the Jewish nation ; Wordsworth, etc., to the literal Israel (as a race) and to the Spiritual Israel (as the same); Origen, Chrysostom, Paulus, Lange, etc., to the believers (as a race), as indicated in v. 33. Other interpretations are given, as e.g. that (so Elliott, Barbour, Lord, etc.) it refers to the future generation then living, making it parallel with Luke 21 : 31, 32, "when ye shall see ;" Luke 17 : 34, "this night," etc. Some (as Byrant, etc.) think the key is found in vs. 33 of the preceding ch., in "this generation of vipers," indicative of a continued unbelief. The reverse of this is given by others (as Rutter, etc.), who make it "the generation of the righteous," referring to the perpetuity of the faithful or of the church ; or (as Lange), "the generation of Christians, as a generation of those who wait for Christ never pass away." (Lange's view is a revival of De Syra's.) Piscator, Erasmus, etc. render generation by *ætas* or age. Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 68) refers to quotations, showing that the word translated "fulfilled" is often used to denote the beginning of an event without expressing its completion, so that it would read, if retaining the limited idea of generation : "*This generation shall not pass till all these things* (the predicted desolations of Israel, terminating with His Sec. Coming) begin to be fulfilled." (This is the opinion of Luther, Cunningham, Bush, Van Oosterzee, Ebrard, and others.) Bickersteth and others refer the verse simply as including the overthrow of the temple and Jerusalem. The meaning of the words "generation" and "fulfilled," as given in Lexicons, in Commentaries, and in other renderings, make such interpretations justifiable. Hodge (*Sys. Div.*, vol. 3, p. 799) says : "There is high authority for making 'generation' refer to Israel as a people or race ;" the same is true of others. We cannot admit the limited notion of generation without allowing (unless we adopt the idea of "age" or "beginning to be fulfilled") the claims of Rationalistic criticism, which asserts, truthfully, that these predictions were not fulfilled within the bounds of an ordinary generation. (Comp. Alford, Lange, Stier, Nast, etc.; Brookes's *Maranatha*, p. 67 ; Cumming's Great Tribulation, pp. 157, 159 ; *Proph. Times*, vol. 6, p. 76 and p. 205 ; Seiss's *Last Times*, Ap. ; *Literalist*, vol. 3, p. 160 ; Lord's *Lit. and Theol. Journal*, July, 1854, p. 161, etc.

Obs. 4. Luke 19 : 11–27 forcibly demonstrates our Proposition. Jesus uttered this parable "*because they thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear.*" In His reply there is no intimation (as is unjustly inferred, comp. Prop. 110) that the Jews were mistaken in their idea of the Kingdom, and that, if modern notions are correct, the Kingdom had already come and was established. If this had been so, then the answer of Jesus would be *cruelly irrelevant ;* but with the proper conception of the Kingdom it is *finely consistent and forcibly expressed.* For there is (as there could not be) no declaration that they were wrong in believing that the Kingdom which they expected, the Messianic, *was still in the future.* They were only mistaken in the opinion, carefully announced, "*that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear.*" Now the parable is given *to correct* this belief in *the immediate setting up* of the Kingdom, to indicate that *it would not soon appear*, but *only after* an undefined period of time had elapsed. For He represents Himself as a nobleman, who, having a right to the Kingdom, goes "*into a far country to receive*" (to have His title confirmed) "*for Himself a Kingdom, and to return.*" During His absence His servants "*occupy till I come.*" Then *after* an interval of time, not definitely stated, the period having come to enter upon His reign, having received the Kingdom, *He returns*, judgment follows, and those who rejected Him (saying, "we will not have this man to reign over us") are destroyed. Here we have : (1) the Jews thought that the Kingdom *would now appear ;* (2) but *it was not nigh*, for (*a*) He would leave, (*b*) they had refused His proffered reign, (*c*) those, however, who were devoted to Him should "occupy" until He returned, (*d*) during His absence there was no Kingdom, being gone to receive the power to reign ; (3) He would *return and then* manifest His acquired power (Prop.

83) in the establishment of His Kingdom. Thus we have the absence, and then "*the appearing and Kingdom*" of Christ.

This parable first seriously directed the attention of Greswell (*Work on Parables*, vol. 4, p. 419–514) to the Millenary dispensation, and confirmed his faith in the Primitive Church view of the Kingdom to be set up at Christ's return. He justly remarked that it was *impossible* to explain it "satisfactorily and consistently upon any other principle than that of a reference to the Millenary dispensation," etc. This is corroborated by the contradictory statements of commentators and others, who spiritualize this Kingdom, and have it existing either under Christ's ministry or at His ascension. Thus e.g. Barnes, *loci*, after having repeatedly told us that the Kingdom had *already* come, that multitudes pressed *into* it, etc., flatly contradicts his former bold inferences by saying that "the reign of the Messiah should immediately commence, He spake the parable to correct that expectation." But how reconcile it with his own statements? Thus: "By the nobleman is undoubtedly represented the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ; by His going into a far country is denoted His going to heaven, to the right hand of the Father, *before He should fully set up* the Kingdom and establish His reign among men." Lisco (*On the Parables*, p. 398) correctly observes "that this Kingdom should be *immediately*, without any further delay, set up, against which the intimation in the parable is directed, that it should necessarily be *a long time* before the return of the nobleman," but vitiates the force of it by putting into the parable what it does *not*, even by implication, teach, viz: "He (Jesus) will give full manifestation of it (the Kingdom) from heaven." Numerous illustrations of this character could be given, but these will suffice to show how men, under a false theory of the Kingdom, labor to reconcile this parable with a spiritualistic conception by introducing that which, on its face and intent, it utterly repudiates. Attention might be called to other passages, especially Luke 17: 20–37 (see Prop. 110), but as these will be brought up in connection with other Propositions, this proof must, for the present, content us. For, taking these together, and observing their uniform testimony, they already suffice to establish our Proposition.

Obs. 5. It is worthy of notice, that Christ only openly predicted His sufferings and death toward *the close* of His ministry, Matt. 20: 17–20, John 12: 32–34, etc. This was *designedly* done, and *accords* with our position. The Kingdom was offered according to the promise made to the Fathers. Being a minister of the circumcision to confirm the promises, this tender, embracing the most precious of the promises, was necessarily included. When He was rejected, and efforts were made to destroy Him, *then* He was free to unfold what God had farther purposed in view of, and to overrule, this rejection.

The critical student will also notice another peculiarity, viz.: that before it was fully determined by the chief men of the nation to kill Jesus, He was far more free in communicating in private than in His public discourses. Judge Jones ("Philo-Basilicus," *Essays, Literalist*, vol. 3, p. 62–64) has noticed this, and assigns some excellent reasons for His observing such a distinction. The main one has already been given by us. To strangers, as to the woman of Samaria, the Centurion, Zacchæus, He revealed from the first more concerning the future purposes of God pertaining to the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles, than He did to His own disciples before the conspiracy of the Jews, thus evincing *both* His Divine foreknowledge and His wonderful tact in keeping His disciples in the most favorable position and mental condition to preach the offer of the Kingdom. This entire procedure, as related in the Gospels, is one of those unintentional but most forcible evidences of *divine inspiration*. A narration which so carefully preserves the most delicate arrangements, without any violation of propriety and character in the actors of a complicated drama like this, can only be accounted for on the basis already assumed, Prop. 5. The sincerity of Jesus is evidenced (Matt. 23: 37, Luke 19: 42, etc.), the covenanted relationship of the nation is preserved, the fact of its failure to repent is so represented that the foreknowledge of God is vindicated, the contingency of the offer on repentance (Rom. 9: 31–33, and 10: 8, 10, 21, and 11: 7, 23, etc.) is made manifest, the Purpose of God is made in consideration (Gal. 3: 8, Acts 2: 23, etc.) of all the foreseen circumstances as they actually arose, the faithfulness of God (Rom. 3: 3, 4) is preserved, the necessity (to raise seed unto Abraham) of calling and

engrafting the Gentiles is shown—these and various other features involved *are all* so clearly and distinctly given, without any conflict or antagonism, that they stamp the book containing them as *the Word of God.* The principles and interests involved, although pertaining to the highest and noblest known to man, are carefully guarded with incomparable simplicity.

Obs. 6. This change of preaching in Jesus has been noticed by Renan and others, and they *wrongfully* attribute it to a change of plan respecting the Kingdom, forced upon Him by attending circumstances. That is, seeing that He could not secure the throne and Kingdom over the Jewish nation, He concluded to erect a more spiritual Kingdom. Such an opinion cannot be *legitimately* inferred, and it overlooks *the most positive proof* that Christ, instead of altering His view of the Kingdom, His rightful claim to it, His intention to restore the Theocratic-Davidic throne, *only postponed* its execution until the lapse of a determined period of time. Renan and his class *totally ignore* the abundance of Scripture assigning *the reasons for postponement*, just as if they had no existence.

Such a mode of procedure, a revival of Porphyry's (Art. on, M'Clint. and Strong's *Cyclop.*), unjust to the Word and discreditable to honest reasoning, which forbids the Scriptures to testify in its own behalf, is becoming very prevalent. The position of Jesus, in view of the foreknown rejection of the Kingdom, was peculiar. To Him the progress of events, the history of the future was fully known; hence down to the very moment of His proposed arrest by the representatives of the Jewish nation, His language, impelled *by regard due to His mission*, respecting the Kingdom is guarded, and if we desire to appreciate it, to attain to a correct apprehension of it, we must keep in mind the nature of that Kingdom, *as covenanted and predicted*, its offer to the nation, its rejection by those who had the controlling influence, its postponement until a Seed—the elect, chosen ones—of Abraham is gathered out, and its final re-establishment at the Sec. Advent. *Then* the attitude and words of Jesus stand out with new propriety and force. This, and this alone, will render radiant with hope many a passage which otherwise would remain dark.

Obs. 7. The notion entertained by some, that *only* temporal blessings and rewards were offered to the Jews under the Levitical economy, is also shown (as before noticed), by the tender of this Kingdom and its postponement, to be erroneous. In the very nature of the case, temporal blessings are largely annexed to it (for did not the curse greatly deprive us of them, and if Redemption is completed, will it *not* restore them?); but besides these, there are special and inexpressible great spiritual ones connected with them. This, as we advance, will become more and more apparent. The Theocratic rule brings *God Himself* into national relationship as its earthly Ruler, and this relationship *insures* present and future blessings, both temporal and spiritual. If the reader will but reflect upon the Kingdom offered to them—the same still held in abeyance—upon the events requisite for its re-establishment (as e.g. the resurrection, the presence of God, etc.), upon the imagery used to represent its blessings (as e.g. a feast, marriage, etc.), that were included in the covenants to be ultimately realized by the elect, he will at once perceive that the Theocratic ordering *necessarily embraces both the highest temporal and spiritual blessings to which Redemption, in its fullest, widest reach, extends.* The earnests indicate it; the fruition, under the coming Messianic reign, realizes it.

Obs. 8. In view of this foreknown change in the preaching of Jesus resulting from a postponement of the Kingdom, Christ did not *publicly*

assume in His personal ministry the title of "*the Christ*" until *after* His betrayal, Mark 14 : 62. After the death of John the Baptist, which already foreshadowed His own rejection and the nation's refusal of the tender, of the Kingdom, He strictly charged His disciples *to tell no man* that He was "*the Christ.*" The intimations publicly given were inferential, and might, as He Himself asserted, be adduced from His works. New this, to many an unaccountable feature (owing to their making the phrase "the Christ" a *doctrinal* one instead of regarding it, as it is, His *Kingly* title, comp. Prop. 205), is *in accord* with our position ; for knowing His rejection as "*the Christ,*" in that the nation refused to obey the condition annexed to the obtaining of the Kingdom, it would only have afforded the greater facilities to His enemies to accuse Him as a rebel, etc., to the Roman power.

One of the best writers on this point is Judge Jones, in his *Notes on Scripture* (as e.g. on Matt. 16 : 20 and 23 : 8, etc.), and in his *Essays* (Philo-Basilicus) attached to vol. 3 of the *Literalist*. The Judge, with his fine scholarship, theological learning, and eminent legal abilities, was well calculated to see and bring out points unnoticed by the large class of expositors. Among other things he notices the remarkable change in the phraseology as seen in Acts and the Epistles when compared with the Gospels, and justly argues that, as the name of Jesus, the title of Son of man, was designedly given at one period, and the titles of Christ and Messiah were kept in the background, so also *after* the death and ascension of Jesus the title of Christ is purposely more prominently exhibited. The former procedure is based on the fact of the offer and rejection of the Kingdom ; the latter is founded on the fact that this same Jesus, dead, buried, and crucified, is nevertheless "the Christ," and that the covenanted promises *will yet* be realized through Him. The very title implies faith and hope in *the fulfilment* of the covenants.

Obs. 9. Lee (*An Inquiry into the Nature of Prophecy*), Hatfield (*Amer. Presby. Quart. Review*, Nos. April and July, 1864), and others have asserted that the prophets predicted only *one* Advent (the First), and that a second personal Advent was unknown to them, or that they had "no distinct perception of a Sec. Advent, or any thought of such an event, is by no means certain," etc. (comp. Shimeall's *I Will Come Again*, Ap. Note D, p. 132). This falling back to the Jewish objection (Prop. 57, Obs. 4, note 1) is owing to *an overlooking* of the conditions that, in view of the foreknown future, were imposed upon prophecy.

This attitude of the prophets, in not more accurately discriminating (Prop. 34) in respect to the mission of Jesus at His First Advent in offering the Kingdom to the nation, is the very one required by the sincerity of the tender, the free agency of the nation, the rejection of the Kingdom, and its postponement. To have distinctively announced the two Advents, with *the interval* between, and with *the results* of each, would have materially interfered with the course of events. Yet now *both* the wonderful foreknowledge of God and the wisdom of the Almighty, in the prophetic announcements, are *strikingly* exhibited. Now it is no longer a matter of difficulty to discriminate ; the fulfilments at the First Advent teach us what to apply to it and what to refer to the Second. Both Advents are plainly delineated—one of humiliation, suffering and death, and exaltation ; the other, one of triumph, vengeance, dominion, and glory. The Primitive Church view gives us *the key* to this peculiar prophetic style, and this very delineation, now so perplexing to Jewish Rabbis and to unbelievers, is evidence, if we will receive it, of *Divine* inspiration.

PROPOSITION 59. *This Kingdom of God, offered to the Jewish nation, lest the purpose of God fail, is to be given to others who are adopted.*

This Kingdom is incorporated by covenant promise with the seed of Abraham; that seed is chosen, but refusing the Kingdom on the condition annexed to it, now, that the Divine Purpose revealed in the covenants may *not fail* in its accomplishment through the unbelief and depravity of the nation, another seed must be raised up *unto Abraham*, to whom the Kingdom, in a peculiar sense (as will be explained hereafter), is to be given.

Obs. 1. In Matt. 21, *after* the chief priests and scribes and elders manifested their opposition to Him, and *after* He had told (v. 31) them, "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you" (i.e. in view of their repentance and faith, they became *heirs* of the Kingdom), then He gives the parable of the wicked husbandmen, who not only rejected and killed the servants, but finally even *the heir* (v. 33–46). When the Jews answered Christ's question concerning what the lord of the vineyard would do in such a case, He accepts of their reply (*condemnatory* of themselves), and shows that He (the Stone) has been rejected, and adds: "*therefore* (i.e. on account of their refusing to receive Him), *I say unto you, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.*" Now let the reader carefully consider: (1) The Kingdom of God *taken from* them. This Kingdom belonged *exclusively* to them (comp. Props. 24, 29, 31, 49, 54, 55). It was theirs by covenant relationship; but, having made themselves unworthy of it, the tender was withdrawn, and it was to be *given to* others. (2) The Kingdom was to be given to a nation, a people, who, by the fruits resulting from obedience through faith, should show themselves *worthy* of it.

Obs. 2. Additionally, in this declaration of Jesus, we have—(1) the Kingdom which is taken from them is one, which, it is taken for granted, that *the Jews comprehended*, viz. *the covenanted Kingdom*, the only Kingdom that they were acquainted with, thus corroborating our position. They well understood its force and propriety, and appreciated its application to themselves, saying, "*God forbid.*" (2) They expected to receive this Kingdom solely in virtue of their national relationship *without observing* the condition of repentance annexed to the offer. (3) They were *not to receive* the Kingdom within their reach, appertaining to them, owing to their great wickedness in rejecting and even killing, as a culmination of rebellion, *the Heir* Himself. (4) *Another people* was to receive it. This at once opens some interesting questions, which, if we

desire to appreciate the Divine Purpose and to prevent its assuming the changeable aspect of human plans diverted and altered by contingencies, demand on our part *due consideration*. We now merely suggest them, leaving following Propositions to bring them out in detail. The Kingdom of God is expressly covenanted to *the seed* of Abraham (but to the faithful, obedient seed); now how can the covenanted promises respecting the Kingdom in *this line* be carried out into realization when the nation embracing that seed is rejected? Is this rejection final and perpetual, or is it removable and temporary? Can the nation or people who are to *specially* receive what the Jewish nation *then* lost by its non-repentance, obtain it without any reference to the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, i.e. without, in some way, becoming, *by adoption, or engrafting, or incorporation, the seed of Abraham?* Remember that God confirmed his promises *by oath*, and that *He is faithful*—not given to variableness or change—and, *therefore*, unless these questions can be satisfactorily and consistently answered, so that *the promise still runs in the covenanted Abrahamic line*, there would be a sad and unwarranted deficiency somewhere.

Obs. 3. This already teaches us that to preserve *the solemnly pledged faithfulness* of God, this people, to whom the Kingdom is to be given, must, in the very nature of the case, stand *closely related* to the Jewish race. They cannot be gathered out or selected, as multitudes now vainly imagine and foolishly boast, *without any regard whatever* to the old covenanted line. They *must be*, if God is sincere and mindful of His oath, *adopted as Abraham's seed* (comp. Props. 29, 30, etc.).

Obs. 4. John the Baptist had already foreshown that the wisdom and power of God would be amply sufficient to carry out His own covenanted Purpose, even if the nation would reject Christ. When the Pharisees and Sadducees also came to his baptism, after denouncing them with his prophetical spirit as "a generation of vipers," and urging them to repentance, he (Matt. 3 : 9) adds: "And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our Father; for I say unto you, *that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.*" Here are several suggestive ideas that we ought, by all means, to keep in mind: (1) that standing in the covenant relationship (being "children of the Kingdom") as the mere natural offspring or descendants of Abraham *without repentance and obedience* is not sufficient. To insure the Kingdom in their case, *both* are required; for the Theocratic ordering calls for moral preparation (e.g. Rom. 2 : 28, 29) as well as for union with the Fathers to whom the covenant was given. (2) That God is *abundantly able* to raise up *children unto Abraham*, so that, if necessity required it, they could be raised up even from stones. (3) That God would perform so miraculous a creative act *rather than* leave His covenant promises unfulfilled. (4) But even when this would be done, the covenant relationship would be sustained *in their being, by adoption, the children of Abraham.* (5) Hence, the promises are recognized *as given to Abraham, and to inherit with Abraham it is requisite to come into covenant relationship with him.*

This evinces how carefully the covenant relationship is constantly guarded, and that the current views respecting it being immaterial, whether we are related to Abraham or not, are sadly defective. It also has become fashionable for recent commentators, as a concession to rationalistic criticism, to make "these stones" to mean "the Romans"

or " the hard hearts of the heathen," " for a stone has manifestly no life ;" just as if the power of God which gave life to the dust of the earth could not bestow life to " these stones" present. This implies doubt concerning God's power, and is unworthy of a believer.

Obs. 5. The reader will observe that this removal of the Kingdom is *a national* one. (It *necessarily* is such because identified with the nation.) Various writers have fallen into gross mistakes on this point, and quote the passages relating to it *as if* all the Jews that ever lived had forfeited and lost their right to the Kingdom. The fact is, that the believing portion who had died *will yet* receive it, the believing portion who now accept of it *will likewise* obtain it, and the Gentiles who by faith are engrafted *will also* receive it. This will be plainly proven, as we proceed in the argument.

Obs. 6. Another mistake into which many fall must be corrected, viz.: that the Kingdom being *taken from* them, it will *never be given* to the nation again. Now here we must ask the indulgence of the reader, for a number of things which serve *to explain* this remarkable language are reserved for separate propositions, and, therefore, no decided and satisfactory explanation can be presented before passing over these. This much, by way of preliminary, may be stated : (1) that those *then* addressed, the nation as existing down to the present day, *cannot* (excepting individual believers) *inherit* the Kingdom in the higher sense (intimated by giving) *of Kingship and priesthood, co-heirship* with Christ ; (2) that the nation, *as such,* by its wickedness, *forfeited the high position of rulership* with Christ, which individual believers will receive from Him at its ultimate re-establishment ; (3) but this does *not prevent the final restoration* of the nation to its covenanted position *in order to secure* (*a*) the establishment of the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom, and (*b*) the special bestowal of this Kingdom to this very nation gathered out ; (4) hence, Jesus, whilst directly asserting *the forfeiture of a high privilege, does not add,* as many suppose, that the nation itself *shall never again* enjoy the blessings of the Theocratic Kingdom, but in a subordinated position ; (5) for this Scripture must be interpreted, *not isolated,* but in connection with others relating to the same subject.

Obs. 7. This removal of the Kingdom from the nation on account of sinfulness, and its contemplated bestowal upon individual believers (as rulers in it) rebuts the argument of the Duke of Somerset (*Ch. Theol. and Mod. Skep.*, ch. 18), in that he attempts to affirm that " the book of Acts bears false witness against a Christian apostle," owing to Paul's language to the Jews at Rome, when some of them refused to believe in the Kingdom under Jesus Christ as he expounded it to them out of the law and prophets. But we see (Acts 28 : 17–31) *the accuracy* of the writer of Acts and *the exceeding propriety and delicacy* of Paul's representations, contrasting the same with the covenanted relationship of the Jews to this Kingdom, to the language of Jesus, the Master, respecting their rejection of it and its bestowal upon others, and to the apostolic desire that His brethren after the flesh might also inherit—in the higher sense—this Kingdom. There is a beautiful and most delicate consistency in Paul's conduct ; for, giving the Jews the precedence (for the reasons given by us), after an appeal to the Scriptures during a whole day, he *honorably,* as his

character of apostleship demanded, referred them, because of their unbelief, to what had previously been predicted of them, and *then* turned to the Gentiles. There was no deception in the case, but *an open, frank statement of the real facts* as they existed. According to the Duke (who totally misapprehends the nature of the Kingdom preached) Paul ought to have told the Jews that they were mistaken concerning the Kingdom, that Christ had established another one, a spiritual one, etc., and not pretend that he was *in unison with them* in the hope of *the same* Kingdom when really he was *in opposition* to them. Paul could not do this, simply because it would have made his message *discordant*, instead of its being, as it is, in *happy correspondence* with the truth (comp. Props. 44, 70, 71, 72, 74).

The Duke's reasoning has force only if we adopt the prevailing modern views of the Kingdom. If Paul entertained the spiritualistic notion of the Kingdom, *then*, as the Duke observes, neither his conduct nor speech can be commended. But if Paul believed in the Kingdom, as covenanted and indicated in our argument, *then* he is not open to the Duke's strictures and corrections. The objector in the charge of "dishonesty," forgets that the death of Jesus *only confirms* the covenant promises (Prop. 50); that the kingdom was *not* the disputed point, but *whether* Jesus was "the Christ" through whom the Kingdom should eventually appear; that the giving of the Kingdom to others does not change the covenants respecting it or its nature; that, therefore, Christianity is not a "subversion of the Jewish religion," but an elevation of it (the typical, non-essential elements being necessarily removed), showing how the covenants, the Theocratic ordering, the presence of God, etc. *can and will be* secured. The Duke's reasoning, consequently, has force only with such who place Paul in a wrong position.

Obs. 8. The Kingdom had come nigh to the nation (in the tender of it, in the person of the Messiah, and in covenant relationship leading to the restrictive preaching), and the nation, therefore, must have sustained *a peculiar, special relation to it*, or else it could not have been taken from them. To be taken from them is indicative of the nation's having *a claim* upon it (as we have all along demonstrated). Now, preliminary to following Propositions (93–104) it may be well for the reader to notice in this connection that what was taken from them *could not be* "the church," or "the Christian dispensation," or "God's reign in the heart," or "the Gospel," or "spiritual reign" (see usual meanings given to Kingdom, Prop. 3), so prevalently defined *to be* the Kingdom of God. For none of these things *were taken from* the Jews as can be abundantly shown; for they, in this respect, stand precisely upon *the same footing* as the Gentiles. This dispensation was commenced at Jerusalem, the Gospel was first preached to the Jews, and for some time the Church largely embraced Jews as believers. It was by express command that the Gospel should first be offered to the Jews, Luke 24 : 47, Acts 13 : 46, Acts 3 : 19, 21, etc. The gospel with its blessings is just as freely offered to the Jews, and the privileges of the Church just as graciously extended to them as to the Gentiles. Hence it follows: that the Kingdom of God taken from them is *not* the gospel, or admission into the Church, or enjoyment of Church blessings, or the privileges of this dispensation, because *none of these things* were taken from them. What they lost is the Kingdom itself, *just as covenanted*, and not the after provisionary appointments to still secure the Kingdom in the future. Is it not surprising that so plain a feature is so much ignored?*

* Let the reader observe the inconclusive and inconsistent interpretations of numerous commentators (as e.g. Lange, Barnes, Scott, etc., *loci.*), for it was not taken from the

Obs. 9. This taking away of the Kingdom from the nation to whom it belonged as a covenanted right, and thus giving it to others, serves to explain the phraseology of Luke 11 : 20, "*the Kingdom of God has come upon you.*" The offer and the taking it away shows that the nation was indeed nigh to it, if it had only known the day of *its gracious visitation.* So also the phrase, "*the Kingdom of God is among (or within) you.*" Luke 17 : 21 indicates the same fact, for as many critics have noticed the word rendered "among," may mean "within," * and, therefore, in strict accordance with the circumstance that the Jewish nation is an elect (Prop. 24) nation, and that the Kingdom is a covenanted (Prop. 49) one, and that, in view of this, was "*within*" it, connected and identified with it (through the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom, Prop. 31), and hence, tendered among all the nations of the earth, *to this nation alone* (Props. 54, 55). The phrase "*children of the Kingdom cast out*" likewise indicates this same relationship, implies that they stood in close connection with the Kingdom, that they rejected it, and that it was withdrawn from them. For such phraseology cannot be used respecting the Gentiles, all the wicked, but only of those who, in some special manner, *stand related* to the Kingdom by promise or otherwise.

Obs. 10. Two things additional are suggested by the words of Jesus. (1) What unspeakable honor, power, and glory *would have* resulted to the Jewish nation, *if it had accepted* the simple but necessary Theocratic condition of repentance annexed to the offer of the Kingdom. Instead of the fearful judgments of God, the overthrow and dispersion of the nation, the terrible persecution of centuries, the long and bitter Gentile domination treading down the beloved city, etc., it would have taken rank as *the first* of the nations of the world, and it would have been exalted as *the centre of Theocratic influence, power, and dominion.* This is seen by what will occur *when* the saints inherit the Kingdom, and by what will even yet take place *when* "the times of the Gentiles" are ended, and the nation is restored. (2) *The mercy extended to the Gentiles;* the grace of God tendering *the first place* in this Kingdom (i.e. its kingship and priesthood) to those who were *not* in covenanted relationship, but who now, through the unbelief and fall of the nation, are brought into it through repentance and faith. What *a prize* grace offers to us Gentiles!

Obs. 11. There is a remarkable agreement between this taking away of the Kingdom from the nation and giving it to others, and the predictions relating to this matter. Thus e.g. when this Kingdom was offered to the Jews, its proclamation was heralded by "the time is fulfilled." In this, as numerous writers have noticed, there is an evident allusion to the seventy weeks of Daniel (ch. 9 : 20–27). Having seen the result of this

---

Jews to be believers, the peculiar people of God, true members of the N. Test. Church, etc., as evidenced by the facts presented. This only proves the correctness of our position, viz.: that that which is taken from the then existing nations, is a peculiar, distinctive honor and privilege—that of special rulership—which now will be bestowed upon believers gathered out of all nations.

* Jones (*Essays* by Philo-Basilicus, p. 16 and 17, foot-note), after tracing the usage of the word, says: "The word properly signifies within, and the question is, within what? The true answer is, *within the Jewish nation,* which was the elect." (Comp. Prop. 110.)

offer, we find it also foreshown in this very prediction; for instead of a Kingdom and great glory described as pertaining to the nation, we have the Messiah cut off, the destruction of the city, desolations determined "*even until the consummation,*" or for a certain period of time. Thus do the facts, *as they exist to-day*, tally with the previously given predictions.

PROPOSITION 60. *This Kingdom of God is given, not to nations, but to one nation.*

This is distinctly stated, "a nation," Matt. 21 : 43. It necessarily follows from our Scriptural propositions, and corroborates them. It is *a logical sequence* from the premises laid down. For, so long as *one* nation is chosen from among all others (Prop. 24), and the Kingdom is covenanted *by oath* to *that* nation (Prop. 49), it is impossible for other nations, in their *national* capacity, to be thus elected. It would be a violating of the *most solemnly* given covenants and assurances.

Obs. 1. Notice : the Kingdom is promised to the natural believing descendants of Abraham, and as the nation, then existing when the Kingdom was offered, refused to repent in order to receive it, God must now—to carry out His purpose—raise up a nation *unto* Abraham, i.e. a nation in some way *still related* to him. If a Gentile nation or nations (as many suppose) were chosen in place of the Jewish, this would *ignore* all the past assurances given, and *overthrow* the multiplied predictions of the prophets. It would *nullify* God's covenants, and make it appear that He undertook a Plan which, owing to human depravity, *He was unable* to perform. It would *lower* the power of the Divine administration, and make God subject *to change*. Gentile nations cannot *as nations* be substituted for the *one elect* Jewish nation (as we have already abundantly shown). The *importance*, therefore, of tracing His chosen nation, and ascertaining *how* it becomes—*to insure covenanted relationship*—incorporated with the elect nation, the Abrahamic people, *cannot be overestimated*. Upon this largely depends our estimation of the covenants, the faithfulness of God, the continued election of the Jewish nation, the design of the Church, the nature of the Kingdom, and the inspiration and unity of the Word.

Therefore we cannot receive the idea advanced by Oosterzee (see Prop. 57, Obs. 5), that Jesus at His First Advent "put an end to the wall of separation *between Israel and the nations*." Multitudes assert the same, misapprehending the nature and intent of the call of the Gentiles, as will fully appear in the course of our argument, satisfactory Scriptural reasons being assigned for every step taken.

Obs. 2. In the consideration of this matter it is requisite for the reader to keep in mind what has been proven (see Props. 24, 30, 49, 50, etc.), that the wall of partition between the Jewish nation, as such, and Gentile nations, as such, *is not removed* but *only between believers* of all nations and the Jewish nation. This is essential to a proper understanding of the truth, and is a feature *clearly* taught as already shown, over against the inferences of De Colanges (*Ancient City*), and many others.

Obs. 3. The entire tenor of the Old and New Tests. makes the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants subsisting and continuous (Prop. 51); and the Divine Purpose in reference to salvation and the Kingdom is inseparably (Prop. 50) identified with them. It follows, then, as a matter of moral necessity, that this nation or people must come in *under* these covenants. If the Divine forbearance toward the Jewish nation ceased for a time, owing to the rejection of the Messiah, God must now, in a way *consistent* with His own promises and faithfulness, raise up a people *for* Abraham. Jesus, in accordance with what was predicted (as e.g. Deut. 32 : 21), simply states the fact of such a calling, without any explanation as *to the manner* in which it would be accomplished, *leaving* it for the future to interpret His meaning. We cannot be too guarded in *strictly* following the plain narrative of the Word and *in accepting* of its teachings on this point, seeing that the Plan is of God's, not man's, devising.

Obs. 4. God does not change His Plan of having *one* nation (comp. e.g. 1 Pet. 2 : 9) identified with Abraham, in which is lodged *the foundation* of that Kingdom destined to attain world-wide dominion, and to bring all nations directly under its sway. To do this would be indicative of weakness in the formation of His Purpose (as announced and supported *by oath*), and in the power of His Divine administration (to carry into effect that which is promised). Therefore, let it be repeated as something specially worthy of attention, that, in view of the Divine character, attributes, and pledges given, we may rest assured that any change which may occur (dispensational or otherwise) will *not affect the original design contemplated and covenanted,* relative to the Kingdom, in its ultimate fulfilment.

Obs. 5. The original choice of one nation, and the continued selection of "a nation," in some way identified with Abraham, enables us to appreciate the reason why God confined the acceptance of the Kingdom to *one* nation and ultimately gives it to *one* people. It was not merely (as Kurtz, Neander and others) to preserve the purity of religion, to perpetuate it, to make known the true God, etc., but the selection *of a nation* was made to be *the nucleus of the Messianic Kingdom* (comp. what was said under the Davidic covenant); (*a*) in the rulers or co-heirs with the Messiah selected out of nations forming the believing elect, who compose with Jesus a select body having the supremacy; (*b*) that afterward the nation itself might be incorporated (according to promise through the Davidic throne and Kingdom) in it, thus becoming the entering wedge or the fulcrum of universal dominion *because of its Theocratic nature;* (*c*) that in this way (owing to the foreseen depravity of man making such a foretold provision necessary), *the highest and noblest* of all earthly relations (viz. : that of nationality) is seized, appropriated, and through it (exhibited under direct Messianic rule), when all things are ready for its manifestation, the conversion and exaltation *of the greatest number* will be accomplished in the briefest time. For under such an ordering, a certain number saved (i.e. "a nation") is secured to provide for the requisite establishment of a *stable Theocratic government* which cannot be moved by (as in the past) the outbreaks of depravity. The number of the elect completed, *then* the Kingdom is manifested, by which and its introductory judgments the conversion of the world in *a speedy manner* is

insured. From this we infer, that the Proposition contains a Plan adopted by the wisdom of God, by which not only the required number of the elect is obtained in the soonest manner, but that it contains within itself the elements by which "*the sure mercies of David,*" and all the covenanted promises, will be realized *in the briefest time compatible with the free agency of man.*

Obs. 6. It is extremely satisfactory to find that nowhere in the Scriptures does the now prevailing view, that the Gentile nations, *as nations,* are called, find *the least* support. This is precisely what the covenanted Word requires. This one nation to whom the Kingdom is to be given, which shall inherit it, is composed of individuals *out of all nations.* To no one Gentile nation is the Kingdom offered as *it was* to the Jewish, viz. : that on their national repentance the Kingdom of God would be established among or within it. This *could not* be done without doing violence to pledged covenants, seeing that the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom pertains *nationally* to the Jewish nation. But God can tender this Kingdom, on certain conditions, to individuals of all nations ; and therefore all nations are invited in their individual capacity to receive the gospel and by the obedience of faith secure, through believing ones, the blessings of the Kingdom ; i.e. in the persons thus believing "a nation" will be gathered to whom the Kingdom will be given.

The proof will be adduced, and the manner of incorporating this nation in the Abrahamic line will be presented, as we progress in the argument. Attention is merely called to the matter now, so that the proclamation of the Gospel to all nations, including the Jews, may not be mistaken for the bestowal of the Kingdom to a people to be chosen out of all nations according to the foreknown and declared will of God. But comparatively few families in their entirety have accepted of the Gospel, so that we need not expect entire towns, cities, and nations to receive it. It will remain true down to the end of this dispensation, that "*many are called but few chosen ;*" these few, *in their grand aggregate,* forming this chosen "holy nation." For we must bear in mind that God also foreknows, which He has *plainly* predicted, that no Gentile nation, *as such,* will receive the gospel, which is evidenced by the fact that at the very close of the dispensation the nations of the earth (Rev. 19, etc.) will be arrayed against the Messiah. God's Plan is made and carried on in view of this very *foreseen* depravity of nations, and hence it is not His purpose to make all nations this "peculiar people," but to gather them *out of* the nations. We must therefore distinguish between "the Gospel of the Kingdom" being given to all nations, the result of the Gospel in individual believers, the people to whom the Kingdom is bestowed, and the Kingdom itself and the giving of the Kingdom to a nation. The former is done that the latter may be realized.

Obs. 7. It is proper to remind the reader that this bestowal of a Kingdom to "a nation" that is to be gathered does not result from Gentile nations being better than the Jewish nation ; this is evinced by their possessing a common depravity, that justification is accorded to both Jew and Gentile on precisely the same grounds, and that the Gentiles, like the Jews, will ultimately be found arrayed against the grace of God in Christ. It arises *solely* from *the mercy and favor* of God, who, out of the Jewish and Gentile nations alike, is ready and willing to accept of believers in Christ to form that nation to whom the Kingdom is to be given. This gives us the true standard by which to judge of the harsh and unjust opinions and proceedings of Gentile nations toward the Jewish nation, just *as if* they were better than the latter, and not entirely dependent *on grace* for the call to the Kingdom.

Obs. 8. It may be added, that this feature throws light upon the question of *nationalized* churches *as representative* of the Kingdom of God. Such certainly do not enter into the Divine Plan, seeing that since the Jews as a nation were for a time rejected, it is only part of that Plan to gather *out of* the nations "a peculiar people," and not to exalt any Gentile nation to *the Theocratic* position which the Jewish nation alone by covenant privilege possess; and which union of Church and State shall *be only*, in the way contemplated by God, exhibited when this "peculiar people" or "nation" has been gathered out. In other words, individual persons, and not nations, are chosen; after the establishment of the Kingdom, *then*, as we shall see, all nations will also come under its dominion and blessings.

Hence we need not wonder at the lamentable corruptions and failures of State churches, as well as others, in establishing what was wrongfully thought to be the Kingdom of God, as e.g. was done in the Constantinian period (which every historian, excepting Roman Catholic, informs us resulted in injury to the Church, both in doctrine and practice). We need not be surprised that, at the close of this dispensation, the nations most highly favored with the preaching of the Gospel shall be severely punished as the enemies (Rev. 19, etc.), either directly or indirectly, of the Christ. The secular governments of the earth, of whatever form and however they may result from expediency, moral and civil necessity, etc., are *not chosen* by God, out of which and in which to develop the Messianic Kingdom; they all lack the great essential, fundamental feature, viz.: *the Theocratic;* they all, while under the Divine Sovereignty and control, have *not* God acting in their behalf as an earthly Ruler; long ago that choice was made, and it is inseparably *connected with* the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom. The only *national* election is that of the Jewish nation, and with that election, as we shall see, the Kingdom of God is fully blended. This at once removes many wild and untenable theories advanced concerning the union of Church and State in Gentile nations, and also the predictions of fallible men respecting the nationalized glory of Gentile nations thus distinguished by such a union. God does not recognize, either in Daniel or Rev., the alleged and professed conversion of the Roman Empire, for down to the Sec. Advent it retains its *bestial* character. God looks at nations from a standpoint very different from that assumed by their eulogizers (comp. Prop. 164).

PROPOSITION 61. *The Kingdom which by promise exclusively belonged to the Jewish nation, the rightful seed of Abraham, was now to be given to an engrafted people.*

It has been shown that this kingdom belongs by promise and covenant to *the seed* of Abraham (Props. 29, 49); now, as the promises of God are sure (Props. 47, 52), this people, this very nation, *must be engrafted or incorporated* with this *elected seed* of Abraham. This is indispensable, for othewise God's *oath-bound* word would *fail* in its fulfilment. Rather than have so precious a word to fail, God is able, as we have seen, to raise up children unto Abraham even, if necessary, from the stones (Matt. 3 : 9); but instead of resorting to miraculous intervention to produce such a result, God raises up a seed unto Abraham *out of* the Gentiles by engrafting them through faith in the Christ, and *accounting them* as the children of Abraham by virtue of their Abrahamic justifying faith.

Obs. 1. The plan of adoption is simple: Abraham was justified by faith, the election was bestowed upon him in virtue of that faith, and hence those who believe in the promised seed being *also justified* by faith, are brought into living union with Christ ("the King of the Jews"), and through Him become *the adopted children* of Abraham who was of like faith. Hence the apostle in Gal. 3 tells us (v. 7) "*Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.*" But *why* become the children of Abraham? Because, as he shows, verses 14–18, the promises and inheritance are given through him, and we *must be related to Abraham* in order to receive and inherit the same. Therefore he goes on and insists that this very essential relationship is established in and through Jesus Christ, and (v. 28, 29) adds: "*for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.* And if ye be Christ's, *then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise.*" Thus then (ch. 2 : 5) receiving "the adoption of sons," because united and identified with Christ, who is the chief inheritor under the Abrahamic covenant, we become co-heirs with Him. This marvellously simple arrangement, introducing mercy and grace to us Gentiles, preserves the covenanted promises *intact* and *confirms* them.

Hon. Vance, in a lecture (Baltimore, Md., reported in *The Sun*, March, 1874), justly says: "Every Christian to-day is a graft upon the stock of the Jewish Church, and each Christian perpetuates the Jew." On the other hand, e.g., Hodge (*Sys. Div.*, vol. 3, p. 810) does not discriminate, but has the wall of partition broken down between nations instead of, as Paul, between believers in Christ. If it be objected that we have the most comprehensive language, such as the world reconciled in Christ and kindred expressions, the answer is plain: such a reconciliation and the reception of the Gospel by all men has not yet been witnessed—it requiring time to be exemplified practically—but will be in the future, through the instrumentality of this very Kingdom inherited by believers (comp. e.g. Prop. 176).

Obs. 2. This Proposition and the decided Scriptural proof sustaining it, removes at once that painfully loose and inconsistent theological writing, so exceedingly prevalent since the days of the mystical schoolmen, which makes *no account of our virtually* becoming the children of Abraham. Having lost the true force of the covenants, consequently totally misapprehending the nature of the Kingdom and of the covenant renewed in the blood of Jesus, and substituting another and widely different Kingdom for the covenanted one, and utterly ignoring the plainly revealed postponement of the Kingdom,—multitudes (see e. g. Prop. 67, Obs. 3, Prop. 54, Obs. 4, 5, etc.) see no *necessity* for our becoming the seed of Abraham in order to inherit. With many it seems to be the proper thing, *to be as far removed as possible from a Jewish standpoint*, and to this feeling much and precious truth is sacrificed. All passages bearing on the subject are merely regarded and interpreted as *representative or figurative and not real.* But we see *a deep and solid reason* for this process of becoming grafted into this elect, covenanted nation. Paul (Rom. chs. 9, 10, and 11) argues directly that the election runs *only in a certain line* of Abraham's seed, in that of Isaac (comp. Props. 49 and 50) the child of promise, and that after the manifested unrighteousness of the nation, "except the Lord of Sabaoth *had left us a seed* we had been as Sodom," etc.; that *in believers* there is no difference between Jew and Gentile, both being equally heirs of the promise; that Gentiles by their faith *are accounted as believing Jews and also of the election*, because "if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, *wert graffed in among* them, and *with* them partakest *of the root and fatness of the olive tree;* boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest *not* the root, *but the root thee.*" Here then it is decisively stated that Gentile believers are grafted in upon the Jewish olive tree, *the root of which remaining untouched, owing to the elective purpose of God*, this also bears these *engrafted* ones. The *personal* interest in the covenants is thus clearly specified, and the manner in which it is obtained, *by adoption*, is equally stated *in precise* language. This language, too, is addressed to Gentiles, reminding them of the distinctive relationship they sustained to the Jewish elect nation. While the natural descendants of Abraham were included in the covenant relationship, as evinced by the covenants only given to them, by the Theocratic government instituted only among and over them, yet *only* the believing and faithful portion of those natural descendants were to realize the *ultimate* blessing of that Kingdom of kings and priests promised to faith and obedience. Now it is with this believing body *of the Abrahamic line* that believing Gentiles are incorporated, thus coming under *the same* covenant promises and blessings.

Fausset (*Com.* Dan. 7 : 27) justly remarks: "The saints are gathered out of Jews and Gentiles, but the stock of the Church is *Jewish* (Rom. 9 : 24 and 11 : 24); God's faithfulness to this election Church is thus virtually faithfulness *to Israel*, and a pledge of their future national blessing. Christ confirms this fact, while withholding the date (Acts 1 : 6, 7)." Comp. with this Prop. 63, and observe the numerous concessions to be found in various commentaries on Rom. ch. 11 and Gal. ch. 3.

Obs. 3. We cannot too strongly insist upon *this necessary engrafting* of Gentile believers, so that by virtue of *a real relationship*, they, being regarded by God Himself as of the seed of Abraham, may inherit. For, it has become a great and radical *defect* in many, if not nearly all, of our

systems of Theology to overlook the reason *why* a seed must be raised up *unto* Abraham, and to proceed in their elucidations of the subject, as if Abraham and the Jews had very *little* to do with the matter. In treatises on *Justification by Faith* (by which we become engrafted) we find, from beginning to end, *no allusion* whatever to the Patriarchs and the covenants, just as if the present dispensation was separate, unconnected, and independent of all others. This is a *serious, fundamental* blunder, violating unity, and making the election and covenants of little value. Let such writers consider *the exceeding plain* and reiterated language of Scripture on this point. That the Gentile believer *must become an adopted member* of the elected nation is stated in words (Eph. chs. 2 and 3) like these: that the Gentiles who were in time past "*aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise,*" "*who sometime were afar off are now made nigh by the blood of Christ,*" so that in believing and appropriating that blood by faith, "*ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God,*" etc., so "*that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.*" Why does the apostle tell this to Gentile believers, if it was not to show them clearly *into what* they had been *grafted*, viz.: into that elected Jewish nation to which was covenanted the promises? Moreover, such is the peculiarity and distinctiveness of this relationship, or, as the apostle calls it, "fellowship," that the revealment of its adoption and manner of procedure is called "a mystery." For it was a question to be decided, *how* this could be done without changing or lowering covenants given to this Jewish nation.

Alas! multitudes of Gentiles do not regard it in this light. They think it was a very simple process, viz.: to ignore or set aside *oath-bound* covenants, and give the blessings spiritualized to Gentiles without any reference to the Jews. When such utterances as "salvation is of the Jews" (John 4 : 22), "other sheep I have, which *are not of this fold*; them also must *I bring*, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be *one fold and one Shepherd*" (John 10 : 16), etc., are given, they are interpreted in such a manner as to lose their native, inherent force. Learned men gravely inform us that about all the meaning that can be attached to them is, that as the Jews were depositories of truth and religion, so the same was handed down to us through them, and Gentiles receive it and become in turn the depositories. Others, however, go so far as to object to the use of such language. Thus e.g. Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 215, footnote), with his usual destructive criticism in behalf of his lauded religion of humanity, objects to the phrase "*salvation is of the Jews*," as expressing a thought which "appears to have been interpolated." Our entire argument shows that it is *essential* and just the language that ought to be employed. The *vital necessity*, owing to oath-bound covenants, given to Abraham and David, of every Gentile, who desires to secure the covenanted promises sealed by the blood of Christ, in becoming a child of Abraham is entirely passed over as if it had never existed, by such writers. They also endeavor to make a difference between Paul and the other apostles, extending even to an antagonism, because Paul lays more stress on the doctrine of "justification by faith," forgetting that this very feature ought to be prominent in Paul's case, because *specially appointed* an apostle to the Gentiles, and faith was the grand instrumentality by which the Gentiles were engrafted and adopted.

Obs. 4. Men ridicule as "carnal," "fleshly," etc., that we Gentile believers, in virtue of our union with Christ, are grafted in and become members of the Jewish elect nation, *virtually* becoming believing Jews. Overlooking the covenants exclusively given to the Jews (Rom. 9 : 4), forgetting that the Kingdom with its ultimate blessings is only tendered to the true Israel, i.e. to the believing and obedient natural descendants (and engrafted and adopted Gentiles,) of Abraham, our opponents point us,

in order to sustain their rejection of such a Jewish connection, to Rom. 2 : 28–29 : "*For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God.*" Aside from the expression that we must become "*Jews inwardly,*" thus confirming our position (for what, excepting this covenanted relationship, could have induced Paul to use this *peculiar* phraseology, viz. : that, in some way, we must become Jews?), we apprehend, from the very concessions made by many of our opponents, that the expression "for he is not a Jew who is *one outwardly*" has no reference, as is generally supposed, *to birth or descent* from Abraham. This is evidenced by the contrast or antithesis "but he is *a Jew*, which is *one inwardly*;" the latter indicating the state of *the heart*, viz.: being faithful and obedient,—the former "outwardly" has also reference to *the heart*, that it was not right because such an one contented himself with external or outward conformance to the law.

It only teaches what is elsewhere taught, that not all the natural descendants of Abraham will receive the promises (just as now, not all who are outwardly Christians but those who are also inwardly such, shall inherit the Kingdom), though covenanted to them and incorporated with them as a nation, because *they are conditioned*, so far as individual members of the nation, are concerned, by heartfelt faith and obedience. Indeed, to make the passage refer to birth or descent would make it *inconsistent* with the previous dealings of God with the Jewish nation, which was so directly and positively chosen *because of its line of descent.* To the nation, *as a nation*, this, as will be seen more clearly as we advance, natural descent is of *inestimable value*, for to it belongs the Theocratic ordering; to the individual Jew it was, as Paul argues in Romans, of great advantage, because of his *personal* contact with the covenants, but even this advantage (just as now, in church membership and church privileges) could, *through unbelief*, be rendered unavailable and condemnatory, rendering his circumcision, the outward sign of his peculiar relationship, of no profit, not being accompanied by a proper heart observance. Another passage, Rom. 9 : 6, "*They are not all Israel which are of Israel,*" is employed by some as if it discarded the natural descendants. But this is contradictory to the plain fact that for many centuries the promises, etc., were confined to those natural descendants and to the few Gentiles adopted; and to the additional fact that even now they pertain to them, making it necessary for Gentiles to be grafted in and adopted. The reader will observe that the name is *a national one*, for all have a right to the name who are descended from Israel, but only in so far as they *also* imbibe the faith and spirit of him who was first called Israel, for the apostle argues that some, through their conduct, *make void* their interest in the name. Those who are loyal to the name retain it; those who are not cannot be counted among them.

Obs. 5. This necessary engrafting, this vital connection through Christ with the Jewish elect nation (as the seed of Abraham to whom the promises are given) gives *the key* to the word "*Israel,*" applied even now to all true believers. This word has not two meanings, one applicable to the Jews and the other to the Gentiles, such as men in their wisdom attach to it, but only *one meaning* which God has given to it. Given originally to Jacob, it was only applicable (e.g. Rom. 9 : 6) in its original full meaning to his believing descendants who had part and lot in the covenanted blessings; and, therefore, in view of this connection the word is in a general way (as e.g. Rom. 9 : 4, 27, and 11 : 7, 25, etc.) applied to these descendants (including even all the natural descendants because to them were the promises committed,) to whom belonged the covenants, (and to those who were adopted into the nation). Therefore, it is applicable only, *so far as the Gentiles* are concerned, to such as are *grafted in* and thus, becoming members of the covenanted line, are reckoned as "*the Israel,*"

can entertain "*the hope of Israel*," and will inherit with "*the Israel of God.*" Being thus incorporated with "*the commonwealth of Israel*"—the Israel to whom pertain the covenants,—they *virtually* become Jews, and the distinctive title by which the believing line of Jews was favored, *rightfully* also belongs to them. The very name "*Israel*" is a reminder to us of *such* an adoption and election.

The name "Israel" means, as critics have informed us, "Who prevails with God," or "A Prince of God," and is significant of much more than being one whom God favors, viz.: that the one favored is in the covenanted line. Thus e.g. the name is given to Christ (Isa. 49 : 3), because pre-eminently applicable to him as one who prevails, as one who is a Prince, as the Seed in Israel's line, as the one through whom Israel is saved; it is bestowed upon all believers because they prevail, are exalted in the covenanted line; and it is given to the natural descendants of Jacob as expressive of their covenanted position. Fully admitting that the resemblance of names does not necessarily imply identity of ideas, yet if the name continues to have the same idea connected with it throughout revelation, and if no change is *directly* asserted, we may, consistently, maintain the identity, especially in so weighty a doctrine as the election, adoption pertaining to the Kingdom. The name "Israel" applies to the Jewish nation, to *the one line* of Abraham's descendants, and *also* to those adopted into it. Hence it fully belongs, *by right*, to all who are engrafted, and is thus employed. All who are the sons of Abraham, whether Jews believing or believing Gentiles grafted in, *are Israel*. This simple application should prevent the misapplying of the word, as if the present Israel was something separate and distinct from the Jewish stock. We recommend to the reader's notice the following remark from the leading Post-Millenarian of the day. Dr. Brown (*Com.* Rom. 11, note 8) says: "Those who think that in all the evangelical prophecies of the Old Test. the terms 'Jacob,' 'Israel,' etc., are to be understood solely of *the Christian Church*, would appear to read the Old Test. differently from the apostle, who, from the use of those very terms in Old Test. prophecy, draws arguments to prove that God has mercy in store for *the natural Israel* (v. 26, 27)." Such a rebuke from such a source, to the prevailing spiritualizing of the terms, and exclusive application to Gentiles, etc., is worthy of attention, and aids to refute some of his reasoning in *Ch. Sec. Coming*.

Obs. 6. This necessarily becoming "*a child of Abraham*" in order to inherit the promises, is unaccountable to those who overlook the covenants by which it is demanded. Thus e.g. Clarke (*Ten Religions*, p. 403), who regards Abraham's life and influence alone from a historic point, remarks: "the most curious fact about this Jewish people is, that every one of them is a child of Abraham" which "ancestral pride" "has never been the case with any other nation." The reason is evident: the *covenant relationship* demanded such a descent, for it is only the children of Abraham, natural and adopted, that can obtain the promises. This was felt and acknowledged from the express terms of the covenant; and that covenant instead of being rescinded, annulled, or altered remains to-day in full force.

It is, therefore, a matter of surprise that Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 350) should assert that "far better promises are given in these prophets to the heathen *than to the Jews*," when the facts are that they are *the same blessings* covenanted to the Jews and obtained by the Gentiles *only* on the condition of being *engrafted* and thus coming under the blessed reign of "the King of the Jews." This will be more clearly seen when we come to prove the establishment of the Kingdom in accordance with the terms of the covenant given to the Jewish nation, and observe the conspicuous position assigned *to the Jewish elect nation* in it. Knapp's judgment is based on his view of the present dispensation as final, and in the fact that now the Gentiles believe and receive the blessings of the Gospel more freely than the Jews; but this is only taking a very *limited and partial* view of God's Plan in the incorporation of Gentile believers, and in the ever-continued, because covenanted, pre-eminence of the Jewish nation. For we must never forget the declaration, 2 Sam. 7 : 24: "*For Thou hast confirmed to Thyself Thy people Israel to be a people unto Thee forever: and Thou, Lord, art become their God.*"

PROPOSITION 62. *This people, to whom the Kingdom is to be given, gathered out of the nations, becomes the elect nation.*

This cannot be otherwise, *owing to their incorporation* with *the elect* Jewish nation as *the seed* of Abraham by virtue of their faith in, and union with, Christ. To keep up *this elect* the Gentiles are engrafted, and hence are called, on account of their identification with the elected people of God, "*the elect according to the foreknowledge of God*" (1 Pet. 1 : 1, 2), "*a chosen generation*" (2 : 9, 10) "*which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God*" (comp. Eph. 1; 1 Thess. 1 : 4; Col. 3 : 12; Rom. 9, etc.). If we take the language and promises applied to this elect people, they are *identical* with those originally given to the line of election, and summed up in the expressions "*a royal priesthood, a holy nation,*" etc. (comp. Ex. 19 : 5, 6; Deut. 10 : 15, etc.).

The certainty of being engrafted, and thus becoming of "the elect," is not found in a process of reasoning, or in a mere connection with the Church, or in observance of religious rites, but is alone found in a Christian consciousness of acceptance, resulting from justification by faith in a personal Saviour, an appropriation of the Messiah which is evidenced by the accompanying fruits of the Spirit. To this self-consciousness, supported by a fruitage, the Scriptures constantly appeal; to this reality, affording a satisfactory assurance of salvation, believers in successive generations have continually referred; and it alone can afford a soul-satisfying proof, inspiring love, hope, joy, and peace. Personal, individual experience on this point is essential to happiness, for then is verified such declarations as "*I know in whom I have believed,*" "*I am known of mine,*" etc. Comp. Dr. Sprecher's *Groundwork of Theol.*, where this is admirably presented and urged.

Obs. 1. The term "*elect*" is used with reference to their being "*chosen*" for this kingdom. 2 Pet. 1 : 10 exhorts brethren "*to make your calling and election sure,*" and adds that by so doing they shall enter "*the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*" *How make it sure?* (1) The Jews are elect (Prop. 24, etc.); (2) since their national fall (as a punishment for sin) the Gentiles are invited to become, by faith, the seed of Abraham that shall inherit the promises; (3) by thus becoming the seed of Abraham *they enter into the covenanted line and also become the elect;* (4) it is *by faith in Christ,* in whom as the predicted David's Son are centered "*exceeding great and precious promises,*" that they become the elect; (5) hence, to make our call as Gentiles to become children of Abraham, and our election to the promised Kingdom sure, *we must live a life of faith in Christ.* In the very nature of the case, the foreknowledge of God is thus manifested "*having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ*" (Eph. 1 : 5) in order that the covenanted inheritance may be obtained by "*the elect of God*" (Col. 3 : 12; James 2 : 5, etc.).

Before God took the Israelites to Canaan He first provided *a sufficient number* of people, even under great trial and sorrow, who should be able to occupy the land, drive out

their adversaries, and enjoy their imparted possession. So *now* God has promised a rich inheritance, even the whole earth, to the saints under a Theocratic ordering, which they are to realize in a peculiar, exalted way; but before this inheritance is given God is engaged *in gathering out* this people, even under trial, temptation, and tribulation; and when the chosen, elected number *is complete* (known only to Him), *then* the possession will be received, the adversaries will be judged and overthrown by them as associated in Rulership with the Lord Christ.

This will enable us to discriminate between Auberlen and Fairbairn. The latter (*On Proph.*, Ap. K, p. 510), takes Auberlen to task for making the saints of Dan. 7 : 18-22 "the people of Israel," calling it "an unwarranted license," etc. Now that Auberlen is right as to the phrase itself, there can be *no doubt*, seeing that the saints, including the engrafted Gentiles, are truly *the seed of Abraham*, incorporated among the elect, and accounted "*the people of Israel.*" So also a writer (*Proph. Times*, Oct., 1870, Art. 1, p. 148) observes that "the saints of Daniel are Jews, *and not Gentile Christians*," under the idea that Daniel's vision only relates to the Jews when speaking of the saints. The latter is true, but it *includes* Gentile believers who are *incorporated* as Jews, and to whom, as we shall hereafter show, the Kingdom is in *an especial* manner given. We know of no "Gentile Christians" separate and distinct from the Jewish election, and hence Daniel is correct in speaking of the saints relating to the future, without the least intimation of a change from the Jewish to a Gentile standpoint.

Obs. 2. This doctrine of the Kingdom in its covenanted aspect gives us *the key* to the doctrine of election. The language referring to election is based (1) on the Divine Purpose relating to this Theocratic Kingdom; (2) on the Plan embraced in that Purpose, of gathering out a people,—whose character, etc., is predetermined—to whom it can be entrusted; (3) on the acceptance of the conditions by persons through which they come into the line of that purpose. The election then (*a*) is, *so far as God* is concerned, pre-ordained; such a people *will be gathered* (as even Moses predicted) for such a Kingdom of kings and priests to be established, and, as *God changes not*, it will most assuredly be carried into execution; (*b*) on the part of man, he comes in the line of the predestinated order, or elect, or chosen, *just so soon* as he accords or falls in with the determined process of engrafting through faith in Jesus Christ.

Hence, in view of the conflicting and mystical opinions on this point, Dr. Auberlen (*Div. Rev.*, p. 232) justly observes that the doctrine of predestination sprung out of a misapprehension and erroneous interpretation of the history of the Kingdom of God on earth, transferring what only belonged to such a Kingdom "to eternal religious relationships," etc. The term "elect" has then an ulterior reference to the fact (which will appear hereafter) that *after* this number is completed, who are to be associated with Christ in *the higher* Theocratic positions, *no others can or will be added.* They alone form that *chosen body* counted worthy of co-heirship with Christ, and hence even the common ordinary meaning of the word as given e.g. by Macnight (*Prelim. Essays*, essay 4, S. 40, to his Epistles), signifying "the most excellent, chief, the most precious," among other things of the same kind, because excellence is the reason why some things are chosen preferably to others, etc. (illustrated by "the elect captains" Ex. 15 : 3; "the elect angels" 1 Tim. 5 : 21 the "elect lady" and "elect sister" of 2 John 1 : 13, etc.), may be aptly retained. "The times of the Gentiles" are indeed preordained, but only in view of this *foreordained number* of the elect. The foreknowledge of God comprehended the delay in gathering out, and determines the end accordingly.

Obs. 3. The believing Gentile, becoming through his faith a "Jew inwardly," is elected or chosen in the place of "the children of the Kingdom" (Matt. 8 : 11, 12), who, through unbelief, are cut off from the nationally covenanted Kingdom. Therefore, these chosen ones, becoming such through adoption, "*shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob* (to whom the covenant was given) *in the Kingdom of heaven*," etc.

Lincoln (*Lects. on Epis. of St. John*, p. 80) rejects the idea of "adoption," making it to mean "son-placing"—a son's place, saying, "He (God) has taken children, but He does not adopt them," for He makes them such by "actually communicating His own nature and life;" "it is not by adoption, but that it is by the actual impartation of God's own life," in resurrection life, etc. While we fully acknowledge the impartation of the divine in resurrection and glorification, yet the word "adoption" (which *includes* this result) is used in the Scriptures as applicable to a believer now being one accepted, and destined for divine glory (Eph. 1 : 4, 5 ; Rom. 8 : 15 ; comp. with Gal. 3 : 26 ; John 1 : 12 ; 1 John 3 : 1, 2). The higher evidence and realization is in res. power (Rom. 8 : 23), and is given to those thus recognized (Gal. 4 : 5, 6).

PROPOSITION 63. *The present elect, to whom the Kingdom will be given, is the continuation of the previous election, chiefly in another engrafted people.*

This follows from what has preceded, and is thus thrown into a Proposition to impress it upon the mind. The previous, and the present, election *is founded on the promises and oath* to Abraham.

Obs. 1. *Both* elect are the seed, the children of Abraham; *both* sets of branches are on *the same* stock, on *the same* root, on *the same* olive tree; *both* constitute *the same* Israel of God, the members of *the same* body, fellow-citizens of *the same* commonwealth; *both* are "*Jews inwardly*" (Rom. 2 : 29), and of the true "*circumcision*" (Phil. 3 : 3), forming *the same* "peculiar people," "holy nation," and "royal priesthood;" *both* are interested in *the same* promises, covenants, and kingdom; *both* inherit and realize *the same* blessings at *the same* time. From these and other considerations, involving *identity*, we find this election *a continuous one*, by which the faithfulness of God shall be exhibited to the Patriarchs, to their obedient descendants, and to the engrafted believers taken from other nations.

This meets the objection of Williamson (*Letters to a Millenarian*), which rests upon an entire misapprehension of Millenarian teaching. No Millenarian makes the Jewish nation, as such, an *heir* of the Kingdom; all, without exception, make the believing Jew in the elect Abrahamic line (hence identified with, and included in, the nation), and the believing Gentile (engrafted by faith), in their totality *the heir*. We carefully distinguish between the heir and the subjects (Props. 124, 128, 153, etc.). Besides the nation itself, before restored and securing its covenanted supremacy, must be penitent and converted in order to obtain its distinguished position among the nations of the earth. The nation, as such, is brought into nearness with the Theocratic Kingdom, as already explained; as a nation it can abuse, pervert, and reject it, as already shown; but as a nation it can and will (as we will prove in its place) be restored, God foreseeing the same, as predicted, and hence forming His determinate Purpose in view of it. But this nation, thus restored to high Theocratic privileges, as covenanted and predicted, is only exalted because it stands associated with the immortal rulers, e.g. the twelve apostles, etc. We receive with him the same heirs, only that we insist upon their being Abraham's seed, consequently engrafted and adopted as such, in view of the elect covenanted relationship of the nation, in which the Theocracy is based fundamentally.

Obs. 2. This continuous election of *the same body* is manifested not only in the predictions of the prophets, in the reigning with the twelve tribes, in participating with the Patriarchs in the blessings of the Kingdom, etc., but it is surprisingly represented even in the description of the New Jerusalem, which has the names of "*the twelve tribes of the children of Israel*" (Rev. 21 : 12), showing that only those who are the children of Abraham have the privilege of constant association therewith.[1] It is remarkably delineated as a filling up a predetermined number (Rev. 7 : 4–9) in each one of the twelve tribes, and *after* that chosen number is taken out (as we

shall show in the proper place), *then* comes in the multitude, which corresponds with God's Plan.[1]

[1] This may serve to explain James' epistle addressed "to *the twelve tribes* which are scattered abroad," or "which are in, or of, the dispersion." Critics find it difficult, in view of the contents of the epistle and its being addressed to believers, to reconcile this passage with the literal twelve tribes. Yet two opinions prevail, viz.: that James wrote to believing Jews (Beza, Grotius, etc.), or that he addressed all Jews (Lardner, etc). But if we keep in view the engrafting and adoption, the continuous election and incorporation, James forcibly employs this phraseology to designate believers, and their being *the elect people of God*, who also were scattered or dispersed abroad among the nations.

[1] We may only add, if somewhat premature in the argument, that the election has not merely reference to the Kingdom itself, but *to a certain position*—one of distinguished, pre-eminent honor and dignity, viz.: Kingship and priesthood, in that Kingdom. Hence arises *the exceeding preciousness* of this election, bringing to us the glory of associated Rulership with Christ in His Theocratic dominion. "The Plymouth Brethren" define (Art. "*Plymouth Brethrenism*," *Brit. Quarterly*, Oct. 1873) "*the Church of God*," or, as they prefer to call it, "*the Assembly of God:*" "it is the actual living unity with Christ, and with each other, of those who, *since Christ's resurrection*, are formed into this unity by the Holy Ghost." This definition excludes the Old Test. saints, which is erroneous and derogatory to those saints, who also are saved through Christ. The apostles do not call the Church a new thing or a mystery, but that Gentiles could be introduced and put on the same ground ("*fellow heirs*," Eph. 3 : 6) with the Old Test. members. The same glory awaits both; both inherit with Abraham; both form the Church purchased by His blood; both look for and enter the same city, etc. This error is found in many of their works.

Obs. 3. This engrafting and continued election confirms what has already been said respecting "*the wall of partition*" being broken down, *not* between the Jewish nation and Gentile nations (Pressense, *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 292), *but*, between Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ (comp. Props. 24, 30, 49, 50, etc.).

The election is not removed from the Jewish nation, the seed of Abraham, for it continues, as has been proven, unbroken (comp. Rom. 11 : 28, 29, 26, 25, 23). No Gentile nation has been chosen *in place* of the Jewish, for such a procedure would violate and vitiate the solemnly given covenants. Even the covenanted Davidic throne and Kingdom, the Messiah's special inheritance as David's Son, indicates the *continued* necessity of such election. That God's purposes may not be defeated in erecting the contemplated Theocratic dominion with the elect nation for its basis, He continues the election in incorporating Gentiles. For the accomplishment of His Purpose He requires a certain determined number (known only to Him), and as the chosen nation in its membership made itself unworthy through the baseness of its depravity (in rejecting the Messiah), and but few remain "Jews inwardly," the true Israel of God, it becomes necessary to raise up a seed *identified* with that nation; this is done by calling all Gentiles to repentance and faith, and choosing individuals out of the nations, who, by virtue of their repentance and faith, are adopted and become the elect. By this adoption, no distinction exists between them and the believing natural descendants of Abraham, and hence that distinction which once arose between them as a barrier, called "the wall of partition," is removed between such believers. This election is something very different, as will be seen as the argument progresses, from the reception of the Gospel and the enjoyment of the blessings of the Kingdom in the future under the Messianic reign by the nations of the earth. These elect are then in the actual enjoyment of Rulership, etc. The offer now is indeed freely made to all, but all, as yet, do not accept of the same. The Gospel is freely preached to both Jew and Gentile, and by faith they become one in Christ Jesus, the wall of separation being broken down between them because of faith. Hence Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*) is wrong when he says, "the wall of separation between Israel and the Gentile world is already fallen," which is true only as to the call, but not as to election, the latter being the result of faith.

Obs. 4. In various works, the theory is advocated that the Christian Church is so entirely new in its institution, etc., that it is no continuation

of the old order. Thus e.g. Alex. Campbell (*Strictures*, Ap. to Debate on Baptism, p. 225), says: "the Jews were the *typical* congregation or church of God, but Christians are the *real* congregation or church of God." This, however, is *hostile* to the entire tenor of the Divine Plan as unfolded, and *antagonistic* to the covenants and election. The reply to this has already been given. It would be surpassing strange indeed to require engrafting upon a mere "typical" stock or olive-tree, and to promise us an inheritance with previous "typical" members of the church. Admitting that there is a newness in the arrangement by which Gentiles are embraced on the principle of faith, thus causing, through the defection of the Jews and the sacrifice of Jesus, a change in ordinances, etc., yet the expressive language by which it is carefully guarded, warns us to regard the past and the present church of God as *one grand, continuous reality* in the progress of the fulfilment of covenanted blessings.

Obs. 5. The quite early church view, as seen in the writings of the Fathers, made no such *unjust* discrimination between the ancient and modern elect. Both were regarded in *the same light* and as belonging *to the same body*, and such persons as Barnabas, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and others pointedly traced the election of believers to their being *grafted into* the elect Jewish nation, i.e. that portion of the natural seed of Abraham which also believed and rendered obedience, and thus becoming, through adoption, members of the elect nation. We have already quoted language of theirs, illustrative of this feature, under previous Propositions. It may be added, that so identified, through faith in Jesus, did they feel themselves with the Patriarchs to whom the covenants were given, that (as e.g. Lactantius, *Div. Insti.*, B. 4, ch. 10), they called them "our ancestors," and vividly expressed the hope, in virtue of being adopted as their seed, of finally inheriting with them.

Obs. 6. While in relation to "the times of the Gentiles" and their calling, this might be named, as some do, a "Gentile dispensation," yet it is a phrase not strictly correct, because it implies that the Jews were not also called and eligible to the Kingdom, that the Gentiles stood in a position independent of the Jews (i.e. were not grafted in, etc.), and that there is an unjust (to the Jews) discrimination in behalf of the Gentiles. Hence, careful writers avoid the phrase.

Obs. 7. This adoption and continued election, materially aids in throwing light upon the difficult question, why it was that the apostles and first Christians, with their faith and hope in Jesus Christ, continued faithful Jews, attending the religious services in the temple and synagogue; and that we have no distinctive utterance from the apostles, even when in council together considering the admission and circumcision of the Gentiles, respecting the abrogation of the Mosaic ceremonial law, etc., excepting by Paul afterward. The views entertained respecting virtual adoption, incorporation, and election caused them to occupy such a posture.

The opinions generally expressed concerning this are various, such as, that it was an accommodation, provisional, temporary concession, necessary transition state, lack of knowledge, and even inconsistency. But we see in it a deeper reason: the Jewish nation was the elect nation, and until God showed clearly, by the destruction of the temple and dispersion of the nation, that it was for a time rejected (there being no commen-

surate repentance for its contracted guilt), it was right and proper for Jews to observe the institutions nationally connected with the nation. When these were abrogated by the manifested judgments befalling the nation—and for which Paul forewarned and prepared the Jews in Hebrews—the same reason existed no longer. It was then the covenanted relationship that the nation, as a nation, sustained to the Kingdom of God, that influenced believing Jews to manifest a regard for everything *nationally* connected. With their ideas of the covenants, inseparably connected, as they yet are, with the nation in the Theocratic relationship instituted, and allied with the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom inseparably identified with the nation, it would have been *premature* in them to have turned away from the nation thus favored, until they were clearly taught, *both* by inspiration and the providence of God, that the nation, as such, had indeed fallen, and that others, even Gentiles, were engrafted. This clinging so tenaciously and persistently to the nation (as e.g. see even statement of Sulpitius Severus, Mosheim's *Eccl. His.*, vol. 1, p. 138, footnote 2) is evidence—the highest—of their faith in this very election, incorporation, adoption, and that salvation is truly identified with the Jewish nation. This very feature which multitudes deem so defective in early Christianity, and which infidels scoffingly deride, is *honorable* to those believers. Distinguishing between those who made circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic ritual essential, and those who, discarding the same as superseded by faith in Jesus, etc., still held to a union made requisite by covenanted relation, we observe a logical consistency. Even Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, vol. 2, p. 14) observes this feature: "The Gentile converts, who by a spiritual adoption had been *associated to the hope of Israel*, were likewise confounded under the garb and appearance of Jews;" and in a note adds: "An obscure passage in Suetonius (in Claud. c. 25) may seem to offer a proof how strangely the Jews and Christians of Rome were confounded with each other." This is explained by the simple fact that so long as the Early Church clung to the literal belief of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, there *was much* that was common *to both* (however they disagreed respecting the Mosaic ritual being still binding), but as the Gentile believers drifted from this belief, an antagonism sprung up and continued.

PROPOSITION 64. *The Kingdom being given to the elect only, any adoption into that elect portion must be revealed by express Divine Revelation.*

No addition to, or continuation of, that elect portion to whom the Kingdom is alone promised (by way of inheritance), can be made *without direction from God Himself.*

Obs. 1. It has already been shown (Prop. 30), how God, in order to vindicate His foreknowledge and purpose, revealed that Gentiles should participate in the blessings of the Kingdom. But *the manner* in which they should be introduced, was left unexplained. The indefinite nature of the predictions (as e.g. by Moses in Deut. 32) are now, in the light of fulfilment, become definite. But it was *not so* in the days of Jesus and His disciples; something was to be added to show how this incorporation could be effected, for with *the special election* of *the one* nation, it would have been presumptuous for any one to have joined others with it *without due authority* from God. Hence we find Jesus before His death promising the keys of the Kingdom of heaven to Peter, i.e. *the authoritative knowledge* by which that Kingdom could be gained. Owing to the excessive sinfulness of the nation in rejecting and killing the Messiah, *the one key* concerning the Jews (Acts 2 : 38), was given to Peter on the day of Pentecost, while *the other key* pertaining to the Gentiles was given to him later by *special* revelation (Acts 10 : 1–48).

Comp. my Art. "The Keys," in *Evang. Review*, vol. 20, p. 269 and 341. Our line of argument disproves the utterly unfounded assertion of Lord Bolingbroke, that the Gospel was only for the Jews, and that Paul was *the first one* who saw it necessary to extend it to the Gentiles, which he did, corrupting it, etc. The Key of Knowledge was *first given* to Peter, and from him extended to the others. It is amazing, in the light of the predictions of Jesus and the fulfilment in Peter (next Obs.), that Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 259), can say, after placing the call of the Gentiles prior to the conversion of the Centurion of Cæsarea by "a simple (?) chronological arrangement:" "To some obscure Cyrenicians and men of Cyprus, friends of the illustrious proto-martyr, justly belongs then the honor of having been *the first* to break down the barrier which limited the word of God within the sphere of the Israelitish nationality." We, however, are content to leave this "honor" with Peter, to whom it more "justly belongs." Reuss unintentionally belittles Peter (making him weak and foolish) and the other apostles, by making these unknown (for he cannot even name them) preachers persons of far greater enlightenment than the apostles themselves, adding: "in their case, no visions, ecstasies, or celestial voices were needed to enable them to receive the positive and repeated assurances of the Saviour."

Obs. 2. This doctrine of the election of the Jewish nation, is one so clearly taught that it was deeply rooted in the minds of the Jews. The result was that no addition could be made to it or allowed without *an extraordinary* Divine revelation. Hence we read (Acts 11) that when "the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had

also received the word of God," they *contended* with Peter in consequence of his thus encouraging the Gentiles. Peter rehearsed the whole matter; what vision he had seen; what directions he had received; what results had followed; *how God* had acknowledged the validity of such an engrafting of Gentile believers by the bestowal of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. This was satisfactory; for "when they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying: *Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.*" On a later occasion when the dispute was again raised by a few respecting the conversion of the Gentiles under Paul and Barnabas, Peter interfered, showing how the Gentiles through him heard the Gospel and believed, the Holy Ghost testifying to the same. Then Paul and Barnabas increased the force of the testimony by relating what miracles and wonders *God* had wrought among the Gentiles through them. The result of the discussion is announced by James (Acts 15 : 13–21), in which we have distinctively three things presented: (1) The election and incorporation of the Gentiles, "*Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name;*" (2) the identification of this elect people with them (the Jews) in the covenanted Kingdom, "*And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written, 'after this'* (viz. : after this people are gathered out) '*I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up,*'"—both elect enjoying this restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom; (3) the blessings that would follow this restoration, "*that the residue of men,*" etc.

The comments of various commentators are exceedingly unsatisfactory (as also of writers, e.g. Hengstenberg's *Christ*, B. 3, p. 233, etc.), simply because they forget to place themselves in the Jewish position, ignore the necessity of adoption and incorporation, and misapprehend the nature of the Messianic Kingdom. Even Olshausen, generally good in noticing the intent of passages, is here weak and uninstructive, while such commentators as Barnes (*loci*) flatly contradict their own Church-Kingdom theory by admitting a line of reasoning which is fatal to it. For Barnes admits (1) that this has reference to Messianic time; (2) that these times, thus described, are identified with a Jewish restoration to great prosperity and blessings, etc. But the Messianic times and Kingdom cannot be thus established, as predicted, because no such prosperity, no such restoration came upon the Jews at the First Advent; instead of such a fulfilment history records the sad fate of the nation. It is true that Barnes and others endeavor to shield their view under the ever-convenient but pitiful subterfuge of making this prediction emblematical of the favor of God and of other blessings than those specified.

The entire history of the election of Gentile believers indicates, from the jealousy with which it was regarded and the divine proofs that had to be necessarily attached to it, that in the minds of the apostles and believing Jews it was connected and blended with their own national election; it was regarded as a virtual engrafting and adoption as the seed of Abraham, to whom the covenants and promises belonged. If it be asked why such a revelation was necessary, owing to a previous admission of Gentiles as proselytes, the answer is, that the former system of admission being abrogated, and the Abrahamic covenant being renewed and pertaining exclusively to the faithful portion of the Jews, it was requisite, if the Gentiles were to be adopted, etc., to show how this could be accomplished.

Obs. 3. Various authors of eminence have unjustly accused the apostles, and especially Peter, of being "*too Jewish*" in their views respecting the call of the Gentiles. But in the light of the covenants and the election, *how*, we ask, could they be otherwise? It will not answer, as some defenders of Christianity, to assume that this "Jewish exclusiveness" was merely "a husk" enveloping something else; for we find this alleged "husk" *an important and indispensable element* even down to the present day. Recent

Christian writers may, rather sarcastically, remark that Peter thought that "the Gentiles must be brought, as it were, over the bridge of Judaism into the Kingdom of God." But Peter had *no right* to think otherwise *until* God revealed the matter to him how Gentiles could be engrafted and also become of the elect people without observing the rites and ceremonies of Judaism. In this whole affair, the apostles sustained *the very attitude* required by our Propositions concerning the covenants and election.

The criticisms of some writers on Peter are of such a nature that it almost seems as if they thought *the keys* were given to themselves instead of being presented to Peter. It will not answer to say, as some do, that salvation is just as necessary to the Gentile as it is to the Jew, and hence that no difference is made, no engrafting takes place, etc. Admitting that both need salvation, the question to be constantly kept before us is *how* God Himself arranges and carries out His Divine Purpose of Salvation. The objection, if it is to be regarded as such, might with equal propriety be alleged against preceding dispensations (as e.g. the choice of the Jewish nation, its Theocratic relationship, etc.), and even against this one, seeing what little provision has been made for the salvation of the heathen of past centuries, although they also needed salvation. A Christian *cannot* thus object, because God, who is all-wise and merciful, undoubtedly selects the best methods by which (in the briefest time, consistent with man's moral freedom and His own Purposes), to attain to the ultimate Redemption of the world with the least loss and with the greatest honor to His moral government. Hence we, unable to grasp the innumerable details and principles underlying a Divine Plan only partially unfolded, should not set ourselves up as judges and arbiters of the matter, but simply receive the mode indicated by the Word itself. Such writers as Froude (*Short Studies*, p. 239), when they proclaim "the narrow littleness of 'the peculiar people,'" of course do not regard the covenanted Theocratic relationship, etc., but seek after objections to gratify their own "high-mindedness."

Obs. 4. The pronouncing, by Paul, of this election of Gentile believers as "*a mystery*,"—something, which, in view of the elected position of the Jews, was unexplained and to human reason inexplicable,—*confirms* our line of reasoning. That which made "the mystery," was the sole and exclusive promise given to *the seed* of Abraham; the solving of "the mystery," was the making known *how* the Gentiles could be incorporated *with* the elect nation.

Obs. 5. Even the intimations given by Jesus, before his death, could not break in the minds of the disciples the force of this exclusive promise, until it was *also shown how* the Gentiles could become the seed of Abraham without observing the rites, etc., of a previously ordained proselytism. In the nature of the case, it could not be otherwise, and it increases our admiration of the correct knowledge and attitude assumed by the disciples.

Let us briefly survey one of those intimations as given in Matt. 12 : 14–22. Here we have—(1) the Pharisees holding a council, and consulting to destroy Him; (2) when Jesus knew it, He withdrew from thence, and "charged them (the people that followed) that they should not make Him known," in order that two things "might be fulfilled: (*a*) His submissiveness to suffering and death, and (*b*) in view of His rejection by the nation and the nation's fall, the call and election of Gentiles. But in this, as in others, *the manner* of incorporation is passed by, it being left for future revealment. Some writers (as e.g. Potter, *Freedom and Fellowship in Relig.*, p. 207), assign to Paul, and not to Peter, the calling of the Gentiles; but this is opposed to the divine statements (Obs. 1 and 2). It is confounding Paul's special apostleship to the Gentiles with the call, and it is setting up a claim for Paul which he never assumed.

Obs. 6. Dr. Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 151) adduces as proof that the Kingdom itself changed its nature and became spiritual, the removal of

exclusiveness in the call of the Gentiles. But this is a strange and most erroneous inference. Paul tells us in Rom. ch. 11, Jesus declares in Matt. 21 : 43, other passages assert, that the calling of the Gentiles resulted, *not from a change in the Kingdom* (*God forbid*), but, from the posture of the Jewish nation, viz. : *its deliberate rejection of the King and tendered Kingdom.* To argue that the Kingdom itself was changed to accommodate it to the Gentiles, is *to violate* the covenants, *to annul* God's oath to David, to make the Gentiles *another separate and superior* elect nation, in brief, *to override* the important and scripturally sustained reasons given in preceding Propositions. Reuss' position (which only illustrates that of multitudes) is opposed to the teaching of the prophets (Prop. 35), who, although announcing the conversion of the Gentiles, never intimate *the slightest change* in the Kingdom, but constantly refer to it as *the restored Theocratic-Davidic.* It is hostile to the express declarations of the apostles, who, when in council to consider the relationship of the Gentiles, announce that it is *not in conflict* with the still future restoration of the fallen tabernacle of David. It is contradictory to the entire tenor of the Word, which only predicts and promises *one* Kingdom, the restored Davidic, for the elect to inherit. The theories which require for their support a present existing Davidic Kingdom, must, of necessity, not only advocate a change, although it is an ignoring of the most precise covenants, but seek in its behalf the lame apologies already so abundantly presented.

This subject of the election and the call of the Gentiles, with the engrafting on the principle of faith, fully accounts why Paul enters so largely into the matter of, and lays so much stress on, the doctrine of justification through faith. The contrast between his writings and that of the other apostles in this particular is so great that some have concluded it—erroneously—to be "another Gospel." But *the key* is to be found in his being specially appointed as the apostle of the Gentiles. His very mission made this a very significant and highly important topic, and consequently, in faithfulness to his calling, he *enlarges* upon it.

PROPOSITION 65. *Before this Kingdom can be given to this elect people, they must first be gathered out.*

The nature of the Kingdom as covenanted, and the rejection of the Kingdom by the chosen nation (making such a gathering requisite), requires such an arrangement. The introduction of the faith principle, by which Abraham was justified before circumcision took place, to raise up children to Abraham, merely produces "*the heirs*," who inherit the Kingdom. The elect are "the guests," who are first all invited and furnished *before* the marriage feast takes place. The Kingdom is not given—in the sense of being actually realized—to them one by one as gathered, but when all are gathered.

Obs. 1. This final gathering of all the elect "from one end of heaven to the other," at the period of inheriting the Kingdom, is mentioned, e.g. Matt. 24 : 31 ; Mark 13 : 27 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 1, etc.

It is a query, whether in such passages as Matt. 24 : 31 there is not a reference to the Jewish nation. The elect nation, after a time of punishment, is also to be gathered out of all nations. Jesus was speaking to Jews who believed their nation to be the chosen, elect one, and His language would necessarily lead them to apply it to the gathering of the nation as predicted by the prophets. The special point made by the Saviour is, that such a gathering can only take place *after* the period of tribulation has run its allotted course (comp. Props. 111-114). This includes, however, as other passages teach, the gathering out of those also who are incorporated—who are deemed worthy of a Theocratic position in the Kingdom. Bonet, in his address, *Christianity and the Gospel*, before the Evang. Alliance for 1873, defines even the word "saint" to mean "set apart."

Obs. 2. This Kingdom is promised to the direct faithful seed of Abraham, and it is incorporated with the Jewish nation through the adopted and amalgamated Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom. It is likewise promised to the engrafted seed, but necessarily subject to the same incorporation. Hence, until this seed is *openly manifested* in its nationally engrafted character *with* the Jewish elect nation (a restoration of the nation being *imperative* to fulfil covenants), the Kingdom as promised and predicted *cannot* be established.

Therefore, in view of this, a petition occurring in the Burial Service of the Church of England has often arrested the attention of the writer, viz. : "That it may please Thee, of Thy gracious goodness, *shortly to accomplish the number of Thine Elect, and to hasten Thy Kingdom.*" Not keeping in view the design for which the election is made, viz. : to qualify men *for* the future divine administration of the restored Theocratic Kingdom, Fairbairn (*On Proph*, p. 263) applies things to the restored Jewish nation in its *un-theocratic form* (i.e. without the Davidic covenant literally realized in a personal reign of the Messiah, David's Son), which only refer to the elect saints, viz. : that portion accounted worthy to rule in the Theocratic Kingdom when the restoration is effected. The Jewish nation in the flesh is subordinate to these *firstborn* glorified rulers.

and while the latter come in the elect covenanted line, yet they are superior to the former in honor, station, and privileges. The reader's indulgence is asked, for it is yet too early in our argument to give more than these hints. Compare Props. 118, 153, and 154.

Obs. 3. In view of the Kingdom being thus future, it is reasonable to expect such futurity to be specified in connection with the election. This is done in various places, as e.g. 2 Pet. 1 : 10, 11, the election is stated and faithfulness enjoined that an entrance may be secured *hereafter* into the Kingdom. In 1 Pet. 1 : 2–13, the elect are mentioned, and they are pointed *to the future,* even to the revelation of Christ, for their inheritance. So in Eph. 1 : 4, these chosen ones are directed *to the future* gathering for their inheritance. *The Word does not contradict itself.* Therefore this futurity of the Kingdom is the basis of the numerous exhortations to obtain it, to walk worthily of it, to look, seek, and pray for it.

Obs. 4. God for a time leaving the nation first bidden, and treating the Jews as individuals (i.e. not in their national relationship), now invites both Jews and Gentiles to become this people of faith, and through Peter, to whom this knowledge was imparted, the relation of these elect to the Kingdom, in the age to come, is fully and explicitly stated. There is a fitness in this, that the apostle selected to indicate this election should also refer the Kingdom to the future for manifestation and realization. In addition to the passages quoted from him, the reader may turn to his sermon, Acts 3 : 19–26, where the eye of faith is directed to *the coming again* of Jesus and the accompanying "*restitution of all things.*" In no place is it asserted, that the promised covenanted Kingdom was *already* in possession of the elect, for such a statement would *be palpably contradictory* to the most sacred portions of Holy Writ, viz. : *to the covenants.*

Obs. 5. This Kingdom is to be given to all of the elected nation, both believing Jews of natural descent and engrafted Gentiles, to all believers, therefore, that have ever lived ; and it will be bestowed upon *both at the same time,* including the Patriarchs, ancient worthies, faithful Jews, and believing adopted Gentiles. One portion of the elect cannot inherit *before* the other portion ; *both* stand precisely upon the same footing and obtain through the identical election and covenants *the same* inheritance. (The rejection by the nation of the tender, does not change the nature of it, other guests are invited and participate instead of those previously urged, and now under a cloud for their refusal.) In reference to one portion of these elect, Paul informs us (Heb. 11 : 39, 40), after enumerating a long list of worthies, "*these all received not the promise*" "*that they without us should not be made perfect.*" None of the present saints, (viz. : of this dispensation,) have inherited the Kingdom, for the inheriting is placed in the future, as e.g. Matt. 25 : 34. The Kingdom is promised to both, forming *the one elect body,* but those things which belong to the actual realization of the Kingdom, such as inheriting, receiving the crown, reigning, etc., are all, as the reader will find by a comparison of passages, *related to the future.* The saints, the elect of this and previous dispensations, are represented as *waiting* for the Kingdom (comp. Rev. 6 : 9–11 ; Luke 18 : 7, 8 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 5–10 ; Rom. 8 : 23, etc.).

Whatever the intermediate state may be, whether in Hades simply (as some assert), or in Paradise in Hades (as others claim), or in the third heaven (as some announce),

etc., one thing is clearly demonstrable, viz.: that *the inheriting* of the Kingdom, *the receiving* of the crown, *the obtaining* of the distinctive reward as allied with covenanted promises, are all still *future*, always linked with the future resurrection of the just or allied with the Sec. Advent of Jesus Christ. The Bible is explicit on this point, and the covenants absolutely require this to preserve *the requisite unity*. Let the reader compare what is said on the intermediate state, Prop. 136.

Obs. 6. This Kingdom is to be given at a specified *appointed time* known to God. Without now discussing the predictions, we only refer to the fact that before "*the Kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High*"(Dan. 7), a certain period of time *must first elapse*, certain events *must first transpire*, and *then* the Kingdom is bestowed. It is given to this people at a particular time or era. The parable of the talents ("*after a long time*," etc.), and of the tares and wheat, the delineation of 2 Thess. 2, and of other passages, illustrate this same truth.

Obs. 7. In comparing Scripture, it will be found that this period of time is stated to be at the era of *the Sec. Advent, when* this Kingdom will be bestowed upon the elect, Matt. 25 : 34 ; Luke 12 : 32 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 5–10, etc. Hence the elect are represented as "*called*" (1 Thess. 2 : 12) to this Kingdom, to "*a patient waiting for Christ*" (2 Thess. 3 : 5), and "*His appearing and Kingdom*" (2 Tim. 4 : 1) are united ;—they are exhorted to endure trials that (2 Thess. 1 : 5) "*ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God.*" To these might be added numerous passages, which will appear as we proceed ; in the meantime, the reader is reminded that this *accurately corresponds* with what has preceded and what follows in our argument.

We only remind the reader, as an indication of a Divine Purpose and Providence, that as the larger number of the elect, the great mass, are taken out of the Gentiles, the time chosen for this call of the Gentiles was signally opportune. Thus e.g. the change from the Hebrew to the Hellenistic language was one of the providential movements preparatory to this calling, and facilitated the same. The time specified in the Obs. and the delay of the Kingdom, until the number of the elect is completed, has been noticed by many able writers. Thus e.g. Olshausen (*Com.* Acts 1 : 6–8), remarks, in connection with referring "the times of refreshing and restitution" to the personal Sec. Advent of Jesus : "The conversion of men, therefore, and the diffusion of faith in Christ, are the conditions of the speedy approach of that blessed time—a thought which occurs again in 2 Pet. 3 : 9."

Obs. 8. It may be added, that this future Kingdom covenanted to the elect nation, and which the elect, including the promised Seed, are to inherit, is explicitly called Christ's Kingdom. This ought to be so, if our position is correct, and has already been foreshown under Prop. 45, etc. The Kingdom at the Sec. Advent is distinctively called "*His Kingdom*," as e.g. 2 Tim. 4 : 1 ; Matt. 13 : 41 ; Luke 22 : 30 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 11, etc. We are gravely told (comp. Prop. 159) by a multitude that Christ at the end of this dispensation at His Sec. Advent, will deliver up "His Kingdom," so that, if we are to receive their theory, *no such* distinctive Kingdom is to exist *after* the Advent for the elect to inherit. But this notion is to be rejected as *utterly untenable and contradictory* to the entire tenor of the Word, which locates the Messianic Kingdom at the Sec. Advent (comp. Prop. 159).

Obs. 9. In studying the subject of the Kingdom, we must not be misled by a striking peculiarity of Scripture, viz. : that things *still future*, owing to their certainty, are spoken of *as present*. The style of prediction and promise, dealing largely of objects of faith and hope, contains this feature as has been noticed by many writers. Thus the Kingdom of God, the great object of faith and hope, being sure, founded on the Word and oath of the Almighty, is in view of its certainty spoken of as present, being received, etc. (comp. Prop. 109), as e.g. in Heb. 12 : 22–28 ; Rom. 8 : 30 ; Rev. 1 : 6, 9, etc. To take such passages, given through the intensity of faith and hope, and make them contradictory and inconsistent with *the general analogy* of the Word, is certainly both unwise and unnecessary.

The illustrations given by Macnight in his *Prelim. Essays* on the Epistles (Essay 4, s. 12, from the Greek, Matt. 3 : 10 ; Mark 9 : 31 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 2, 12 ; James 5 : 3 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 11, 12), prove that, as he says, " the present tense is often put for the future, to show that the thing spoken of shall as certainly happen *as if* it were already present." He (as well as many commentators) overlooks this feature in his exegetical comments on various passages. The illustrations can be greatly increased indicative of the sentiment of Rom. 4 : 17, He " calleth those things *which be not as though they were*," as in Rom. 8 : 30 " *them He also glorified*," in 1 Pet. 1 : 9 (see connection), Luke 1 : 51–53 ; Isa. 9 : 6, many of the Pals., etc. Justin Martyr, long ago, in his *First Apology*, assigns the reason for this mode of expression, " The things which He absolutely knows will take place, He predicts as if *already* they had taken place." This feature heightens the Divine in the Word, making it to speak in the largeness and fulness of the Spirit, as e.g. in that Divine Purpose portrayed in the declaration that Jesus is " *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world* " (Rev. 13 : 8). So also Neander in several places shows how the apostles spoke of the future as present, although he forgets his own admissions in commenting on several passages. Thus e.g. speaking of the author of Hebrews (*His. Plant. Ch. Ch.*, vol. 2, p. 5), he instances ch. 10 : 22, ch. 12 : 23, and ch. 12 : 28, as evidence that " to Christians the future is by faith *already become a present*." And (p. 13), " by means of faith *a vital* connection is formed *between* the Present and the Future. By means of faith, according to the doctrine of this epistle, the Future becomes in some measure a Present to the mind, although this Present has a necessary bearing to a more perfect development, a consummation in the Future."

Obs. 10. The reader need scarcely be reminded, that in all the elect ones, both ancient and modern, who are to enjoy the Kingdom of God, *certain moral qualifications* are necessary as a prerequisite. *The natural and engrafted seed of Abraham must all be of faith and obedience.* The decisive argument in Romans and Hebrews evinces this ; for while the seed of Abraham is chosen, not every individual is thus favored ; while the nation is elected to a Theocratic position, not every member of it will be saved ; it is only *the faithful portion* of Abraham's seed that is commended and that will be exalted. This has been so ably represented by various writers (as Noel, McNeill, Bickersteth, Bonar, etc.), that it only requires brief mention.

It may be added : this requires more than mere knowledge, viz. : the *practical* reception of the truth and a *heartfelt* obedience to the same, lest we fall into the " delusion" specified by Dorner (*His. Prot. Theol.*, vol. 1, p. 19), of receiving the truth merely by the mind and not by the mind and heart—the latter alone leading to *a personal appropriation* of Christ, influencing heart and life In the Obs. ancient and modern saints are *purposely* placed in the same position, for there is much written at the present day respecting the inferiority of Old Test. saints, grounded on their being justified by works, the law, etc. This is certainly a misapprehension, seeing that the apostles hold up the believers of former dispensations as *pre-eminent patterns of faith* (their works being *the result* of faith) and that their lives evinced, in obedience to God's requirements, the strongest faith. They were justified by faith, and not by the law, and not by their works, however, the law might drive to faith, and the works might evidence the purity and strength

of faith. Hence, as faith introduces the blessing of Redemption through Abraham, and all his seed are of faith, we cannot receive the disparaging remarks of eminent writers in this direction. Thus, to illustrate, Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 290), says, alluding to conversion and its moral results : "The new relation of which we have spoken was evidently an individual relation between the believing man and his God. Now we must remember that such a relation had *no existence* in the religious sphere of Judaism, which was a purely and essentially national institution, the members of which had rights and duties only as belonging to the great whole." This is simply overlooking the distinctive Theocratic element connected with this nationality, which bound *the individual member* to his Sovereign Ruler. The tendency, indeed, constantly was to ignore this Theocratic feature, but God insisted upon its retention as alone honorable to Himself as the Theocratic King.

Obs. 11. The Kingdom thus given to these elect ones does *not remove the election* of the Jewish nation as a nation. This, aside from the covenants and the Theocratic ordering allied with the nation, is seen from the fact, that this seed gathered out is virtually regarded as part and parcel of the nation (is a continuation of the election, Prop. 63), and when the nation is nationally restored will be so recognized *in the inheriting with* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Again, let any one compare Deut. ch. 32, Rom. ch. 11, together with various predictions relating to this elect Jewish nation, and he will find the following succinctly stated : (1) The Jews an elect nation (Prop. 24) ; (2) this nation can render itself unworthy of the Kingdom by disobedience ; (3) by its own conduct it will bring upon itself terrible evils and *a temporary* rejection as a nation ; (4) the Theocratic rulership will be, for a time, withdrawn ; (5) during such a period of rejection, God still continues His work of gathering out of it, and out of the Gentiles, the elect ; (6) but the nation itself, for a time under the most severe tribulations, will, owing to this very election (being "*beloved for the Father's sakes*"), again—as the covenant to be fulfilled demands—*be restored* to the favor of God. This nation, therefore, now under trial, is still *the chosen nation, and this will be manifested in due time* (see Props. 111 to 114). Hence the preference (Luke 24 : 47 ; Rom. 1 : 16 ; Acts 3 : 25, 26 ; Rom. 2 : 10 ; Acts 13 : 46, and 19 : 21), showed to this nation even after the day of Pentecost in preaching the Gospel—a preference based only upon this election, the Jews being, by virtue of their relationship to Abraham, "*the children of the Kingdom,*" and the descendants of those who once enjoyed this Kingdom in its initiatory, incipient form. The natural seed must not, therefore, be ignored ; and only upon their refusal to accept of the proffered gospel of the Kingdom were the apostles, and even Paul, authorized to seek after the engrafted ones. One of *the darkest pages* in the history of Christianity is that which records the tendering of insult, wrong, and death instead of the precious message of hope and peace to this covenant favored people.

This already gives us the clue to *the literal* fulfilment of the covenant promises, confirmed as they are by *the oath* of God, and therefore unconditional. Thus e.g. the promise of making Abraham's seed a mighty nation (which has specially excited the ridicule of infidels in comparing the feeble Kingdom of Israel with the mighty empires of the earth) will be realized *when* this elect nation will all be gathered and stand *associated with* the restored Theocratic Kingdom. It does not require much reason to see, that when God's Plan is carried out and openly manifested, it will exceed the highest eulogies that the Prophets have given, and most amply vindicate God's Word. Let all the seed of Abraham be brought together at the appointed time, and language fails to express *the might and grandeur* of the nation. The world will be astonished at the sublime manifestation.

Waldegrave (*New Test. Millenarianism*, Lect. 3) entirely misapprehends this election of the Jewish nation, holding that the continuance of the election by the engrafting of the Gentiles forbids any future special manifestation of God's favor to the Jewish nation, as e.g. to bestow upon it pre-eminence over Gentile nations. Much that Waldegrave says we can cordially adopt, excepting his extreme in this direction, seeing that he does not discriminate between the pre-eminence *of those who inherit* the Kingdom (i.e. the saints as rulers) and *that of the nation restored* among and over the nations by virtue of its covenanted position and relationship with these glorified saints, the seed of Abraham. This engrafting process, we also hold, gives "a perfect equality between Jew and Gentile," and it is likewise correct to assert, as he does, that "the believing Gentile, though uncircumcised, is much more really a child of Abraham than the circumcised Jew who does not believe." The reason for this has been fully assigned in previous Props., but this does not, by any means, necessitate his hasty and inconclusive deductions, which make the Davidic covenant and numerous prophecies inoperative and unfulfilled.

Obs. 12. These elect, now gathered out, are in the various denominations of Christians. The diversity, even of doctrine and practice, does not interfere with the possession of *the living engrafting principle* of faith. The former arises incidentally from the liberty allowed to humanity, which, through infirmity, results in doubt and even error being, more or less, mixed with apprehensions of the truth; the latter, however, in the eyes of a just and merciful God, compensates, if followed *by corresponding fruit* in evidence of its sincerity, for the weakness exhibited in the former. The one could not have been obviated without largely infringing man's moral agency; the other cannot be negatived without interfering with the Divine Will itself.

The reader is reminded that while *many* professors are rejected and *few* are chosen, it is also true that out of those saved some are but barely saved, as by fire, and cannot expect to enjoy that honor of position that others realize in the coming Kingdom (comp. Prop. 135). Prosperity, too, is no sign of God's special favor, for Heb. 12 : 5–12; James 1 : 12; Rev. 3 : 19, etc., clearly teach that trial, adversity, etc., are often but tokens of God's love toward His elect. With Paul (Col. 1 : 24), they fill up the measure of Christ's sufferings, for being designed as co-heirs, co-rulers with Christ, it is *essential* that they become in all things Christ-like, imitating Him and cultivating His spirit, which can only be done by being tested and tried, as Jesus Himself was afflicted, so that they may partake of His glory. Enduring temptation and trial is indicative of a proper apprehension of Christ, of the Spirit and truth abiding with us, of our being truly the children of God, of our being the elect. But while enduring, under trial, fighting the good fight of faith, it is not for us to sit in judgment over others who may be struggling and tried as we are; it is sufficient to realize in our own experience God's leadings and to enjoy the sweet consciousness of His favor in the fulfilment of promises pertaining to the present life.

Obs. 13. This elect people are charged with folly by others, because they trust in covenanted promises, and in the Seed by whom they shall be fulfilled. This was predicted many centuries ago, Deut. 32 : 21, and is pointedly referred to in 1 Cor. 1 : 25–28.

Obs. 14. Many claim, some arrogantly, that they alone are these elected ones and all others, outside of their organization or doctrinal position, are excluded. This is simply presumption; for it ever remains true what is stated in Matt. 7 : 21–23, etc. Profession is not God's judgment; and these elect will be made manifest when the Judge cometh.

Julius Müller (quoted by Dr. Sprecher in *The Luth. Evangelist*, 1877) forcibly observes: "As an inalienable acquisition—derived by the Protestant Church out of the sad decay of its orthodox theology, especially in the latter part of the seventeenth cen-

tury and after, out of the Pietistic and Moravian reactions, and out of the revival of living faith in the present century—we must regard the conviction that the faith which saves does *not consist in the adoption of a series of articuli fundamentales primarii, but in an absolute and truthful surrender of one's self to the personal Saviour*; a surrender of which the simplest child is capable. Although this conviction may in the next few years have to sustain violent attacks and be branded as heresy—the attacks have, indeed, already begun—yet it is so deeply rooted in the Divine Word and in the fundamental religious sentiment of the Reformers, that we cannot but have confidence in its final triumph."

Obs. 15. The Kingdom with its attendant blessings, being the same tendered to both Jew and Gentile believer, at once removes the objection urged against the Bible in the following extract. One of the advocates of "the Absolute Religion" (quoted by Birks, p. 413 in *The Bible and Mod. Thought*), speaking of the Old and New Tests., says: "One offers only an earthly recompense, the other makes immortality a motive to the Divine life." "If Christianity and Judaism be not the same thing, there must be hostility between the Old and the New Testaments, for the Jewish form claims to be eternal. To an unprejudiced man, this hostility is very obvious. It may indeed be said, Christianity came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets but to fulfil them; and the answer is plain, *their fulfilment was their destruction.*" Our line of argument clearly shows *a fundamental union and vital connection* between the two: it also proves *the perpetual* election of a seed and the ultimate fulfilment in that Abrahamic seed *of all that has been covenanted, promised, and predicted* in the Old and New Tests. The prevailing view, which introduces the antagonism and hostility alluded to by its transmutations of covenant and promise, is alone chargeable with suggesting the objection.

PROPOSITION 66. *The Kingdom that was nigh at one time (viz.: at the First Advent) to the Jewish nation, is now removed to the close of its tribulation, and of "the times of the Gentiles."*

This can be distinctly inferred from what preceded (as e.g. Props. 58, 59, 65), especially since that Kingdom is now linked in the New Test. *with the Sec. Advent of Christ.*

Obs. 1. Let us again refer to Luke 21 : 31, in which it is stated "*when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand.*" Now among "these things" which *are first* to happen are the Jewish tribulation and "the times of the Gentiles" (v. 24), and when these come to pass, and Jerusalem is no longer under Gentile dominion, and the Advent (v. 27) of the Saviour is witnessed, *then* the Kingdom will be established. So long as "the city of the great King," and so long as His land, His by inheritance (Prop. 116), as David's Son, *is under Gentile dominion*, it is *simply impossible* for the Kingdom to exist ; and *it is folly to argue*, with the light of the Davidic covenant and prophetic announcements relating to it, that the Messianic Kingdom has been set up. This Jewish tribulation, these times of the Gentiles, this gathering out of an elect, the nonfulfilment of "these things,"—these, and a multitude (in following Propositions), of considerations, show that *it is thus postponed.*

Efforts are made to break the force of our reasoning by interpreting Luke in a manner inconsistent both with the context and the facts of history. Thus e.g. Barnes (*Com. loci*), while reluctantly admitting an ulterior reference to the Sec. Advent in Luke's discourse, endeavors to make "the redemption" (v. 28), in order to agree with his Church-Kingdom theory, to consist in a deliverance from Jewish persecution, forgetting that the Church was soon after given over to far more severe series of persecutions under the Roman emperors. If this was *all* that the Saviour meant, how could they rejoice in such a deliverance when greater trials were impending? It is *an utter perversion* of the passage. But they involve themselves in still greater absurdities, for they tell us that the Kingdom of v. 31 is the Church, although it is spoken of as not established, but only "nigh at hand," when they know full well that the Ch. Church was founded *before* the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the nation, and that the Gospel was proclaimed throughout the Roman Empire. The inconsistency of many of this class is the more glaring, since, when we turn to their comments on Matt. 24 : 33, on the same parable, they allow that it has a decided reference to the period of the Sec. Advent. Some give it a double meaning, making it to refer to deliverance at the destruction of Jerusalem and also to deliverance at the coming again of the Son of man. This only indicates weakness. Again, Prof. E. W. Hengstenberg (*The Jews and the Ch. Church*, p. 66), weakens the force of Christ's own prediction by asserting : "The treading down of Jerusalem by the heathen has already twice ceased—once under Constantine, and once in the time of the Crusades, when a Christian (?) Kingdom existed at Jerusalem." This (1) invalidates the continuous treading down of Jerusalem until certain "times of the Gentiles" are fulfilled ; (2) it makes the "times of the Gentiles" to be an exact equivalent of "the times of the heathen," which it is not, for in its broader meaning it denotes all nations who are not of the Jewish race or of the observances of the Jewish religion. It has reference to nations other than the Jewish ; (3) it makes the phrase expressive of nations who do not profess Christianity, which was not its meaning when uttered by Jesus ; (4)

it does not preserve the relationship of the Jews to the city, which the overthrow and subsequent restoration makes necessary; (5) it substitutes a nation, the Roman under Constantine, and in its divided form at the Crusades, as if it were an exact equivalent of the Jewish nation; (6) it forgets that under Constantine and the Crusades the Jews were badly treated, and had no power in and over the city; (7) it overlooks the fact that the very power which held the city at the times designated is delineated as "a beast" even down to the end, as e.g. the fourth beast power in Dan. 2 and 7; (8) to make out such a cessation, linked as it is with the dispersion and restoration of the Jewish nation, is to pervert a standing proof of inspiration.

Obs. 2. The proof on this point is abundant. Thus e.g. the Kingdom is associated with the period of "restitution" (Prop. 144), "regeneration" (Prop. 145), "revelation of Jesus Christ" (Props. 138, 139), "the Judgeship" of Jesus (Props. 132, 133), "the new heavens and new earth" (Props. 148, 151), the reign of the saints (Prop. 154), the overthrow of Antichrist (Prop. 160), the Pre-Millennial personal Advent (Prop. 120), etc., etc.

Obs. 3. "*The house is left desolate*" until He comes again, when its fallen, desolate condition will be removed. One of the most decided and expressive passages is that of Matt. 24 : 29, where, after delineating the Jewish tribulation running down through an allotted "times of the Gentiles" we come to the language "immediately *after* the tribulation" (not before, but *after* it) certain events such as the open Advent of the Son of Man and the gathering of the elect, will take place, which in many places (as e.g. Matt. 25, Dan. 7, 2 Thess. 5, etc.) are associated with the setting up of the Kingdom. Such a portraiture of the course of events is in harmony with *the general and uniform testimony* of the Prophets, who almost invariably contrast this Kingdom with a previously endured tribulation by the Jewish nation which has finally ended through special Divine interposition (as e.g. Zech. 14, etc.), and the nation enjoys the blessedness of covenants fully and gloriously realized.[1] With this Prop. must be united such Props. as 58, 88, etc.

[1] The student is reminded, in this connection, of a suggestion advanced by several writers. Thus e.g. Frazer (*Key to Proph.*, p. 80), quoting Rom. 11 : 30–32, adds: "To make the parallel exact, it is meet that the Jews should remain in unbelief as long as the Gentiles did. The Gentiles remained excluded from the ordinances of the true religion for 2000 years, from the call of Abraham to the coming of Christ. The Jews must remain in unbelief for the same period.' He quotes Hos. 6 : 2, making "the day" as 2 Pet. 3 : 8, a thousand years. This would give an approximative idea of the duration of the Jewish tribulation and of the relative nighness of the Kingdom. And yet, for aught we know, the time may be shortened or lengthened as best suits the Divine pleasure.

PROPOSITION 67. *The Kingdom could not therefore have been set up at that time, viz.: at the First Advent.*

This is apparently from Propositions 56, 57, 58, 59, etc. The Kingdom being one with the Davidic throne and kingdom, *it was impossible* because of the rejection and punishment of the nation for a certain time, to establish it. "The tabernacle of David" *remains fallen down;* the nation, invited nationally, refused the invitation because of the imposed condition of repentance, and now other "guests" must be furnished before "the feast" is enjoyed. The "nation" is not yet gathered; one by one the elect are received and adopted, but *the time of manifestation* has not yet arrived; the "nation" as a nation is not yet exhibited in its nationalized form.

Obs. 1. In Matt. 12 : 28 (Luke 11 : 20), when the Jews had taken counsel to kill Jesus, He cast out a devil and was accused by the Jews of performing miracles through the power of Satan. In self-defence, showing that this very power was necessary to Him *who would* establish the Kingdom, He says: "*But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God*" (Luke: "*the finger of God*"), "*then the Kingdom of God is come unto you*" (Luke "*upon you,*") i.e. it was tendered to them on condition of repentance and Christ's miraculous power evinced the ability to verify the offer of it. Then the Jews sought a sign; Jesus in reply severely rebukes them, and condemns *that existing generation,* declaring that their last state is worse than the first, i.e. instead of repenting in their already fallen condition and rendering themselves worthy of the Kingdom they became worse until the judgments of God (comp. Barnes *loci*) were fearfully poured out upon them. How dreadfully was this verified. This indicates that, in the condition of the nation as it then existed and increased in wickedness, it was *impossible* for the Kingdom to be set up as covenanted. The nation is not *morally prepared* for the blessed Theocratic ordering. The Kingdom is offered to them in virtue of their election; it has come "unto or upon them" both in the tender and in the manifested power and person of the Messiah; it pertains to them because of their covenanted relationship; it is conditioned only by a repentance of the nation, and this being rejected by the representative, ruling men of the nation, Jesus censures them and predicts their *continued and increasing* fall; hence, as the Kingdom was to be taken from them (i.e. the offer of its establishment at that time was withdrawn, and the pre-eminent position assigned to the elect in that Kingdom was to be given to others), and as it was to be given to others who were not yet gathered, it follows that our Proposition is correct.

Obs. 2. But this taking away of the Kingdom from the nation (then unworthy), and the giving of it to others (in a special sense, i.e. as inheritors

as will appear in the course of our argument), must not be pressed, as the reader has already been warned, to the extent that the Kingdom will *never again* be established with this Jewish nation restored to God's favor. For this would *nullify God's covenants and oath, and vitiate Christ's inheritance.* This is directly predicted: (1) The continued Jewish tribulation owing to sinfulness, and (2) the final restoration of the nation, *after* the period of trial, to national greatness. Leaving the proof for another Proposition, we, in this connection, direct attention to Ezek. ch. 16, which describes the first, intermediate, and final position of this elect nation. Here we have (1) the great goodness of God toward Jerusalem; (2) her monstrous sinfulness even exceeding Sodom's; (3) her grievous punishment; (4) yet it is added: "*nevertheless I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant.*" Thus, in virtue of God's covenant with that nation, we are cautioned not to draw the erroneous conclusion that the exceeding and unparalleled wickedness of killing even the Heir, will *forever* withdraw God's covenanted blessings from the nation.

Multitudes, however, contend that God does *not* remember His covenant; theologians, unmindful of the *express* covenant relationship of this people, write—under the influence of the Church-Kingdom theory—*as if* the covenants were of such a nature that they could be annulled, modified, or altered. Illustrative of this election, remaining perpetual notwithstanding sinfulness and subsequent punishment, we have a striking declaration in 1 Kings 11 : 39. When the Kingdom of Israel was rent from the house of David, God emphatically says: "And I will for this afflict the seed of David, *but not forever.*" For sinfulness ten tribes (with consequent evils) are taken away, but it *will not be forever;* the twelve tribes will again as the seed of Abraham be reunited. Jarchi, on this verse, says: "*when* the Messiah comes, the Kingdom shall be restored to the house of David." The reader can readily recall prophecies which predict this very removal of a former separation and an abiding union. To the student the writer only suggests, that those ten tribes can be restored by God either literally or if necessary by a process of engrafting somewhat similar to what is witnessed in the present elect ones. It is foolishness to limit the power of God, for either the nucleus of those ten tribes is somewhere preserved, or else such a nucleus can be formed through the exertion of the Divine pleasure. It is yet premature in our argument to meet the objections of Second Adventists (in periodicals and books), and others (as Williamson, see Lord's *Journal* for Oct. 1853, First Art.), who contend that the Jews are not in any sense "the lawful heirs of the Abrahamic covenant" and will never again be restored to their former Theocratic position.

Obs. 3. The Kingdom could not be set up, because it required (according to the Theocratic ordering and the Davidic covenant accepting and incorporating it) *a nation,* and that one *the Jewish nation* (to whom alone it is covenanted), before it could be re-established in a most glorious form under the Messiah. Nationally rejected for a time—yet to continue the seed of Abraham recourse is had to adopting individuals out of all nations —until *the repeal* of this rejection and of the punishment pertaining to it, it is simply impossible to fulfil the covenant promises *as written.* To spiritualize those covenants as some do—to make them conditional as others do—to ignore them as many do, *is to make the most sacred of all the Divine Record unreliable, and the oath of God,* as well as the faith of believing Jews, *of little value.* If the covenants teach any truth clearly, it is this: that the Jewish nation and the Kingdom are *inseparably connected;*—that the one *cannot possibly* exist without the other. It follows, therefore, that during the period of national rejection and punishment (i.e. during "the times of the Gentiles," and "the treading down of Jerusalem"), imposed on account of sinfulness, the Kingdom *cannot* be in existence.

Obs. 4. The Kingdom being thus postponed, *no Theocracy* was established. Men, indeed, claim this for the church, but this is a grave mistake and misleading. Let the reader refer to our Propositions on the Theocracy and he will see that the leading essential element, that which constituted a Theocracy, was the fact *that God condescended to act as an earthly Ruler.* Now it is self-evident that no such distinctive feature was inaugurated at the First Advent. It is true, as Lange (*Com.* Heb. 1 : 5–14, Doct. 8) says, that "the Christocracy is the fully unfolded, world-embracing form of the Theocracy" but *only* at His Sec. Advent when He is manifested *as the Theocratic-Davidic King.* The Theocratic-monarchy in its covenanted form—not spiritualized but *real* as predicted—must be exhibited *before* the Kingdom can be manifested.

PROPOSITION 68. *This Kingdom is then essentially a Jewish Kingdom.*

This follows from the Abrahamic, Sinaitic, and Davidic covenants; this is uniformly taught by the Prophets in associating and identifying the Kingdom *with the nationality* of the Jews; this again is confirmed by *the election* of the Jewish nation, the *oneness* of the Kingdom, the *preaching* of John, Jesus, and the disciples, the *renewed covenant*, the *offer* of the Kingdom, the *engrafting* of Gentiles, the rejection of the nation only *until* the times of the Gentiles are ended, the *postponement* of the Kingdom, etc. *The whole tenor and analogy of Scripture sustain this position;* and it is but a weak, unsatisfactory, inconsistent procedure to deny what is *so plainly* the burden of Holy Writ.

Such a denial can only rest in a destructive criticism and arbitrary handling of *the most precious* covenanted promises contained in the Bible. It can only be sustained by a system of interpretation which constantly, with singular rashness, asserts that the plain grammatical meaning of the covenants and predictions cannot possibly be maintained. Doctrines are summarily disposed of by bestowing upon them the epithet "*Jewish*;" and learned men suppose that the doctrines contained in our faith receive their condemnation by being designated "*Jewish*." It is a favorite phrase with some writers, and scornfully emphasized, and judging from the frequency with which it is used, it is regarded as one of *the most effectual* means to bring our doctrines into disrepute with unreflecting and unscholarly persons. Let us briefly refer to the reasons for employing this phrase against us, and show how inexcusable and uncharitable such an exhibition of intended "sarcasm" is in those who profess the name of Christian. It is evidently intended to indicate that our doctrines are erroneous, thus making "Jewish" or "Judaic" an equivalent to "error." Yet these same writers profess to believe much that is "Jewish." They believe what Jews said and wrote, they profess that "salvation is of the Jews," that Jesus and the apostles were Jews, that we Gentiles are engrafted upon the Jewish stock, etc. Why then institute a comparison which, if it has *any logical* force, must be antagonistic to their own faith and hope, founded so largely upon what is "*Jewish*"? It is used by way of reproach, to stigmatize our views as if they were antichristian, etc. How unjust this is, will appear, if such writers only consider how largely they themselves are indebted to a Jewish source for many of the most precious articles of their own faith. Gratitude, to say nothing of other motives, ought to restrain such a usage of terms. It is employed to hold others up to ridicule, to irritate, etc. But this, in the eyes of the intelligent and of the humble Biblical student, recoils upon its authors, seeing that it seriously reflects upon their own appreciation of indebtedness to Jews for the sublime and saving truths of Christianity. If any doctrine of ours is erroneous and as such stands related to errors of the Jews (as Pharisees, etc.), let the fact be demonstrated by proper argument, instead of seeking refuge in terms which are so general and include so much that is noble and excellent.

Obs. 1. It is a standing proposition, even among some who profess to be defenders of Christianity, that, as Renan (*Life of Christ*, p. 373), expresses it, "the general progress of Christianity has been *to separate* more and more from Judaism," and the inference is drawn that *the wider* such a separation is made, *the better* for true religion. Everything distinctively

Jewish is to be sacrificed, giving place to *a substituted Gentileism*. This is especially true of the leading doctrine of the Kingdom ; the Jewish view is denounced, and *a wide departure* substituted as better adapted to the wisdom, standing, etc., of Gentiles.

This will be met in succeeding propositions. Briefly let us trace the rise and progress of this rejection of "Jewish conceptions," this scornful usingof the term "*Jewish*," (or as Ruge calls it, "*Asiatisamus*"). The apostolic, and immediate succeeding, church was (as we shall show Props. 69-75) intensely Jewish in its conceptions. The reproach of being Jewish belongs to a period later than that distinguished for its pure Chiliasm (comp. candid remarks of Neander, *Ch. His.*, vol 1, p. 294, etc.). The universality and unity of teaching prohibited the usage of the word in any other than a respectful sense. But when the general Millenarian views were attacked by Origen and others, this state of things changed. Origen (L. 2, c. 12) says : "Those who deny the Millennium are those who interpret the sayings of the Prophets by a trope," those who maintain the Mill. " disciples of the letter," who interpret " Judaico-sensu, after the manner of the Jews." From this arose the reproach, often reiterated, thus expressed by Jerome (*Hieron. in Es.* l. 18 in Proem. p. 477 Ed. Bend.—quoted by Prof. Bush, *Mill.* p. 16) " If we understand Revelation literally, *we must judaize*," etc. This usage was accelerated by (1) the adoption and extension of the spiritualistic Interpretation ; (2) the rise and progress of the Papacy ; (3) the fall, conduct, and dispersion of the Jewish nation ; (4) the persecution of the Jews. In the course of time such was the bitterness against the Jews, that everything " Jewish" was despised. Of course when Bishops (even e.g. Cyril of Alexandria, see Socrates *His. Eccl.*, vii. 13), persecuted Jews it was easy to discard " Jewish forms." A variety of prejudices excited and fostered this anti-Jewish spirit, which continued unchecked for many centuries. In more modern times, out of a host unduly biased, Semler may be adduced as materially strengthening the movement by which everything objectionable is to be discarded under the cry of " Jewish notions." He even undermined the authority of Scripture under the plea of its Jewish character, making it local and temporary (Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, p. 386), so that Tholuck well remarked that " he carried the torch which kindled the conflagration." Thousands of volumes are filled with its spirit, and at times it becomes simply outrageous, as e.g. in *The Lyceum* (a Free Religionist periodical designed for the young, in Jan. No. 1875) says : " We detest the thought of an old *Jewish* God living in this age of the world." Multitudes, however, who have imbibed this prejudice against " Jewish conceptions," could never be brought to utter anything so disgusting as the Lyceum's blasphemies. Yet men of ability venture into this direction of disparagement, as e.g. Beecher (as reported in *Cin. Daily Gazette*, Nov. 11th, 1874), who spoke slightingly of the Patriarchs " as compared with *the manhood* we *now* have," etc. Comment is unnecessary to such endorsement of Parkerism, etc.

Obs. 2. It is fully admitted by able writers, of all classes, that the Scriptures, taken *in their literal aspect*, do expressly teach *a Jewish* Kingdom ; but our opponents contend that this literal rendering is to be discarded *for a spiritual or mystical one*, mainly on the ground that the literal has not been verified. But we cannot, dare not *thus receive the Word of God*. This Jewish form is decidedly in our favor ; we accept of it gratefully, and with it of *the reproach* heaped upon it. For it is *Jewish*, based on *Jewish* covenants, the *Jewish* Scriptures, the *Jewish* Prophets and Apostles, the *Jewish* nationality connected with the Theocratic ordering, and the *Jewish* Son of Man in descent and office. We would not abate this, if we could, believing it to be *indispensable* in order to preserve the true doctrine of the Kingdom, and the unity of Purpose in its establishment. The time too, if we are to credit recent utterances, has gone by when sober reasoning based on Scripture is to be set aside by charges of doctrine being " *too Jewish.*" Able works, showing the intimate connection of the Old and New Tests., acknowledging and pressing our indebtedness to that which is " Jewish," are paving the way for such a result among the pious thoughtful. The

masses, indeed, will not be reached, but the scholarly, if also devout, cannot overlook it.

We accept of the intended reproach given by Herbert Spencer (*The Study of Sociology*), when he designates the New Test., by the significant phrase "*The Jewish* New Testament." We rejoice in its Jewish cast as a matter *logically essential* to secure covenanted blessings. But when Sara S. Hennell (*Christianity and Infidelity*) declares, that the Gospel of Christ was "a noble outburst of *Jewish fanaticism*," which our times are outgrowing, it is only too evident that she never studied its connection with *a covenanted Divine Purpose*, and its continued vital relationship to "*the Hope of Israel*." The *Essays and Reviews*, repeating the rationalistic ideas of others, utterly discards everything distinctly Jewish under the word "Judaism," and as part of its religious scheme gives us a "*Christianity without Judaism*," the result of which is to sever Christianity as much as possible from the Old Test. Mansel in the *Bampton Lectures* (p. 287) remarks, "Mr. Powell in his zeal for 'Christianity without Judaism,' seems at times to forget that Judaism, as well as Christianity, was *a revelation* from God." Powell, however, would soften this objection by the low estimate he takes of revelation. His contempt for "Judaical origin," "the Judaical school," and "Judaical Theology," includes of course the very foundations of the Kingdom, the covenants and related predictions. For he opposes not merely that which God designed to be temporary under this term, but *the oath-bound* promises of God upon which Christianity (as provisionary, etc.) itself rests. Let the reader consider the precise promises of *the Jewish* covenants and the *Jewish* predictions, all uniting in a glorious Messianic Kingdom under the reign of *a personal Son of David* on a restored Theocratic throne with *a Jewish supremacy*, overthrow of enemies, irresistible power, vast dominion, etc., and it is *utterly impossible*, without a total perversion of the covenants and prophecies, to separate the Jewish cast from Christianity which is designed to prepare "heirs" to inherit these promises and this Kingdom *with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. It is folly to ignore, or to deny, *this Jewish relationship*, and in place of it attempt to make out a fulfilment of these things in the past history of a fighting, struggling Church.

Obs. 3. It is certainly strange that the old prejudice, originally urged by Celsus against the Jews as in no special and favorable relationship to God, should be so deeply rooted in the minds of many at the present day so that everything that can be even remotely reduced to a so-called "Jewish form" or "Jewish husk" excites a degree of bitterness and hostility, which, to say the least, indicates something akin to the Gentile "*high-mindedness*," against which we are cautioned by Paul (Rom. 11).

In tracing (see note 1) this prejudice, the old monkish and popish view had much to do with its extension. To account for its prevalence in more recent times, we must also look to the results flowing from the fashion revived by Voltaire and others, viz. : of attacking Christianity through Judaism. In resisting such attacks even good men went too far, separating Christianity from the Jews, making the former something independent of the latter, and, in the midst of a misjudged zeal, manifesting contempt toward everything "Jewish." The rule of Jerome, quoted under Prop. 23, seems to have been their guide in the controversy. To-day we have books (e.g. Renan, etc.), circulated, which proclaim that Jesus entertained respecting the Kingdom "Jewish expectations," that deceived Himself and His immediate followers; works in reply apologetically admit "the Jewish forms" either as a necessary accommodation, or as a transition excrescence, or as something only to be apprehended in a very spiritual sense. Our position is such, that we are not driven to that *abject* apologetical tone, which, to the triumph and delight of unbelievers, must either admit the ignorance of the disciples or deny the express words of Revelation, or engraft another and different meaning upon the grammatical sense. We cordially accept of these "Jewish expectations" (*as found in the Bible*), and show (1) their *logical* connection with a consecutive Plan, (2) *why* they have not yet been fulfilled, (3) *when* they will be realized, (4) and *what provision* is made for their ultimate verification. Surely the time is passed with the intelligent "to" (so Paley justly said) "wound Christianity through the sides of Judaism."

The charge of Celsus against the early Christians that they deserted the ancient Jewish doctrine (the exact reverse of unbelieving objection of the present day), is a misapprehension of the truth, as clearly shown by various writers. But is not this specification

virtually correct when urged against those who reject *the grammatical sense* of the covenants, Abrahamic and Davidic? The main doctrines, which, by way of pre-eminence, are Jewish, pertaining to the Jewish nation as such, cannot safely be excluded without entailing, to a greater or less extent, such an accusation. Chiliasm alone refutes it by a practical faith and hope.

Obs. 4. The doctrine of the Kingdom, arising from the covenants, must, in the nature of the case, *be essentially Jewish*, being covenanted to *a Jewish people* (and engrafted ones, *the seed of Abraham*), and standing related to *a Jewish throne and Kingdom* (the incorporated Theocratic-Davidic). Hence we are prepared to accept of the statement of Shedd (*His. Ch. Doc.*), that our views were *of Jewish origin* (discarding his *ungenerous* reference to Cerinthus, with which compare the candor of Neander, or the Reply of Shimeall), in a sense however different from his own; also, of Mosheim (*Com. de Rebus Chris.*, p. 721), that they were derived from *the Jewish views* of the Kingdom; or, of Walch (*His. of Her.*, vol. 2, p. 143), that they are *of Biblical origin*, sustained by *the Apoc.*, and *explained* by Jewish opinions. A multitude of writers, either honestly or in scorn, attribute to it (viz.: our doctrine of the Kingdom) a Jewish origin (as e.g. Prop. Bush in *Millennium*;—Dr. Hodge in *Sys. Div.*, vol. 3, makes it an objection, so also many of our Reviews, books written in opposition to us, etc.), and this is asserted by way of evidence to indicate *weakness*, but we receive as corroborative of *real strength and unity*. The most learned theologians (as we shall quote hereafter) are beginning to see this, and acknowledge our doctrine to be *a legitimate outgrowth* from that which preceded it.

Rev. Dr. Sprecher, translator of Dr. Dorner, informed me that Dorner fully admits Chiliasm to be a legitimate historical reality, and not merely derived from Jewish conceptions that are to be discarded. Many begin to occupy a similar position. Even unbelief (as e.g. Potter in *The Genius of Christianity and Free Religion*) declares "Christianity to be developed Judaism," basing it upon the fact that the link between Jesus and the Hebrew people is found in "the Messianic idea," as given in "the Jewish prophets and literature."

Obs. 5. The Lord Jesus Christ is to-day as much "*the King of the Jews*" as He was when the superscription was placed upon the cross. This title *pre-eminently* belongs to Him *as the covenanted Davidic Son, as the promised Theocratic King*, and we hail *its association with the cross*, inasmuch as it proclaims the assurance that the malignity of His enemies, resulting in His death, cannot and will not remove *His rightful claim to the position of Jewish King*. So long as we have such a King of *Jewish* birth and the legal Heir of *the Jewish* throne and Kingdom, it is unbecoming to employ the term "*Jewish*" in any other than *a respectful sense*.

Obs. 6. To illustrate, aside from the covenants and reasoning already given, how intensely *Jewish* this Kingdom is, we refer (by way of anticipation) the reader to two or three particulars. (1) At the restoration of this Jewish nation, while Gentile nations shall experience great blessedness, *the supremacy* among all nations is accorded *to the Jewish nation*, as e.g. Micah 4 . 8, and 7 : 15–20; Zeph. 3 : 14–20; Zech. chs. 10, 12, 14, etc.: (comp. Prop. 114). (2) *Jerusalem* shall be wonderfully exalted in that day, as e.g. Zech. 8 : 3; Jer. 3 : 17; Joel 3 : 17; Isa. 24 : 23, etc.[1] (3) *The land itself* shall be highly honored, as e.g. Ezek. 36 : 34, 36; Isa. 51 : 3; Zech. 2 : 12;

Isa. 60 : 15 and 62 : 4, etc. To separate these predictions from their connection with the Jewish nation, is a destroying of their consistency and force, for *the same identical* nation, Jerusalem, and land that was suffering under Gentile dominion, is to enjoy such honor and happiness. To apply these predictions to another and mystical nation, city, and land is to make *the threats* all "Jewish" and *the blessings* all of a Gentile nature ;—which procedure is *a gross violation* of the well-founded laws of language. Hence we reject it as unwarranted, deceptive, a degradation of the election, and as virtually making *God unfaithful to oath-bound promises.*[2]

[1] Even Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 56) notices the predictions in this style : "that one day Jerusalem would be the Capital of the whole world, and that the human race would become Jewish," etc. The last remark he no doubt founds on the Jewish supremacy and Theocratic rule of David's Son, but it is not quite accurate seeing that Gentile nations are predicted as continuously existing, acknowledging and enjoying the blessings of such a rule. Comp. Prop. 168.

[2] The anti-Judaic spirit manifested by Neander, himself a Jew, has been noticed by others. Thus e.g. the writer of the art. on "Neander" (*North Brit. Review*, Feb. 1851), observes : "His phraseology, his ideas, his principles, bear no trace whatever of a Jewish origin, if, indeed, the violence of the reaction be not the best proof that he was a Jew. This has told for good, by leading him always to exalt spirit above form, the inward principle above the outward manifestation, the religion of the heart above ceremonial worship. *It has sometimes told for evil*, by making him often confound spiritual Judaism with formal Pharisaism." To this we add : it told largely for evil, seeing that moulded by his philosophy, it prevented him from observing the continued and everabiding relationship that Christianity sustains to pure Judaism in its covenants and prophecies. (Comp. Dr. Shaff's remarks on Neander in *His. Apos. Church.*) Multitudes assume his position. On the other hand, eminent writers, who themselves advocate Chiliasm, use expressions, which are liable to misapprehension. Thus e.g. Dr. Dorner (*Person of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 408) says : "Christian Chiliasm, so far from being derivable from, may in part be more justly regarded as a polemic against, Judaism on the part of Christianity. This, in particular, is its character, when it has apparently borrowed most features from Judaism." Dorner here evidently refers to one form of Judaism limited to circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic ritual (and Rabbinical traditions), which Chiliasm unrelentingly opposed, and then to a broader form which embraced the covenants and promises, adopted by Chiliasm. Now many persons make "Judaism" and "Jewish" synonymous with the contracted form, and, prejudiced, are unable to appreciate the higher form, and the depth and preciousness of its many promises. There is a Judaism founded on the temporary provisions of the Mosaic economy and the traditions of the past, which is irreconcilable with our doctrine of the Kingdom ; and there is a Judaism grounded upon the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, and the promises to the nation, which is inseparably connected with our belief—indeed, is *fundamental* to it. The Props. on the election 24, and 55–65, alone evidence this union.

PROPOSITION 69. *The death of Jesus did not remove the notion entertained by the disciples and apostles concerning the Kingdom.*

It is asserted in numerous works that the death of Jesus caused such an immediate revolution in the minds of the disciples that it destroyed *all their anticipations* of the expected restored Davidic Kingdom. This is done without due reflection, seeing that it is opposed by the plainest statement.

Thus e.g. Barnes (*Com.* Acts 1 : 9), eager to set aside the Jewish faith in the Kingdom of Israel as expressed by the disciples in Acts 1 : 6, affirms the following : " If their Saviour was *in heaven*, it settled the question about *the nature* of the Kingdom. It was clear that it was not designed to be a temporal Kingdom." Thus the ascension, and the ignoring of the postponement, is made the basis for denying the grammatically expressed fulfilment of covenant and prophecy, and for sustaining a spiritualizing system ! That the Messiah being now " in heaven" does not " settle the question about the nature of the Kingdom" for Barnes, is self-evident from *the singular variety* of Kingdoms that he has introduced, and which we quote under Prop. 3. Sara S. Hennell (*Thoughts in Aid to Faith*), takes the ultra view that Jesus, " the noble enthusiast," influenced by deep feeling aroused by prophecy and his surroundings, ambitiously undertook the mighty project of establishing a Kingdom—" conceive the grandeur of it ; to bring down a reign of righteousness on earth !"—but he failed through his enemies, died " a martyr" to his ambition, and *before* his death taught his followers " *to fix all their hopes on heaven.*" She eulogizes the " artistic beauty," the " nobleness" of Jesus while making him a mistaken enthusiast, a fanatic and deceiver, and concludes as a deduction from her *unhistorical* portraiture of Him and her confessed *ignorance* of the facts of His life and their basis in the covenants, that the origin of Christianity can be traced to natural causes, for " there is unfolded in one unbroken stream, the most marvellous, *though strictly natural*, chapter in the world's experience." From temporal visions Jesus turned to spiritual, and His death enforced the latter. But this does not satisfy some, for they see that the death of Jesus did *not* remove the Jewish idea of the Kingdom, and hence they look around to find another founder of Christianity and select the Apostle Paul. Thus e.g. Schlessinger (*The Historical Jesus of Nazareth*), after exhibiting, more or less correctly, the Messianic idea as it existed in the Jewish nation through the prophets, concludes, in view of the New Test. testimony, that " Jesus was nothing but a Jew," the disciples being the same, and then, by the grossest perversion of Paul's teachings, makes the Christian system *to originate* with Paul, who boldly cut the new religion loose from its parent trunk, Judaism. We shall show again and again, by quoting Paul frequently, that he entertained *fully and completely* the Jewish view of the Kingdom, and with all the other teachers, located its establishment at the Sec. Advent. The death of Jesus made no change in the Kingdom preached by His followers.

Obs. 1. It is true that the death of Jesus (notwithstanding the intimations previously given, as seen in Props. 58, 66, etc.) must have placed them in a perplexed attitude, and must, before His resurrection, have appeared contradictory to their expectations. This much the record intimates. The question *how* to reconcile this sad event with their *continued* view of covenant and prophecy pressed them heavily. Not appreciating the necessity (in more respects than one) of that death to seal the covenant and make its fulfilment (as e.g. in the triumph over death) possible, the

question would naturally arise, *how* can this Kingdom be established *when* the King, David's Son, Himself yields to death? Still the faith in the wonderful words and works, clouded by this distressing event, was sustained in a measure by the astonishing death itself and the things connected therewith, while the resurrection, restoring the Messiah to them, *reconfirmed that faith in His ability, etc., to fulfil the covenants and Prophets*, so that it ever after shone forth with undiminished strength and lustre.

Nast (*Com.* Matt. 16 : 21–28), following others, gives this as a reason, why Jesus predicted His own death and resurrection : "This very announcement was intended to strike at the root of their carnal Messianic expectations," i.e. the same "carnal" expectations *that they preached!* Such a reason is purely imaginative, and derogatory to the truth. If so designed (which we utterly deny) it *signally failed* with these inspired men, seeing that even *after* His death they entertained them. Nast himself (*Com.* Matt. 11 : 1–6, etc.) admits that the death itself did not remove them, for he undertakes to correct the preachers that Jesus trained, and informs us that before and immediately after the ascension the apostles had still very partial or meagre ideas of the Kingdom of God.

Obs. 2. If writers are correct in their deductions of the effects of Christ's death in revolutionizing the minds of the disciples, *then* there ought to be —if it was a result intended by Divine Providence—*a distinct announcement* of the same in the New Test. We ought to find (1) that they had been mistaken in their previous apprehensions of the Kingdom, and (2) that the death of Jesus and events following indicated this to them. But *nothing* of this kind is found in the record, and we are not at liberty *to infer* it.

We append a specimen of the contradictions in which those are involved, who maintain that Christ's death removed an erroneous view of the Kingdom from the apostles' minds. Thus e.g. Barnes, *Com.* Acts 1 : 6 contends that "the apostles had entertained the common opinion of the Jews about the temporal dominion of the Messiah," etc. He then informs us that the death of Jesus was calculated to "effectually check and change their opinions respecting the nature of the Kingdom," etc. (He does not seem to notice how, if the disciples were in error, this reflects upon the Master who then—if Barnes is correct—sent them forth and allowed them to preach error.) In all this Barnes overlooks his own comments in other places. Thus on Matt. 13 : 11 "because it is given to you to know the mysteries of heaven but to them it is not given," he professes that to the disciples it was given *to know the truth* respecting the Kingdom, but not to others. How can his comment on the latter passage be true, if his comment on Acts 1 : 6 is correct? Commentators, much admired, afford many such palpable antagonisms, and this largely detracts from their many excellences.

Obs. 3. For the present it is sufficient to produce a single passage which amply proves our Proposition ; others will be added as we proceed. The death of Jesus took place ; His resurrection occurred ; He remained after His resurrection with those previously sent-forth preachers of the Kingdom "*forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God*" (Acts 1 : 3). It is exceedingly difficult to conceive, when the Kingdom was *the principal topic* of conversation, that if these apostles were still ignorant of the very nature of the Kingdom and Christ's death was to be the medium for their enlightenment, some *decided* information to remove the *alleged* "error" was not granted to them during these forty days. The tenor of the narrative shows that in *all* their conversations *respecting* the Kingdom *nothing* was said that *changed* the faith of the apostles. They still held the belief that they had *authoritatively preached.* The proof is

found in the question (v. 6), "*Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?*" This is admitted by all—*very reluctantly* indeed by some commentators and writers[1]—to mean that *they still believed* in a restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom under the reign of the Messiah. The reply of Jesus, as we already had occasion to observe, *confirms* their belief; for instead of rejecting their idea of *the nature* of the Kingdom, He takes that for granted as substantially correct, and *only refers to the time* when it should again be restored to Israel as something reserved by the Father, thus meeting the question proposed which related to *the time*.[2]

[1] Aside from the unwilling concessions found in our anti-Millenarian commentaries, it is sufficient to direct the reader to the statements of Brooks' (*El. of Proph. Inter.*, p. 62, etc.) showing that those who have no sympathy with our views are forced to admit in this place a still believed in national restoration of the Jews. So e.g. "Govinus the Jesuit, in his comment on Acts 1 : 6, says that Cyprian, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexandrinus, Augustine, Bede" understood it. Indeed, an interminable list might be produced, but are unnecessary, as we give many under various propositions.

[2] Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 183), presses this passage beyond its intent, when he makes it an absolute measure of the future "condition of the church as regards her knowledge of coming epochs in her history," which "could not be annulled by any subsequent information on the subject." This is certainly a bold assertion, in the face of additional communications being afterward given relating to epochs of time, when he himself, a few sentences on, is forced to acknowledge that the Apocalypse does give us an idea of intervals of time, etc. Agreeing with Fairbairn that the exact day and hour is unknown, and that we can only approximatively know the periods of ultimate fulfilment, yet we firmly believe, from the information imparted and the signs given, that this approximation is more "than probable grounds of expectation." This, after all, Fairbairn virtually admits, for on p. 182 is the remark, "He gives certain signs of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem and of His own personal return to the world, by the careful consideration of which His followers might not be taken *unawares* by either event." But we must not anticipate (see Props. 173 and 174).

Obs. 4. The conversation between Jesus and the disciples pertaining to the Kingdom, and the question of the latter just before the ascension, *most effectually disproves* the assertions of eminent writers that the Kingdom *was already* established sometime in the ministry or life of Jesus (Prop. 56). The narrative given by Luke unmistakably proves that such theories are incorrect, since the apostles—hearers and preachers, and confidants—*knew nothing* whatever of such an already established Kingdom. Their preaching, instructions, etc., manifest that they had not even the most distant idea of such an important measure if it had really existed. It is impossible to credit such theories over against *the direct testimony* of men, who, of all persons living, were *the most likely* to know and express the truth.

Strange that learned men and able theologians can find a covenanted Kingdom existing (even if it is one in the heart) during the ministry of Christ, when the apostles, at this most favorable period, were *utterly unconscious* of the same. *Whom shall we credit*—preachers appointed by Jesus Himself and under His special instruction, or those who flatly contradict the apostles' knowledge at this stage of historical development? We give some illustrations of the mode of handling the divine statements. Brown (*Com.* Acts 1 : 6), after intimating without *a particle of proof* that Jesus (v. 3) had imparted instruction respecting a spiritual Kingdom, tells us (v. 6), "Doubtless their *carnal* views of Messiah's Kingdom had *by this time been modified*, though *how far* it is *impossible* to say. But as they plainly looked *for some restoration* of the Kingdom to Israel, so they are neither rebuked nor contradicted on this point." The apostles then had previously preached a carnal Kingdom, and they still retained a portion of it, but with it all, Brown conjectures, they had some glimmering of Brown's spiritual Kingdom! How does he reconcile this charge of carnality with his comment on Matt. 3 : 2 where he says: "A

Kingdom for which repentance was the proper preparation behooved to be essentially spiritual" (overlooking that when the Theocracy, a civil and religious organization, was established it also demanded the confession of sin and repentance), when the very men appointed to urge this repentance, failed to acknowledge it. So Killen (*The Ancient Church*, p. 190) follows the prevailing track. After previously informing us how Jesus *specially* instructed and trained preachers, who held that which "was vague as well as much that was visionary" concerning the Kingdom (the very thing they were to preach), he then gravely informs us, without *the slightest proof*, that " during the interval between the resurrection and ascension," the apostles so profited, because He " then opened their understanding," that " the true nature of Christ's Kingdom *was now fully* disclosed to them," and this he repeatedly tells us is " the spiritual Kingdom" now established. But where is *the evidence* of this gross ignorance and this sudden enlightenment? It is simply and solely *imaginary*, and thus introduced to give his modern ideas *an apparent* Scriptural support. Much of this loose writing exists. Others in reference to this interval are more cautious, as e.g. Scott (*Com. loci*), who, however unwilling, is forced to say : " But, notwithstanding all which He had taught them, they still entertained some thoughts of *a temporal* Kingdom," and these expectations, he informs us, were eradicated *on and after* the day of Pentecost. The interval is thus given to us without an effort to retain it ; and it poorly accords with various comments, on events and sayings preceding it, found in his commentary. It is sad to find so many writers of ability (as e.g. Ebrard, *Gosp. His.*, p. 332, etc., Art. " Offices of Christ " in M'Clintock and Story's *Cyclop.*), who declare that during the ministry of Jesus, He and the disciples taught that " the Kingdom of God *had come*," " *was come*," when the record so flatly contradicts the usage of such language, and the preachers, who are stated to have said so, were *utterly unconscious* of any such a Kingdom established, *even during this interval*. It is refreshing to turn from such contradictory presentations to the simple facts as appreciated by others. Thus Rev. Andrew Fausset, the Commentator, in our " Lord's Prophecies" (*Christ. Herald*, Ap. 10th, 1879), refers to " Repent ye, for the Kingdom of God is at hand," and then asking *why* this Kingdom did not immediately appear, correctly answers by a reference to the non-repentance and unbelief of the nation, as proven by the address of Jesus, Matt. 23 : 37–39, saying, " these words indicate that the unbelief of the Jews caused *the postponement* of Christ's Kingdom." Such a position enables us to receive Acts 1 : 6, and kindred passages, *without degrading* the disciples and apostles into " carnal " believers, etc. The apostles were not " ignorant and mistaken" at this period, and we may well believe, that the question was actuated by the honor and glory it would bring to their Master, by the personal interest they felt in it, owing to the specific promise of rulership in it, and by the blessing, according to prediction, it would prove to the Jewish nation and the world. It was *just such* a question as hearts full of love, faith, and hope would suggest with a resurrected Messiah before them. The question vindicates their deep interest in " *the Christship*" of Jesus, and His answer *confirms* their confidence in Him.

PROPOSITION 70. *The apostles, after Christ's ascension, did not preach, either to Jews or Gentiles, that the Kingdom was established.*

They could not *consistently* preach that it was established, because (1) the covenant forbids it, the express terms of it not being verified; (2) the rejection of the kingdom by the Jews and its consequent postponement during "the times of the Gentiles," forbids it; (3) the seed of Abraham to whom the Kingdom is to be given not being yet gathered out, forbids it; and (4) the non-arrival of the Sec. Advent forbids it.

It is painful to notice how our recent apologetical writers (as e.g. Row, *Ch. Evidences, Bampton Lectures*, 1877), while not denying a future fulfilment of prophecy, make the Messianic prophecies to be mainly realized at the First Advent and in the Ch. Church. This is a grave mistake, *utterly opposed* to the covenants, prophecies, and teachings of the apostles, all of which point us to the Sec. Advent for the astounding and most joyful Messianic manifestations. Such an error, if entertained, vitiates any system of belief, and weakens the defence of Christianity itself, because it perverts and misapplies Scripture and the Gospel History. Many Pre-Millenarians (as e.g. Dr. Nast in Art. "Christ's Mill. Reign," *West. Ch. Advocate*, July 23d, 1879) hold that a "Kingdom of grace" was established in the Church (which they also designate "new dispensation," etc.), or in the heart of believers (a spiritual Kingdom), but hold that this is to give place to "the Kingdom of Christ" in its full covenanted and proper prophetic sense, viz.: "*an undisputed Theocracy on the earth.*" While we feel compelled, *logically and Scripturally* (as we shall show in detail), to reject this view as untenable and misleading, yet it is—in view of the unity of Scripture being more largely preserved by it—immensely preferable to the prevailing theories on the subject. Those holding to this opinion are self-contradictory, which is evidenced by the following illustration. In their comments on Matt. 3 : 2 they already find this Kingdom of grace, but coming to Acts 1 : 6 it is postponed to the day of Pentecost, and when we come to that period, we find the Kingdom inferred—the Church established being simply preparatory. Because Jesus is the Messiah, it does not follow that He now fills the covenanted and predicted position assigned to Him; men hastily conclude that He does (a multitude of writers assert it, and make it fundamental in their system), but we show from the Scriptures, step by step, that we have *to wait for the Sec. Advent* before the Messianic manifestation in connection with the Kingdom can be realized.

Obs. 1. Our entire argument thus far (with additional reasons that will be advanced) does not allow us to entertain any other opinion than the one stated in the Proposition. After the declarations of Jesus that "the house" (Davidic) would remain desolate until His return, that He would leave, remain away for an indefinite time, that the Kingdom was connected with His coming again, etc., it is reasonable to look *for a corresponding style* of preaching in His chosen witnesses. This we find in such profusion that it is a favorite charge with infidels (as Strauss, Bauer, Renan, etc.) that the apostles still adhered to "*the Jewish ideas of the Kingdom*"; the apologists (as Neander, etc.) admit that "Jewish forms" were retained,

but contend that these were to be (alas! how true) gradually obliterated in "the developing consciousness of the church."

Many writers of the Tübingen school and others, regarding Christianity as the resultant of a Petrine and Pauline development, attempt to distinguish between these periods. The Petrine being essentially Jewish is the prevailing type of Christianity during the first period, but was finally displaced and absorbed by the Pauline, which is regarded as more anti-Jewish. In this way they endeavor to account (overlooking the Alexandrian and Gnostic influence) for the overthrow of the Jewish notions of the Kingdom, although all admit that even the Pauline and Johannine are *not entirely* freed from "a Jewish cast." Unfortunately not only Rationalistic but prominent defenders of Christianity (as Neander, Nevin, etc.), have seized upon this Petrine and Pauline theory, and incorporated it into their own line of apologetics, under its shelter apologizing for *the modern* view of the Kingdom being so different from that of the early Church. (Comp. Props. 72, 74, 75, 76.) This is done at the expense of concessions, which, to say *the least*, vitiate or lessen apostolic authority. Every theory of this kind forgets that to Peter was first *specially* committed the keys of this Kingdom both to Jew and Gentile (comp. Prop. 64), and that from this circumstance alone he was in no way inferior to Paul or John. Is it possible to believe that one to whom *such keys* were entrusted, should be ignorant of the Kingdom to an extent that requires another's services to set it right? No! the whole theory—hypothetical—introduces *an uncalled-for, and unproven*, antagonism between the teaching of the apostles (comp. Prop. 187–8), which only exists in a philosophical conceit. Differences in characteristic writing, in witnessing statements, manner of presenting truth, exist between Peter, John, and Paul, but *none in doctrine*, or in the truth itself, or in the teachings concerning the Kingdom. On the subject of the Kingdom they were *a unit*, and none of the differences alluded to (as e.g. in Paul's laying so much stress on justification by faith, rendered necessary by his special mission to Gentiles to secure their engrafting, or, in his portrayal of the overthrow of the Mosaic ritual, made incumbent by the same, etc.), are of a nature to form an antagonism between them. This is seen from our line of argument, enabling us to quote as *freely* from Paul as we do from Peter. This divine unity of doctrine is *essential* to their character as witnesses; for just so soon as we admit that in any important doctrine (as that of the Kingdom) any one of the apostles was in error (however apologetically and philosophically presented so as not to shock our sense of propriety), *then* his testimony is lowered to a mere human standard. Even if men endeavor to screen such an one, chargeable with misconception, from ignorance and of bearing false witness, by saying that under "the Jewish form" or "Jewish husk" there was still "a germ" (invisibly small) of truth, which must pass through a process of development before it can be appreciated, yet all this, done with the most excellent and pious motives, is only opening the floodgates of infidelity, for it is an undermining of unity and apostolic character. Well may the Tübingen, Parker, and other schools, triumphantly ask, after such *vain* concessions, if the apostles were *mistaken* in their notions of the Kingdom, *how* can we trust them as infallible guides in other matters? The sad truth is, that this specious, fallacious theorizing is a fearful blow dealt to apostolic knowledge and authority. Instead of having a sure foundation in the Word, it is placed in "church-consciousness," in development, growth, church authority, etc. And moreover, when it comes to finding those microscopical germs, scarcely two are agreed as to their appearance, shape, or to their resultant growth. The enemies of the Bible are not slow in seizing this vantage ground offered to them, and are finding these germs and developments—using the theory most effectually—in Comparative Theology, and making Christianity only a stage of development toward a higher plane, etc. Volume after volume of recent American books with this plausible philosophical hypothesis running through them, are bearing the fruit of its adoption. They echo the sentiments of the German "Friends of Light," that the Scriptures were good enough in the early history of the church, but were never intended for *the present* highly intelligent and cultivated times! It may be said, that this is pushing the theory to an extreme; but we can scarcely deny that it is a legitimate one, when employed, as it is, to disparage apostolic teaching as contained in a "husk."

Obs. 2. The weakness and Jewish cast assigned to the early church teaching respecting the Kingdom, is the place of persistent attack from unbelievers. It is remarkable, and indicative of the truthfulness of our position, that for some time the chief assaults have been turned in this direction.

For, if it can be shown—taking advantage of the admissions and concessions of believers, which allow a change of view in the church doctrine of the Kingdom—that the faith of the apostles *was discarded* by the church as "*too Jewish,*" then it follows *of necessity* that *the very foundations* of Christianity are unreliable and the superstructure erected upon them is unsafe. This insidious (and unjust to the Record) charge is skilfully directed and paraded by thousands of pens. If any of the apostles were wrong, may not all others be equally in error? Invalidate the testimony of one on a leading doctrine so that it becomes antagonistic—directly hostile—to another; declare that the doctrinal position of one or more was tolerably well calculated for that age but not for successive eras, and you have *no infallible* directory. Believers stand amazed, amid the enlightenment of the age, to find the multitude of unbelievers so vast. Alas! we say it sorrowfully, these are the legitimate fruits of following a spiritualistic system of interpretation which *dares not accept* of the language and faith of the apostles, and of the early church as recorded concerning the Kingdom; which *vainly* wishes that the Millennarian, the Jewish view of the Kingdom, had never existed. We repeat: the church *by forsaking the old landmarks* of this doctrine will reap in bitterness the sad results of its own sowing. In forsaking the primitive, covenanted doctrine of the Kingdom, so fundamental; in declaring that the first Christians were in error on this most important and essential matter; in heaping upon apostolic fathers and martyrs the epithets of "carnal," "sensual," "material," "gross," "Jewish," and "fanatical" interpretation, she has been paving the way and forging the weapons for the present unrelenting attack upon the citadel of Christianity itself. And just so long as she continues to entertain her view (now so prevalent) of the preaching of the disciples, she is incapable of *fairly* meeting and setting aside the arguments of unbelievers.

The gross attack of Bolingbroke, owing to alleged discrepancies in preaching, etc., in endeavoring to make out that the New Test. contains two distinct Gospels, one given by Christ and another by Paul, has been refined; the theory of doctrinal development from the germ supplying the abundant material. Dr. Priestley (*Letters* 1 and 2 to Mr. Burn, quoted by Fuller in *Calv. and Soc. Sys. Comp.*, Let. 12), not knowing what to do with some Scripture, remarks: "some texts of the Old Test. had been improperly quoted by writers in the New," being "misled by Jewish prejudices." This is repeated by multitudes, and, what is remarkable, more or less endorsed, in some form or other, by theologians and apologists. Thus to give a single illustration (in a different spirit) from an eminent author, able and interesting: Oosterzee (*Theol. of N. Test.*, p. 378), says that the Apocalypse sustains a "*purely Israelitish character*" (see e.g. p. 53 where the Jewish views are stated), and that it indicates "that even the most highly developed of the Apostles at the end of his course, *had by no means torn himself from the Theocratic national ground* in which he had ever been rooted." We thank such men for their frank and noble concessions of truth, however adverse it may be to their own theories, especially when it is done not in the spirit of unbelief but for *the sake* of the truth. Multitudes proceeding on the theory that the Messianic Kingdom was established in the Ch. Church, take it *for granted* that the apostles changed their views. Thus e.g. Walker, in the *Philos. of the Plan of Salvation*, constantly presents it, and locates (p. 245) the period of enlightenment as follows: "On the day of Pentecost, the promised Spirit descended. The apostles at once perceived the spiritual nature of Christ's Kingdom." But the proof is lacking, and over against Walker we place the above declaration of Oosterzee's that John had not changed in his last writing. Covenant, prophecy, unity, all forbid such a change, especially in communications divinely received.

Obs. 3. Our argument—fortified (1) by Scripture, (2) by charges of infidelity, (3) by frank concessions of apologists—accepts of these "Jewish conceptions" of the apostles as *legitimately correct* and *imperatively de-*

manded by the covenants and the Divine Purpose. One writer attempts to get rid of these "Jewish forms" by dividing the church into Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine (some make the Pauline last) stages or eras, lauding and magnifying the one to the prejudice of the other, and making the former to be absorbed by the latter; another writer (as e.g. M. Pecaut) says that Paul continually betrays his "Jewish conceptions"; Semler, and others, inform us that John's writings, especially the Apocalypse, are in harmony with a "Jewish spirit"; another writer (as e.g. *Westm. Review*, Oct. 1861, Art. 5) tells us that all of them give us "an expansion of the great Hebrew Theocratic conception." These expressions are given to us apologetically, or sneeringly (with intended sarcasm), but in themselves they contain *so much truth* that the apology or sarcasm becomes uncalled for and harmless; for we are fully prepared and warranted to accept of these "*Hebrew Theocratic conceptions.*" Scholten (Oosterzee's *Theol. N. Test.*, p. 395) may see only "forms derived from an earlier mechanical view of the world, which show that John had not yet entirely risen *from his former Judaism*"; Renan (*Life of St. Paul*, p. 250) may tell us, that "the great chimera of the coming Kingdom of God was thus *the creative and mother idea* of the new religion," and in another place (p. 162), "the dream which had been the soul of the movement of ideas brought about by Jesus, continued to be *the fundamental dogma* of Christianity; everybody believed in the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God, in the unexpected manifestation of a great glory, in the midst of which the Son of God would appear," etc., and that Paul "*expresses Messianic hopes clothed in the garb of Jewish materialism*"; Neander, Pressense, and a host of others, may *reluctantly* admit the "Jewish forms," "Jewish conceptions," "Jewish materialism," "Jewish husks," etc. (telling us that growth was to cast these aside), but we *gladly accept of the very things* which are thus *wrongfully* supposed to be prejudicial to the truth itself.

Some writers, overlooking their own concessions in other places, endeavor, with their Pauline theory, to clear Paul as much as possible from Jewish views. Under the shelter of Paul's consistent objections to *some* Jewish views (viz.: those relating to the ceremonial and sacrificial law abrogated in Jesus, which we also hold), they endeavor to make out that he rejected everything *essentially Jewish*. Our argument, as we proceed, will show *the unfounded nature* of this theory. It is a matter of surprise that Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 303), after his admissions concerning apostolic adhesion to Jewish conceptions (thus introducing antagonism between apostles), in his eagerness to rid Paul of Judaistic views, roundly asserts: "*whom* (*Christ*) *he* (*Paul*) *did not regard as the mighty monarch of a Kingdom to come.*" Where is *the proof* of such a sweeping assertion? The *exact contrary* is evidenced from even a partial comparison of Paul's teachings. This will appear in the course of our argument under various propositions, where we will show that Paul lays *much stress* on the Sec. Advent and the future Kingdom *then* introduced, employing largely *the very Jewish phraseology and ideas* which were universally applied by the Jews to the Messianic or Davidic restored, Kingdom. There is no contradiction between Paul and the other apostles, as is seen in his equally pressing the importance of the Second Advent, the futurity of the Kingdom, the location of the restitution, inheriting, the day of Jesus Christ, etc. But as all these points will come before us in regular order, we need not anticipate them.

Obs. 4. We take the position that if the witnesses of the truth thus occupied—as enemies and friends, assailants and defenders declare—"*a Jewish standpoint*," it was *necessary* for them to do so *in behalf of the truth itself*. A little reflection here, in view of the special character and mission of the apostles, will lead any unbiased mind, which acknowledges the inspiration

and authority of the Scriptures, to feel that any theory which places the apostles in an attitude, *doctrinally*, antagonistic to the future posture of the church, *is, and must be, radically defective.* A mind and heart imbued with deep reverence for the Word, ought to be prepared to investigate the doctrinal views of the persons divinely commissioned to proclaim, *authoritatively, the truth*, and to do this with *the utmost impartiality.* Such, too, ought not to allow, without *the most decisive proof*, that the apostles were mistaken in their "Jewish" position.

In this matter we only follow the excellent suggestion of Dr. Hodge, one of our opponents, when he says (*Sys. Theol.*, vol. 3, p. 793, comp. p. 797), "what the apostles believed, we are *bound* to believe; for St. John said: '*He that knoweth God, heareth us.*'" This is true, but, alas, how little regarded even by those who are friends and admirers of the apostles! The quotations, apologies, etc., given already evidence this; many more will be adduced as we advance.

Obs. 5. Additionally it may be said: (1) If the apostles preached that the covenanted, predicted Kingdom was established, why do they not *directly declare* this as a fact, and thus remove error and prevent the incoming Chiliasm? Is there a single passage which *directly teaches* that the Christian church is the Kingdom? No such declaration or passage is to be found in all the apostolical writings. (2) Hence it is a fact which cannot be gainsaid that those who hold to a present establishment of the Kingdom exclusively rely upon *inferential* proof. This feature alone—a doctrine derived from *pure inference*—should place the reader on his guard so that he may well consider whether such inferential testimony can possibly outweigh the previously given covenants and teachings of Jesus. An inference may be right or wrong, and this must be carefully tested. It has no decisive weight against *direct* testimony, but must give way to the latter. Let us add: it is inconsistent with the leading doctrine of an oath-bound covenant, of the early preaching of the disciples, and of all prophecy, to leave it (the doctrine of the Kingdom) deducible from mere inference resulting from human opinion on the subject. Inferences too so completely of human origin, that the most learned and pious differ among themselves as to the meaning to be attached to it, and the time of its establishment. It is, therefore, a just conclusion, that, in a matter of so high moment, if God really (as claimed) established the Kingdom covenanted to David and predicted by the prophets in the church or in the hearts of believers, etc., *then* those former preachers of the Kingdom ought (since we are told that they were mistaken, etc.) *as honest men*—to say nothing of their apostleship—both to have confessed their previous error (for if in error, as claimed, simple justice required this), and to have plainly and unequivocally declared the presence of the Kingdom in human hearts, or in the church, or in the world. But they did neither of these things: the first they could not do, because they *had not been ignorant, false preachers* of the Kingdom; the second it was impossible for them to do, since it would have convicted them of having *previously* preached an erroneous Kingdom, of abandoning the solemnly given covenants, and of holding forth a Kingdom which has none of the divinely covenanted and predicted characteristics. (Passages from which the opposite is inferred, will be examined in detail hereafter.) Inferences, therefore, which are in antagonism to the previously ascertained tenor of the Word, to the anticipations of the pious Jews, to the former preaching of John, Jesus, and the

disciples, are justly open to grave suspicion, and one to be discarded as too unreliable for doctrinal teaching.

Obs. 6. Take the first sermons of Peter, and nothing is said of the establishment of the Kingdom, although multitudes inform us that it was *only then* manifested. Turning to Acts 2 : 14–36 and 3 : 12–26, we ascertain the following: that in the former, speaking to Jews instead of making out that the covenant was to be spiritualized and applied to Christ, Peter boldly asserts that *Jesus was to sit on David's throne,* that He was raised up and exalted for this purpose, that He was seated at God's right hand until the period arrives (comp. e.g. Rev. 19 and 20) for making His enemies His footstool, and that, therefore, He is *both Lord and Christ.* (Let not the reader forget here, the meaning of Christ to the Jewish mind —see Prop. 205.) Let the student place himself in the posture of the Jewish hearers at that preaching, with their Jewish expectations of the Kingdom and "the Christ," and he will see at once that this sermon was most *admirably adapted to confirm* the Jews in their faith of the Kingdom. Peter's argument takes *the Jewish view* of the Kingdom to be the correct one, and as one *well known* (Props. 19–44), and hence, without entering into particulars, endeavors to show *that Jesus is that Messiah* under whom the covenanted sitting upon David's throne *will yet eventually* be realized —His resurrection and present exaltation giving us *the needed assurance.* The Kingdom *is not* disputed, but He who is to be the Messiah, the King, is *the subject* controverted and thus brought forward. This is confirmed by the second discourse, in which it is distinctly announced that *this Jesus,* thus declared to be the Messiah, shall remain in heaven *until the period of restitution* spoken of by the prophets, and always linked with the Messianic Kingdom, shall arrive; for this Jesus shall come again to be the Restorer as the prophets announce. Now let the reader consider *how the hearers* of Peter regarded *the times of restitution* (comp. Prop. 144), comprehending under it the Messianic reign, the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, etc., and it is *utterly impossible* to conceive of *any other impression* made upon their minds *than that the Kingdom was still future, and would be established when Jesus would come again.* The proof is found in the historical fact, that the first Christians *thus understood* Peter. The times of restitution and the times of the Kingdom are strictly *equivalent* phrases to the Jewish mode of thinking and belief; hence the language of Peter, as consistency demanded, is in strict accord with our Proposition. Many of our opponents are forced to give us Acts chs. 2 and 3, as fully sustaining continued "Jewish expectations."

Thus e.g. Pressense (*Early Years of Chris.*, p. 46), says that the apostles after the day of Pentecost "still enveloped that truth (i.e. the truth of Christ), *in Jewish forms,*" and (p. 48) adds: "they (the first Christians) believed in an immediate return of Jesus Christ 'to restore all things.' They supposed that the end of the world was at hand and that the last days foretold by Joel had begun to dawn. Acts 2 : 17 and 3 : 19, 20. Thus *they awaited* those days of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, which was to inaugurate the Sec. Coming of Christ." Schmid (*Bib. Theol.*, N. Test., p. 337), frankly admits that Acts 3 : 18–25 viewed with Peter's utterances in his epistles, refers to the Old Test. prophecy of the restitution of all things, which "*is to be completed at His second appearance.*" (Comp. Prop. 144.) A large amount of similar testimony could readily be produced from the writings of our opposers—some of which we present under other Propositions,—and this is the more valuable since it is reluctantly forced from them, being, as they well see and acknowledge, at variance with their preconceived notion of the Kingdom. We admire the integrity of such men, who in honesty, however adverse the

confession may be to their own views of the Kingdom, frankly admit "*the Jewish standpoint*" of the first preachers of the Kingdom; while we censure the weakness—if not worse—of that class who either dare not confess it, or pretend, against overwhelming evidence, that it does not exist, being afraid that an honest acknowledgment would recoil upon their own system of faith. The truth of God never suffers by exposure and freedom; it is confinement and restrainment that, if it does not seriously injure, at least eclipses it. Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 506), however much he endeavors to give a modern hue to these sermons (and thus makes out that Peter at one time, at least, had preached a false Kingdom, viz.: before the day of Pentecost), makes important concessions (1) that the times of restitution occur at the Sec. Advent; (2) that the sending of Jesus again, is that Advent; (3) that even "the seasons of refreshing" if "the sense absolutely require it," "might be identified with the times of the restitution of all things" (although he thinks it not necessary); (4) that (p. 168) it were against all probability to suppose that the apostle meant to speak of the prophecy (of Joel) as having found a complete fulfilment in the events of that particular day, or as being in any measure exhausted by these."

Obs. 7. Paul's teaching fully corresponds with that of Peter. Thus e.g. in the 1st and 2d chs. of 2 Thess. he *unites* the Kingdom *with the Advent* of the Lord Jesus, and, *instead* of a present covenanted Kingdom existing, predicts that before *the still future* "*day of Christ*" is manifested there will be a falling away, and the Son of perdition, the Antichrist, will be revealed. That is, before the predictions relating to the promised glory of the Messiah's Kingdom can be realized, certain events must *first* transpire, and that trouble, trial, and persecution, more or less, await those who are called and are under the influence of the truth. (Comp. e.g. the Jewish conceptions of Rom. 8 : 19–23; 11 : 1–32; 13 : 11, 12, etc.; 1 Cor. 1 : 7, 8; 4 : 5, 8; 6 : 2, 3, 9, 14, etc.; 2 Cor. 1 : 14; 3 : 16, etc.; Gal. 1 : 4; 3 : 16–18, etc.; Eph. 1 : 10–21; 2 : 12–19; 4 : 30, etc.; Phil. 1 : 6, 10; 2 : 10, 11, 16, etc.; and so through all his writings,—constantly speaking of Jesus as the Messiah, and locating the fulfilment of the promises held by the Jews *to the future coming* of this Jesus, by employing *the language and ideas* of the Jews applied to the Messiah.)

Obs. 8. James in his Epistle, *instead* of a kingdom now established, calls believers "*heirs of a kingdom*," and exhorts to a patient waiting for "*the Coming of the Lord*" *when* the promises will be realized, thus strictly verifying Christ's statements. In Acts 15 : 13–17, in the council of the apostles, James corroborates the non-establishment of the Kingdom by showing that "*after this*" (i.e. after the gathering out of the Gentiles) "*I (Jesus) will return and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down*," etc. The postponement is most plainly taught.

The apostles *all agreed* to this postponement as presented by James. Let the careful consider: that, in the very nature of the case, this *must be* so, or else the apostles come in direct conflict with the statements of Jesus (comp. e.g. Props. 58, 66, etc.). In this matter there must be, in order to preserve their character of apostleship, a full and cordial agreement.

Obs. 9. John in his Epistles, *instead* of proclaiming a present existing kingdom, tells us of antichrist, encourages to faithfulness and looking *for the coming* of Jesus. In the Apoc., given to show the future revelation of Jesus, he shows the trials and tribulations of the church during a period of time still future to him, and positively asserts *that only at a certain time* (Rev. 11 : 15 and 20 : 4) the dominion or Kingdom of Christ would be manifested. Jude, in his short Epistle, refers us to *the coming King* when

mercy and glory are to be revealed to His saints. Thus all the leading first preachers present *the same postponement* of the Kingdom ; and it is *a perversion* of their language to make them testify to anything contrary to this and their former preaching. Indeed, it is more than this ; it is to make them *contradictory, unreliable, and hostile to the Covenants and Prophecy.*

Obs. 10. The simple fact, running through the Epistles, is that *the Kingdom is spoken of as still future and constantly associated with the speedy Advent of Jesus.* The expectancy of that Advent and *related* kingdom forbids the entertainment of *the substituted notion* of a kingdom now so widely prevalent. This linking of the Kingdom with the Second Advent is *nowhere* spoken of (as now reiterated by eminent writers) as the development of a new stage in the Kingdom. The passages already adduced abundantly confirm our position, for, instead of teaching what the Alexandrian, monkish, popish, and modern schools so loudly affirm (viz. : that the covenanted Kingdom *had already* arrived and was in full realization and progress). they point us *to the Sec. Coming of Jesus for the glorious establishment of the Kingdom.*[1] We give but a single illustration of the apostolic mode of presenting this subject : Take 1 Pet. 1 : 10–13, and we have (1) the inheritance and savaltion (Jewish phrases) "*ready to be revealed in the last time*" ; (2) to be realized "*at the appearing of Jesus Christ,*" "*at the revelation of Jesus Christ*"; (3) and this is the same inheritance and salvation which the prophets predicted, *linking it* with the Messianic Kingdom on earth. Why should we then, contrary to the entire tenor of the Word, attempt to locate the fulfilment of this salvation, etc., at a period of time *different* from that specified by the apostle and his co-laborers ; or, why should we disconnect that which the Spirit ("knowing the deep things of God") has *expressly joined together?* Let any one carefully consider the phraseology of the New Test. in reference to the coming again of Jesus, and observe how there is united with it *all the Jewish hopes* of kingdom, restitution, redemption, dominion, reigning, crowning, destruction of enemies, deliverance of His people, etc., and he will clearly see that the distinctive Messianic hopes, the hopes *that centre in the official Christ, are postponed* to the expected, precious Sec. Advent of the Messiah.[2]

[1] To a person who has never collated the passages relating to the subject, it will be surprising, if he undertakes it, to find *both* how numerous they are, and how unanimous the voice of the apostles in making the same representations. (Lists are given in Bickersteth's *Guide*, Brooks' *El. of Proph. Interp.*, Seiss' *Last Times*, Shimeall's *I will come again*, etc.). What Van Oosterzee so aptly applies to Peter, will be found, to a very great extent, true of all the apostles : "as well the discourses as the First Epis. of Peter teach us to recognize this apostle especially as *the Apostle of Hope*, in this sense, that the return of the Lord equally dominates his whole presentation of Christian truth, his whole conception of the Christian life."

[2] Overlooking this feature, many writers find obscurity and difficulties, when none exist. Thus e.g. Reuss, neglecting this key given so plainly in Hebrews (as in 2 : 5 ; 4 : 9 ; 9 : 28 ; 10 : 36, 37, etc.), says : "How involved, obscure, and ambiguous is the Scriptural demonstration of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 4 : 3 etc.), the design of which is to establish the certainty of God's promises." Of course, *when* men spiritualize God's promises and survey them only from a modern mystical standpoint there must necessarily be ambiguity, but let any one place himself *on covenanted ground* and *then* he will see the clearness of the argument, (1) to show that Jesus is the Messiah, (2) that the promises will be fulfilled in and by Him, (3) that even as Priest He makes provision for their fulfilment, (4) that His very death ensures the fulfilment of the covenant, (5)

and that such a realization of covenant promises will be experienced at His Sec. Coming unto Salvation. Thus this epistle falls in fully, clearly, and powerfully with the other portions of Scripture.

Obs. 11. If we critically consider the confession of Peter, it leads us to the same conclusion. Peter confessed that Jesus was "*the Christ, the Son of the living God,*" and received for this the *special* approval of Jesus and acknowledgment that "*flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee but my Father which is in heaven*" (Matt. 16 : 16, 17). Now this approbation, calling Peter "*Blessed,*" and the declaration that *the Father* revealed it, *clearly indicate* that Peter *knew* the significancy and proper meaning of the title "*the Christ.*" This is self-evident from the narrative. What view of "*the Christ*" did Peter entertain excepting *solely that of the Jewish expectations,* and that Jesus, and none other, was indeed the promised Christ. When Peter, therefore, made this confession he believed *as fundamental* to it, that "*the Christ*" was the kingly title of Jesus, that which indicated Him as "the anointed" One, coming as *the King to restore the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom.* This is not mere conjecturing Peter's view of the Christship, for we have *overwhelming proof* that such in reality—and consistently too with Covenant and Prophecy—was his opinion. The proof is found in *Acts* 1 : 6 (comp. also Prop. 205, etc.). The reader will also reflect that if the modern doctrinal view of "*the Christ*" was in Peter's mind, is it not reasonable to suppose that Peter or Jesus would have, on this occasion, disabused the other disciples of their Jewish conceptions of the Messiahship ; and can we consistently account for Peter's rebuking Jesus when He shortly after spoke of His death and resurrection, Matt. 16 : 22.[1] But when we see that Peter's conceptions of "*the Christ*"—as shown to exist—were *approved by Jesus Himself,* who shall dare to decry them as "*ignorant*" *and* "*antiquated.*" To do the latter is both presumptuous and dangerous. No ! Peter *knew* what was comprehended under the phrase "*the Christ,*" and however ignorant in reference to the manner and time in which "*the Christ*" would be openly manifested as such in His glorious work, he *certainly* was not mistaken in *the meaning* that he attached to it. Notice then what follows : without the slightest change or hint of a different meaning Peter *continues* to preach to the Jews "*the Christ,*" which was understood by all to denote *the One anointed to be the King on David's restored throne.* If this was not its meaning, *how could* inspired men leave the Jews and others under the impression, without correction, that such continued its meaning, *only pointing* to the still future Advent for the manifestation of this Jesus as "*the Christ*" in the fullest sense entertained.[2]

[1] It is saddening to see into what palpable contradictions most excellent men are involved, who deny Peter's conception of "the Christ," and persistently reject "Jewish conceptions" of the Messiah. We give an illustration (the reader can readily find a multitude) : Barnes, *Com.*, Matt. 16 : 16, 17, endeavors to give *an unwarranted* turn to this confession, an Anti-Judaic one, as if Peter did not entertain the Jewish views, and as if the words meant : "You, Jews, were expecting to know the Messiah by His external splendor, His pomp and power as a man," etc. He thus ascribes to Peter a highly wrought spiritual conception of "the Christ," according with *modern* ideas. Now notice, in the same chapter, on verse 22, he interprets Peter's conduct as resulting from this : "He expected, moreover, that He would be the triumphant Messiah," etc., and, on Acts 1 : 6, the apostles, including Peter (for he makes no exception), are charged with holding the exact Jewish expectations of a "temporal dominion of the Messiah," etc. In the one place he has the proper idea of Christ, and in the other places he is represented as holding erroneous views. Our argument shows that Peter, however ignorant of the

means and time of accomplishment, *consistently held* to one continuous proper meaning of "Christ," corresponding with his preaching as a disciple and an apostle.

[2] Admirable writers make the grave mistake of changing the definite title of "the Christ" (comp. Prop. 205). Apologists fall into the same serious error, as e.g. Leathes (*The Religion of the Christ*, Lec. 6, on "the Christ of Acts") correctly points out the teaching of Jesus concerning His death, that such a death appeared destructive to the Jewish faith of the Christ, and that the Christship was fully asserted notwithstanding the death, but unfortunately (overlooking the distinctive title in its covenanted relationship, and the postponement of the Kingdom) deduces from this, grounded on His resurrection and ascension, that "the Christship," as covenanted and predicted, was most amply realized in the establishment of the Church, although *unable* to designate *a single Messianic feature thus fulfilled*. The facts of the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, Apoc., and early Church, all show that this is an erroneous conclusion, calculated to lead into a perversion of much that is precious. Leathes applies the same reasoning to the Epistles, and comes out with the astounding assertion, that by His ascension, the establishment of the Church, and the conferring of spiritual life and gifts, "He thus Himself shows the fulfilment of psalm and prophecy *more* than if He had restored again the Kingdom to Israel, and had gathered in subjection to the throne of David all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." How sad it is, to see excellent men, who desire to honor Jesus, make that which is preparatory *to be* the full realization of covenant and prophecy. The simple truth, that the apostles showed that this Jesus, once dead, but risen and exalted, was the Messiah promised, and that at His Sec. Advent—*not before*—this covenanted and predicted Christship would be manifested in power and glory, is completely overshadowed by a preconceived theory to which all Scripture *must* bend. Do we need to be surprised at *the lack of faith* in the Church, when good men, in vast numbers, lend themselves to such a work.

Obs. 12. The testimony in behalf of our position is cumulative. Some may be added here, leaving the additional for other Propositions (as e.g. 93–104, etc.). Much of the language of Scripture pertaining to this dispensation is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of a Messianic Kingdom, not merely in its covenanted and prophetic outlines but in its several details. Thus e.g. if the covenanted Kingdom really existed as many tell us, *how* can the church be exhibited, over against the prophetic delineations, in a position *equivalent* to widowhood, or, at least, separation from a beloved one, which mars happiness, Luke 5 : 33–35. This certainly finds no correspondence with the Messianic Kingdom as given in the Old Test. Again : the Kingdom is to be revealed in "*the day of the Lord Jesus Christ*," but *after* the ascension of Jesus, the apostles did not see this day (so Jesus previously informed them, *Luke* 17 : 22), for they regarded it *as still future* (locating it with the Sec. Advent, as in 1 Cor. 7 : 8 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 2, 23 ; Phil. 1 : 6, 10, comp. with 2 : 16 and 3 : 20, 21, etc.). Now all this employing Jewish phraseology *without any indication of change of meaning*, can only be reconciled with *the postponement of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent*. The careful student of Scripture must have been arrested by this additional peculiarity, corroborative of our argument, that in many places (as e.g. 1 Cor. 1 : 7, 8, etc.) the apostles rapidly pass from the present to the Advent, the intervening period being not worthy to be compared, owing to the absence of the King and Kingdom, to what transpires at the Messiah's return ; or, in other words, the distinguishing characteristics of a purely Messianic nature are attributed *to the Sec. Coming*, and the period intervening being *merely preparatory*, is passed by. If the predicted Messianic times, the Millennial glory, are to precede (as many declare) the Sec. Advent, could such a style of writing be adopted *without dishonoring* the predictions of God and the things of the Messiah? Our argument finds this distinguishing feature *in harmony* with all the utterances of the Spirit, and regards it as *a necessary sequence of the postponement*.

Surely the student requires no apology at the length, and the details, of our argument. The *fundamental* nature of the subjects considered, and their influence in forming a correct view, are a sufficient justification. The illustrations of diverging opinions, may be regarded as numerous, but the student will find them valuable, because they serve to show—frequently in the very words of their supporters—the line of reasoning by which they are sustained, and then the defectiveness of the same is either pointed out in the text or note. We give considerable space to this early history, and we feel excused in so doing, when our opponents concede that its close study is *most weighty*. Thus e.g. Pressense (*The Early Years of Christianity*, in Pref.) well remarks: "Of all the topics of the day, none is of *graver importance* than the early history of Christianity, and the foundation of the Church. Everything points inquiry in this direction," etc.

Obs. 13. That our Proposition is true appears from the immediate result of their preaching. The early church, the Apostolic Fathers, all that were nearest to the apostles and the Elders, *knew* of no established Kingdom but *looked for one to come at the Advent of Jesus*. This is evidenced by the intensely Chiliastic position of the Primitive Church. *How* can the reader account for this, unless our view of the Kingdom is the correct one. When the apostles, and their co-laborers, "*preached the things concerning the Kingdom of God*," "*preached the Kingdom of God*," how does it happen that *the only doctrine* of the Kingdom, East and West, in the churches under their supervision (comp. Props. 73–77), is the one that we advocate? *Is this merely accidental?* Can a single writer be quoted who lived in the First, and Second, and part of the Third, centuries, and who proclaimed *the modern view* of the Kingdom, now so generally entertained? Let men in answer to this, take refuge in the development theory, in accommodation, in transition, in substituted revelation, etc., but all such subterfuges prove unsatisfactory, at the same time invalidating the credibility of inspired teachers under whose *personal* supervision and instruction such a doctrine was allowed to prevail.

Men who lack the scholarly attainments of Neander, Bush, etc. (and hence cannot make the concessions and admissions of such men) endeavor to bring discredit upon our doctrine by linking it with heresy (as coming from Cerinthus, or Jewish converts), but aside then from the impossibility of tracing the Church excepting through "heretics," these professed critics conveniently overlook the historical fact (so Neander, etc.), that Millenarians were among the stoutest opposers of Cerinthus and the gross Judaizing (in reference to the law) tendency; they forget that not only Christian Churches composed of Jews but also those among the Gentiles, *equally held* to our doctrine; and that the writers on all sides claimed that they received the doctrine both from the Scriptures and the recent traditionary testimony of the apostles and elders. (Comp. the succeeding Props.)

Recent works frankly acknowledge our statements, and endeavor, in view of their uncontroverted existence, to show that the Scriptures themselves are unreliable, and that apostolic authority is not so great as has been deemed. Thus e.g. Desprez (*John, or the Apoc. of the New Test.*) when speaking of "the Gospel of the Kingdom" (in the chapter on this subject) holds that the view we have thus far presented *was taught* by Jesus and the disciples, that it *was perpetuated* in the church, etc., giving the proof of the facts as stated. Thus far Desprez is certainly correct, but alas! he only leaves *a part* of the Divine Record to testify;—for seeing that these expectations were not realized, he hastily jumps to the conclusion that they are unavailing and utterly unreliable, forgetting that Jesus, the apostles, and the Apostolic Fathers, *all unite* in asserting the postponement of this Kingdom to the Sec. Advent (and for good, substantial reasons). This procedure destroys the reliability, the integrity of Scripture. This stumbling-block of a "speedy Advent," its "nearness," etc., forces Desprez to look at the subject with human eyes and weakness, overlooking that when the Spirit speaks, in the measuring of time according to His own vastness of conception, that a period necessarily long to man, when contrasted with the briefness of his own life and generations, is but brief—"a moment"—with the Infinite.

Obs. 14. Others, seeing how this Kingdom is united with the Sec. Coming of Jesus, and unable to find consistently the establishment of the Kingdom under the preaching of the disciples, and yet, with their theory of a Kingdom, compelled to have some kind of a Kingdom in actual existence during this dispensation—resort to the most arbitrary spiritualistic interpretation to locate the Sec. Advent *in the past* so that a resultant Kingdom may logically be connected with it. This will be fully answered as we proceed in the argument.

An illustration or two must suffice: The Antinomian Perfectionists in their Articles of Faith (quoted *Oberlin Review*, May, 1847, make in Art. 28 Christ's Sec. Coming to occur at the destruction of Jerusalem, and in Art. 2, they say: "We believe that, at the period of the Sec. Coming of Christ, Christianity or the Kingdom of heaven, properly began." The Swedenborgians claim that the Sec. Advent took place in Swedenborg's time, and hence engraft upon it their distinctive "New Jerusalem" theory, which includes the grand characteristics of the blessed Messianic Kingdom. Other writers locate this Sec. Advent at His resurrection or on the day of Pentecost, forgetting that after these days the apostles continued to speak of it as future. The most repulsive view is that of making the coming of Titus and the Romans to represent the blessed Advent of Jesus—although some eminent writers have endorsed it—since in the prophecy of Jesus relating to this event, He discriminates between the destruction of Jerusalem and His own Advent. None of the Primitive Church, after Jerusalem was destroyed, for a moment made such *an unwarranted* application; their knowledge of covenant and prophecy prevented such a prostitution of "*the blessed hope.*" As we shall have occasion to refer to this Sec. Advent at length, it is sufficient now to remark: that as such theories also set aside the oath-bound covenants and the prophecies based on them (in their plain grammatical sense), giving them a spiritualistic or mystical dress foreign to their *real* import, they become, by this very process of transmutation and substitution, unworthy of our credence. Such a state of things as followed the destruction of Jerusalem, or the establishment of the Christian Church, and has existed down to the present day, *is not, cannot be* the covenanted, predicted Kingdom of the Old Test., because there is *no real* correspondence between the former and the latter. Men may pretend to such an agreement, but it is *forced and unnatural;* it is done at the expense of the grammatical word and by forcing upon it a sense that the laws of language do not admit.

PROPOSITION 71. *The language of the Apostles confirmed the Jews in their Messianic hopes of the Kingdom.*

This is seen (1) from their employing the Jewish phraseology used to designate the Messianic times; (2) from their applying these to the future advent of Jesus, and urging their hearers to expect that such a Coming will fulfil the prophets; (3) from the fact that the Christianized Jews, in their respective congregations, held *both* to this Sec. Advent (having received Jesus as the Messiah), and to the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom at the second appearing of Jesus.

Obs. 1. This is admitted by the ablest writers, not only infidels[1] but by such men as Neander. It is corroborated by the church history of the earliest period, informing us, *without any dissent*, that, so far as known, all the Jewish believers held precisely the views that we are defending. Before we can permit our doctrine to fall even under unjust suspicion, it would be well if our opponents would *candidly* consider this historical fact, and ask themselves a few questions suggested by it. How does it come that under *the direct, personal preaching of the apostles* such views of the Kingdom were entertained, unless it resulted from *the manner* of teaching? How does it come that such opinions were *so generally received under apostolic nurture*, that the modern views and ideas are *not found* even stated? If these people were in error on so important a point, was it *not* the duty of the apostles and the Elders *to enlighten* them—to leave, at least, *a protest* against it on record? Is it reasonable, that churches under the direct pastoral care of *inspired men* should be so wholly given up *to alleged* grave error? These, and similar questions, ought to be considerately answered before these early Christians are branded as "gross" and "carnal" errorists. If the idea of the Kingdom now generally entertained, is the correct one, it certainly is exceedingly strange, *utterly inexplicable*, that it was not *then introduced*, and that it required *uninspired men* to produce it. If the early church was in error on *so leading and fundamental* a doctrine, then the teachers of the same *are justly chargeable* with both introducing and continuing this error, for instead of contradicting the Jewish views of the people, the apostles use *the very words and phrases most eminently calculated to confirm the Jewish belief*. This is seen in employing, as e.g. "the times of restitution," "the world to come," "redemption," "salvation," "the age to come," "the day of the Lord," "the day of Christ," etc., and without any indicated change of meaning apply them to the Sec. Advent of Jesus, who is the Messiah. *This application naturally and logically* led the Jewish believers to fix their fond expectations of the Kingdom upon *the Sec. Coming*, and not on the First. In this, as we have shown in preceding Propositions, they only *legitimately* followed *the divine*

teaching of Jesus Himself, who declared that His Kingdom was postponed (e.g. Prop. 66, 58, etc.) to the time of His Coming again. Our opponents have either failed in accounting for this feature, or in attempting it have only succeeded in lowering the standing of the apostles as teachers. Our position enforces *no necessity* for abject apologizing, because of such a belief in the early church, induced by the instruction received. We cordially accept of it as *highly indicative* of the truth—nay, as *its essential sequence, the truth itself*. It is the identical faith, *enforced* by covenant and prophecy, by the preaching of John, Jesus, disciples, and apostles, which, above all others, we should find in the Primitive Church.[1]

[1] The most ultra of the unbelievers pronounce the whole matter an imposture. Many proofs of this might be given, but a single example will suffice. In the *Religio-Philosophical Journal* of Chicago, Jan. 17th, 1874, is a work advertised (also published in this Journal's house), in which the author Jones (a "Religio-Philosophicalist") assumes that he has carefully examined and compared together the New Test. and Josephus, and presents us with the following sage conclusion: "that Christ and His Apostles were gross impostors; that Josephus and St. Paul were no one else but Christ Himself, after He had risen from the dead, still had never been dead," etc. Such nauseating matter is styled "criticism"; when it is simply the ravings of the lowest form of the fanaticism of error,—the outpourings of a depraved heart,—and worthy only of contempt from the better class of unbelievers.

[2] Many writers have noticed this peculiar usage of Jewish phraseology and that the phrases "end of the age," "last days," "last times," etc., were regarded by the Jews as the period just previous to and immediate to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. The apostles continue their use, referring them to the still future, including this dispensation, so that in their estimation these times could not possibly include an existing covenanted Kingdom, as e.g. in Heb. 1 : 2 etc. Comp. Olshausen's *Com.*, vol. 2, p. 229, who quotes Acts 2 : 17 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 20 and 1 : 5 ; John 6 : 39, 40 ; 1 John 2 : 18 ; Rom. 2 : 5 ; Rev. 6 : 17, and 9 : 18, saying this corresponds with the Old Test. expressions; Gen. 49 : 1 ; Isa. 2 : 2 ; Mic. 4 : 1 ; Dan. 12 : 13, and 8 : 17, and 9 : 40, which again answers to "the end," Matt. 24 : 6, 14. (Comp. Props. 86, 87, 89, 137, 138, 140, etc.) Redemption was always united in the Jewish mind with the coming and Kingdom of the Messiah, and so it continued, and as Calvin (*Inst.*, ch. 25, sec. 2), observes, the Sec. Advent itself, in view of the results, is called "*our Redemption.*" The unbelieving Jews themselves continued to employ this phraseology. Thus e.g. R. Akiba (Milman's *His. Jews*, vol. 3, p. 100), when supporting the pretensions of the false Messiah, Barchocab, said of him: "Behold the Star that is to come out of Jacob; the days of Redemption are at hand." So also (p. 214, vol. 3), the Karaite belief, in Art. 10, speaks of "a coming Redemption through the Messiah, the Son of David." A multitude of illustrations might be given, but these are sufficient to indicate how deeply these words and phrases were engrafted into the Jewish mind.

Obs. 2. After such appeals as Paul makes (Acts 26 : 6, 7, 8) to the Jewish hope (Prop. 182); after linking the Jewish "Rest" with the Coming Messiah (Prop. 143); after uniting the Jewish view of Judgeship and Judgment with the Second Advent of Jesus (Props. 132, 133, and 134); after making the Millennial glory dependent upon the future Advent (Props. 120 and 121); after joining the restoration of the Jewish nation with Christ's return (Props. 111, 112, 113, 114); after endorsing and enforcing the Jewish first resurrection as preceding the glorious Messianic times (Props. 125–129); *after all these*, and similar points of union, it is difficult to see how men and women with Jewish views, holding *tenaciously to covenant and prophecy*, could possibly understand the apostles *in any other sense* than a Jewish or Chiliastic one. Let the reader consider that this agreement is found not merely in one or two things but runs through a great variety, even embracing all the distinguishing peculiarities of a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom under the Messiah.

Fairbairn, and others, assume that right after the resurrection (which they cannot reconcile with their own interpretation of Matt. 11 : 12), Jesus ruled as the predicted King in the covenanted Kingdom. We, on the other hand, hold that (discriminating the Divine Sovereignty, see Props. 79 and 80), the resurrection of Christ is preparative, qualifying the Son of Man for that predicted rule ; and to prove that His Theocratic reign, as covenanted, does not immediately follow the resurrection and ascension (however exalted David's Son may be), but is connected with a return (as the apostles testify), it is only necessary to turn to Paul's statement, Acts 17 : 31, "*God hath appointed a day*" (Prop. 133) "*in which He will judge*" (taking the Scriptural idea of Judge,—see Prop. 133), "*the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained ; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead.*" The resurrection gives *the pledge* that that period will most assuredly arrive, while our opponents themselves admit that the time of this manifestation is future. The careful student will notice that the credit of being "*the Christ,*" is dependent upon His having risen from the dead; and hence after the confession of Peter He charged His disciples to tell no man that He was the Christ (joining Mark 9 : 9, which gave an illustration of the Christship) "till the Son of Man were risen from the dead." But the meaning of "Messiah" or "Christ" is utterly hostile to a purely spiritual reign in heaven, as we have already shown ; it being the express title of *the Theocratic King reigning over the restored Davidic throne and Kingdom.* Thus the Jews and early Christians understood it, and such continues its meaning. His exaltation only increases *the assurance* that He "*the Christ*" will ultimately be *manifested as such* in power and great glory. If all this were to be changed, as Fairbairn, etc. suppose, then when the subject was up before the Jews (as e.g. Acts 17 : 3) Paul and the other apostles ought to have corrected the Jewish conceptions of the Christship of Jesus. We (1 Thess. 1 : 10) "*wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.*"

Obs. 3. The language of the apostles is in *such harmony* with the views of the Jews respecting the Messianic Kingdom, that our opponents, instead of giving any explicit passages, are driven *to infer* an existing Kingdom ; and this very *illogical* inference, as we have repeatedly shown, involves them in numerous inconsistencies and contraditions. Aside from the singularity of a Kingdom, specially covenanted and predicted, being set up (as alleged by our opposers) and this so loosely left to inference (so that they disagree both concerning its meaning and the time of establishment), it is *incredible* for this to have transpired *without being directly* asserted and the fact becoming *well known* to the hearers of the apostles. A Kingdom set up, and yet the church, for several centuries remain *unconscious* of the matter ! Men may charge us with credulity, but such a view *far exceeds* our power of belief, seeing that covenant and prophecy describe its establishment as a thing so open, so notable, so visible to all, that no one *can possibly mistake* its existence. How can Fairbairn and others, who so modernize Peter's two sermons, account for the belief of the very churches to which Peter preached ; a faith which constantly looked for a kingdom still future and one that should bear the significant and unmistakable marks of covenant and prophetic promise.

Those inferences, therefore, however plausible they may be, had either no existence or no force among the earliest converts, being regarded as illegitimate, opposed to the Old Test. delineation of the Kingdom. Men, in apparent triumph, may now tell us that this arises from their Jewish prejudices ;—let it be so then, if such are grounded in covenant and prophecy, preserve the unity of the Scripture, and preserve for us *the true doctrine* of the Kingdom. Having previously referred to inferences, it may be added :—we are not opposed to inferential or deductive interpretation (if properly and lawfully conducted), seeing that notable examples (as e.g. 1 Cor. 15 : 27 ; Matt. 22 : 31, 32, etc.) are given in Scriptures, and all works on Bib. Interp. endorse them, but attention is directed to this matter for several reasons. It is simply incredible that the establishment of a Kingdom, covenanted, etc., can be left to inference. Again : multitudes speak of the modern view as so self-evident, that the impression is made as if it were the

subject of *direct* affirmation. The passages assumed to infer it will come up in regular review hereafter. Again: some writers (as e.g. Jones, *Sober Views of the Mill.*, p. 26) turn around and, to cover up their own defects in this direction, charge our system of faith with being built on inferences and deductions, and then, to make it odious, declare that nothing can be an object of faith that is *not plainly* revealed in the Word of God, for otherwise we are "building on the sand and not on the rock of truth." Without entertaining such a wholesale prejudice against inferences (for they are valuable in their place), it may be consistently said: that when we produce *the plain grammatical sense*—one that all admit exists in the Word,—we are *not justly* chargeable with inference; when the literal import of covenant, prophecy, preaching, etc. is sustained against another inferred and engrafted sense (given by men uninspired), ought not the former have precedence over the latter? The reader will be abundantly able to judge from what follows, which party—for all the Scripture relating to the subject used by writers on both sides of the question will be brought forward—is the most liable to the charge of founding the doctrine on inference.

Obs. 4. The apostles, in their writings, constantly speak of the Kingdom as something that was well understood and fully comprehended as to meaning. Nowhere do we find the modern explanation and definition given to it; and, according to our argument, being covenanted and fully described by the prophets, *it needed no such additions*, being already clearly apprehended. If the Kingdom had been some entire new thing (as some assert), or if it was to be in a form different from that described in the literal language of the Old Test., *then*, if the apostles became conscious of such a change on the day of Pentecost and afterward, one of two things ought to have been done by them. They, if honest and capable instructors, ought to have told, especially to the Jews, that the covenant with David as they (the hearers) understood it *could not be realized*, or, that the language was *to be understood differently* in a spiritual or mystical sense, or, that *another and materially different* Kingdom (a spiritual one, or, the church as one) was now established thus fulfilling covenant promise—using just such language as modern (if correct) writers employ on the subject. How could they leave their thousands of hearers without giving them (if in error on so great a point) some definite explanation of this kingdom if it *varied so greatly*, as learned men make it, *from "Jewish conceptions."* The truth is that it required *no such explanations*, for the apostles were addressing persons to whom the Old Test. was familiar, to whom the covenants and Kingdom were well known; and hence they labored to show that this Jesus was the Messiah, that at His Sec. Coming the predicted restitution and Kingdom would appear, and that to secure entrance into that Kingdom repentance and faith in that Coming Christ were indispensable.

The critical student will here find one of the chief causes of the early rapid growth of Christianity. Consider the excessive prejudices of the Jewish mind in favor of covenant and prophecy as they pertained to their favorite Messianic expectations, and then *how* can we reconcile such a sudden revulsion of view and feeling in the many Jewish believers, unless there be, as we have shown, certain points—*fundamental*—of contact and union? Imagine the modern theories of the Kingdom *then* preached, and what would have been the result? Certainly a controversy as to the meaning of the Messianic Kingdom, etc. Bauer, and others, think that the immediate conversion of three, and more, thousands is so enormous that it must be mythical, but the Messianic idea and fulfilment applied to Jesus at His Second Coming explains the leverage possessed by the apostles,—the truth being enforced through the power and evidences of the Spirit.

PROPOSITION 72. *The doctrine of the Kingdom, as preached by the apostles, was received by the early churches.*

This is not only reasonable, but shown to be *a fact*, from the apostles having no occasion during their entire ministry to censure any orthodox believers or churches for misapprehending, or holding to a false view of, the Kingdom. The decided and convincing impression is made by the apostolic writings that these first Christian churches were *not ignorant of—but correctly understood—the important and cardinal subject of the Kingdom.*

So decisive is this, that leading Apologists, like Neander, take refuge under the development theory, obtaining the true doctrine in the advancing and growing "consciousness of the Church." Forced to admit our historical position, they endeavor—sacrificing the apostles and elders—to secure their own view of the Kingdom under the plea of an after-Churchly development. Those persons, especially, who desire to be esteemed *so Churchly and so precise*, in their orthodoxy, ought to give this subject a careful investigation in accordance with their professed principles,—but even when asked, their reply may be that of *Jer.* 6 : 16. We append one or two testimonies (comp. Props. 75, 76, and 77 for more) in reference to the prevailing belief. Ebrard (Herzog's *Real Ency.*, vol. 10, p. 579) says: "The apostolic tradition (so say Hase and others correctly) was *so decided, that Chiliasm was the ruling belief* in the first three centuries of the church. . . . The Commentary of Theophilus (Hagenbach's silent witness) is lost, but the belief in *Christ's Coming to establish His Kingdom* on earth in glory formed the essential object and anchor of their hope. They recognized the World-Power as one in the service of Satan, and they looked for no deliverance from it *save* by His Coming." Semisch (Herzog's *R. Ency.*, vol. 1, p. 658) remarks: "Before the end of the first century, Chiliasm was *the common belief* in the Church that had been gathered from the heathen." He then states, in detail, how all the writers on the subject down to Jerome were express Chiliasts, excepting Origen and his school. Our argument, if Scripturally founded, ought—as a logical result—to find the early Church in this identical doctrinal position. The prevailing Church belief is asserted by works having no sympathy with our views, as e.g. Appletons' *New. Amer. Cyclop.*, Chambers's *Cyclop.*, and many others.

Obs. 1. Let the student candidly consult the faith of the early churches and see for himself what it was, viz.: that the intimations of Scripture, the statements of the Fathers, the concessions of Neander, Mosheim, and a host of others, and, in brief, *all* that we have on record of that period, *conclusively proves* that the doctrine held, *both* in Jewish and Gentile regions, was at first (during the First, Second, and greater part of the Third, Century,) that which we have defended. This feature, so noticeable in the Jews under the prophets, under Jesus, and under the Apostles, and thus *continuously perpetuated*, led Auberlen (*Proph. Dan.*, p. 372) to pertinently remark, that Jesus, and the Prophets and Apostles, were "*Chiliasts.*" The early Church in its entire range was *Chiliastic*, and eagerly looked, longed, and prayed for *the expected Kingdom still future.* Enemies and friends, historians and theologians, frankly acknowledge this *distinguishing characteristic* of that period.

Thus e.g. Gibbon's statements (*Decl. and Fall Rom. Emp.*, ch. 15), Carrodi's *His. of Chiliasm* (pronounced even by Prof. Stuart as uncandid), Whitby's *Treat. on Mill.*, Bush's *Treat. on Mill.*, the *Church Histories* of Neander, Mosheim, Kurtz, etc., the Art. "*Chiliasm*" in Herzog's *Encyclop.* (by Semisch), or Art. *Millennium* in Kitto's Ency., Lardner's *Credibility*, Rees', Appletons', and other *Encyclopædias*, Chillingworth's *Argument* drawn from the Doctrine of the Millenaries, against Papal Infallibility, Hagenbach's *His. of Doctrines*, Greswell's *Exposition of the Parables*, Bickersteth *On Proph.*, Brooks's *El. Proph. Interp.*, Seiss's *Last Times*, Shimeall's *Reply to Shedd*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, Brookes's *Maranatha*, Ebaugh's brief history in Rupp's *Orig. His. of Relig. Denominations*, works on the Apocalypse, and commentaries on the same, as Prof. Stuart's, Spaulding, Winchester, etc., Millenarian writers, as Duffield, Begg, Bonar, Cunningham, Mede, Bh. Henshaw, etc. Thus presenting unbelievers, opposers, critics, historians, commentators, and believers, uniting in the same testimony. We here assert that *no writer* has yet been able to present the prevailing modern views *as entertained* by any writer of the Primitive church; no statement quoted, *giving the writing*, is to be found anywhere. Dr. Bonar (*Proph. Landmarks*) has well said: "As to the history of our doctrines, the conclusions to which all inquiries upon this subject have come is, that during the three first centuries *it prevailed universally*, its only opponents being the Gnostics. This is now *an ascertained historical fact*, which we may well ask our opponents *to account for*, as it presupposes *that Chiliasm was an article of the Apostolic Creed.*" Chillingworth's testimony (*Works*, vol. 3, p. 369) is that it was "*held true and Catholic*," "and by none of their contemporaries *condemned*," "being grounded upon evident Scripture," etc. Hagenbach (*His. of Doctrines*), after quoting Justin's declaration that it was the general faith of all orthodox Christians, gives the following, in italics, from Giesler's Ch. History: "In all the works of this period (the first two centuries) Millenarianism is *so prominent*, we cannot hesitate to consider it *as universal* in an age when such sensuous motives were certainly not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity." We are only now concerned with the historical fact, Giesler's explanation appended for its existence is *not* history, but his individual (mistaken) opinion. Bh. Russell (*Discourse on the Mill.*, p. 236) says: "There is good ground for the assertion of Mede, Dodwell, Burnet, and writers on the same side, that down to the beginning of the fourth century the belief (in Christ's return and personal reign on earth) *was universal and undisputed.*" Other testimonies will be quoted as we proceed.

Obs. 2. Men, who would gladly blot this evidence out of existence as being adverse to their notions of propriety and of the Kingdom, still candidly, impelled by the overwhelming testimony, admit the fact, that the Primitive Church, generally, if not universally, held our views.

Thus e.g. Bush (*On Mill.*, p. 20, etc.) admits the prevalence of Chiliasm, "that during the first three centuries *it was very extensively embraced.*" and then quotes approvingly Chillingworth, "that Chillingworth prefers it as a serious charge against the Church of Rome, which lays such lofty claims to the perpetuation within her own bosom of the pure, unadulterated doctrines of the apostolic and primitive ages, that in this matter, if in no other, she has grossly falsified the creed of antiquity, inasmuch as there is ample evidence that the doctrine of the Chiliasts *was actually the Catholic faith* of more than one century; and certainly there are few judges more competent to pronounce upon the fact." While Prof. Bush acknowledges the extent of belief, he thinks that it was thus allowed to prevail because it produced at that time better results than "even a more correct construction of the sacred oracles" could effect;—thus agreeing with Gibbon in his estimate of its transient merits, making *error* for the time better adapted to secure the prosperity of the church than truth! On p. 26 he also remarks: "During the first ages of the church, when the style of Christianity was to believe, to love, and to suffer, this sentiment seems to have obtained *a prevalence so general as to be properly entitled all but absolutely Catholic*," etc. He then refers to the gradual change wrought through Origen, Augustine, Jerome, etc., and the Constantinian era. Dr. Alger (*Crit. His. Doc. Fut. Life*, p. 319) fully believes that the Evangelists and early Christians understood Christ to teach a literal personal Sec. Advent, etc., but he doubts whether Jesus really meant to be thus understood. He endeavors to rid himself of the early views by spiritualizing, and a course of reasoning reflecting most deeply upon the ignorance of persons specially appointed to preach the truth. Pressense (*The Early Days of Christianity*, p. 46) says: "If there is full evidence that they (the apostles)

declared the truth of Christ in all its essentials, the evidence seems to us *no less clear* that they still enveloped that truth in Jewish forms." Which are we to credit, then: "the Jewish forms" or Pressense's developed "germ" out of this "husk"? Who is to distinguish between "the kernel" and the alleged "rind"? What idea does this give us of apostolic intelligence? We only now say, so extended and plain is this testimony given by opponents, that some of the latter endeavor to conceal it from their readers, lest it should exert an influence in our favor. Some even (as Dr. Macdill in the "Instructor," 1879) resort to the ruse of quoting the unfavorable opinions *as to our doctrine* given by various opponents;—just as if denunciation was argument and met the historical question. The nature of the doctrine, etc., will come up, as we proceed, and the denunciations be fully met. Of course, the intelligent reader will discriminate between the historical fact of the extension of our belief as given by opponents (as e.g. Neander, Mosheim, etc.), and their individually expressed opinions as to its Scripturalness, origin, etc. The one is history, the other is personal matter.

Obs. 3. The Primitive Church,—receiving this faith under the guidance of Apostles, and Elders consecrated by apostolic hands, giving us the names of Apostles and Elders as expressly teaching it,[1] appealing more or less to Scripture and to their predecessors in the same belief,—cannot have its doctrine, so fundamental, in this matter set aside and superseded without placing it, and its instructors, in a very dubious and unenviable light.[2]

[1] Thus Papias says: "If I met a brother who had known the Apostles, I asked him carefully what they had said; *what Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew had said.* I thought I could gather more from a living testimony than from books." Again he remarks (quoted by Brooks, *El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 37): "That what he relates *are the very words of the elders*, Andrew, Peter, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, Aristio, and John the Presbyter, as related to him by those of whom he constantly made the inquiry," and pledges himself to the "truth and fidelity of what he reports." Papias is said (by Irenæus) to have been one of John's hearers, and he was intimate with Polycarp. Is it credible that in so vital a matter as the Kingdom, when the gospel itself was "the gospel of the Kingdom," the Fathers nearest to the apostles could have been mistaken? If so, what assurance have we that they not also misapprehended all other points? Justin Martyr also appeals to "a certain man among us, whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ." The reader may consult lists of Millenarian Fathers given in Brooks's *El. Proph. Interp.*, Seiss's *Last Times*, etc. They include—with the reasons given—Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Melito, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, ranging from A.D. 70 to about A.D. 192. Such Fathers as Lactantius, Methodius, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Paulinus, Victorinus, Apollinaris, and others, follow these. In reference to our use of Barnabas (for critics are divided, see e.g. Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 64, and Arts. in Encyclops., respecting the author; although since the Greek has been discovered by Tischendorf, many indorse the work as that of Barnabas), it may be said, whatever its merit, etc., that it can be legitimately quoted as one of the earliest of Christian writings, and fully indicative of the views *then* held. More than this: no one can censure us for such a use, when (Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 86) Anti-Millenarians, as Clement and Origen, who did so much to obscure our doctrine, quoted the Epistle as "in equal esteem with the Scriptures."

[2] Those who make light of this primitive faith cannot help feeling the sarcastic remarks of Gibbon (ch. 15, *Decl. and Fall*), or cannot avoid, *logically*, the conclusions of Desprez (*John*), and of a multitude of unbelievers. It is simply impossible *to account for* the belief without lowering the credibility and authority of the first teachers of the church, unless we accept of it *as legitimate* and the natural outgrowth of a correct teaching. The lowest form of attack in meeting our views is to stab these Fathers, charging them with unreliability, credulity, superstition, etc. This manner of procedure is as old as Eusebius and Jerome. Just as Eusebius e.g. makes out Papias illiterate and weak when referring to his Millenarian sentiments, and yet receives him (B. 3 : 32) as "eloquent and learned in the Scriptures" on other points, so e.g. Prof. Stuart (*Com. Apoc.*), in his estimate of the early Fathers, underrates them on Millenarian grounds—being in their theological views so vitally different from his own—and yet often quotes them, with evident relish and *forgetfulness* of his estimate, when they happen to be *in agreement* with himself. So with Channing (Remarks on Milton, *Works*, p. 189), Le

Clero (*Bib.* 25 : 289), and others, who represent them as just emerging from darkness into light, and hence abounding in childish credulity, etc.

The chief point alleged as evidence of the weakness of Papias and Irenæus (and which brought forth the scoffing of Whitby, Middleton, Stuart, Macdill, and others) is the oft-quoted "grape story" (referring to the astounding fruitfulness of the vine, etc.). But let the reader consider that Papias' writings being lost, and Irenæus' being in a translation (the Greek also lost), it is impossible to correct or substantiate the exact language originally used (comp. candid remarks of Brooks, *El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 56, and Farrar's—*Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 320, foot-note—allusion to and explanation of the same, as well as Greswell *On the Parables*, vol. 1, p. 296). It may be a hyperbole like that of John 21 : 25 in reference to the predicted productiveness of the earth during the Mill. era, to which others have added, under the impression of heightening the effect. It may be even error, for in the details—and as given from hearsay and reported as such, exaggeration may have found scope—the best of men may fall into mistake. But this does *not* invalidate the leading, fundamental doctrine ; it really confirms it, seeing that, under the influence of such a doctrine and its related restitution to Paradisiacal fruitfulness, such statements are engrafted upon it.* Those who reject Papias and Irenæus on the ground of exaggeration, ought then in consistency to reject Origen and many of the other side following, who have been guilty of far greater extravagances in doctrinal statements. Indeed, the writer feels that, while rejecting the story in its present form, or regarding it as hyperbolical, it requires far more credulity to receive some of the statements of the defamers of these Fathers (as e.g. Eusebius' "New Jerusalem," equivalent to Rome, Prof. Stuart's "Neroic Theory," Whitby's "New Hypothesis," etc.) than to accept of these utterances attributed to them. To be witty at the expense of some advocate, or to find some believer extravagant in view, does not, by any means, disprove our doctrine.

Another disreputable mode of procedure to lower the Fathers in the estimation of others or to make them contradictory, is (1) to interpolate or omit, (2) to ascribe to them what they never said, (3) and to ascribe to them some heretical sentiments. In reference to the first, Brooks shows (*El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 52, 53) that in printed copies of Justin the word "not" was omitted in the sentence which expressly asserts that those who are not following the pure doctrine—who are the unorthodox—reject the Chiliastic view.† Popish influence, no doubt, appears in this omission (see another suppression mentioned, p. 54). Bh. Newton (vol. 2, p. 370) has shown that Dr. Middleton (*Inquiry*, p. 26) in quoting Justin Martyr has interpolated the phrase "in the

---

* Comp. Dr. Neander's statement (*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 405–6) respecting spurious works and interpolations, making it difficult to obtain the exact views held. Various writers hold that this grape story is "a burlesque on the term thousand, written by some opponent of the doctrine in corrupting the text of Papias," and "doubtless much more of the 'fanciful and sensuous' has a similar origin, for Chillingworth says that 'imputing to them that which they held not' was one of the means of overbearing the Millenarian doctrine" (so e.g. Editor, *Proph. Times*, vol. 5, p. 194).

† The student who desires to investigate the controversy respecting the suppression of the word "not," will find in favor of its retention : Mede, *Works*, B. 3, P. 2, p. 533 ; Arch. Tillotson, *Works*, vol. 3, p. 380 ; Daille, *Use of the Fathers*, p. 289 ; Chillingworth's *Works*, p. 732 ; Muencher, *His. Ch. Doctrine*, vol. 2, p. 450, etc. Dr. Macdill refers to the following as favoring the suppression of the word "not :" Thirlby, Hagenbach, Neander (!), Shedd (!), Kelly (a Pre-Mill. !), Rossler, Semisch (!), Ed. of the Parisian Ed. ; to which we add Jebb. Dr. Morehead, in his reply to Dr. Macdill (in the Chicago U. P. Ch. paper, *The Instructor*, 1879), takes the former view. We only add the following : (1) That some MSS., according to Holmes (quoted by Brooks, *El. Proph. Inter.*, p. 54), contain the negative ; (2) that the word "not" makes Justin and Irenæus to be in correspondence ; (3) that the Parisian Editor finds the suppression an obscurity and irreconcilable with Irenæus (comp. Brooks, p. 54) ; (4) that many scholars, including our opponents, receive the negative *as essential* in order to make good sense ; (5) that the negative is supported by the general testimony respecting the generality of belief ; (6) that the omission of the word "not" does not affect the orthodoxy of view, for, while it then allows that Christians rejected Chiliasm, yet still it makes Justin say that all Christians exactly orthodox ("*right-minded in all things*") were Chiliasts ; (7) that to vindicate the orthodoxy of opposers, *the entire passage* (which we quote under Prop. 76) ought to have been suppressed.

enjoyment of all sensual pleasures," which Justin *never* employed. Even (so Brooks) the eulogy of Eusebius on Papias as a man "most eloquent and skilful in the Scriptures" is omitted in many copies, although found in the ancient. It would not answer to laud a Chiliast. (On the other hand, Brooks notices how an anti-Millenarian is praised by Dr. Maclaine in his translation of Mosheim's *Eccl. His.*, when he adds to Dionysius the words "learned and judicious" not found in the original.) It was not considered wrong to perpetrate (comp. *Mosheim*, vol. 1, p. 100, Middleton's *Inquiry*, p. 158, Madan's *Thelyphthora*, Pref., p. 12, etc.), for the truth's sake, "pious frauds." Beaven (*Account of Irenæus*, p. 240) says: "As the opinions of Irenæus on the Millennium are different from those which prevailed subsequently with almost universal consent in the Western Church, that portion of his Treatise is rarely found complete in our present MSS., the copyists not thinking it proper or worth their while to copy what was generally disapproved by the church. . . . The five last chapters of the fifth book are wanting in all but two MSS." Fortunately, too, this work was recovered and published to the world by Erasmus, and not by a Protestant or Millenarian. Mede (*Works*, p. 748) charges Jerome with being an "unequal relator of the opinions of his adversaries," and adds: "What credit he deserves in this instance may appear by some fragments of those authors still remaining, whom he charged with the opinion *directly contrary* to that which they expressly affirmed." It is a matter of amazement that such a writer as Fairbairn, on the poor authority of Jerome, asserts (*On Proph.*, p. 254) that the Fathers, without exception, "with one voice," including of course the Millenarians, rejected the notion of a Jewish territorial restoration. Let the reader turn to the quotations that we freely give from e.g. Barnabas, Irenæus, Justin, Tertullian, he will find *an ample refutation* of this statement. (The views of these Fathers respecting the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant and prophecy, the location of the Mill. age before the general judgment, etc., show the student *how they* understood this matter.) Some recent writers, without a particle of fairness and justice, repeat Jerome's charge—a false representation as shown by Mede, Lardner, and many others—against us (aimed especially at Tertullian), "that the saints shall, in the Millennium, have a great enjoyment *of carnal and corporeal pleasures*" (comp. Brooks, p. 59, who gives Tertullian's exact language, *which distinguishes between* the resurrected and glorified saints, and those persons who are spared—see Props. 152, 153, 154, etc.). To reiterate what is so *utterly unfounded* in fact, and which has *so frequently* been exposed as untrue, is evidence of enmity and a lack of desire for truth.*

But the lowest possible polemical trick is to endeavor to associate these Fathers *with heresy*, as Papias with ultra Judaism, Irenæus and Justin with Cerinthism, Tertullian with extravagant Montanism, and Lactantius with Manicheeism. We are not concerned in defending those men; able pens have triumphantly shown that *in no sense* have they been guilty of heresy but were *the opposers* of heresy. The reader is referred to the candid statements of Neander, Mede, Lardner, Brooks, Taylor, Lee, Semisch, Greswell, Dodgson, Mosheim, and a host of others. As to Cerinthus, admitting that he held all that is alleged (although it has often been noticed that the Mill. theory as presented to us does *not harmonize* with his other views, see e.g. Art. Cerinthus, *Ency. Brit.*, etc.), yet our opponents overlook the fact, that Cerinthus was strongly opposed and crushed *by Millenarians*. The assertion of the Ency. of Relig. Knowl., Art. Cerinthus, that "he is to be regarded as the first person who held the doctrine of a mundane Millennium," is *abundantly refuted* by the testimony of the ablest writers, church historians, etc., who assert (what needs no confirmation, since our argument fully develops it) that *the Jews* held to it, and that it was *perpetuated* in the Jewish-Christian church. It is said by Waterland, Michaelis, and others, that the Apostle John wrote against Cerinthus (as asserted by Irenæus and taken from Polycarp). Let this be as it may, John wrote at the time when he knew the doctrine of Cerinthus. Now, is it credible, if the doctrine of the Millennium is an error, that John in the Apoc. should employ the very ideas and language *to perpetuate it*, as seen in the church? Thus we see how, by such grave charges, men not only involve the early church in heresy, trace the church itself through heretical men, but make the apostles justly chargeable with its continuance. It

---

* It is to be regretted that Books of Reference contain such unfounded charges, as e.g. Rees' *Cyclop.*, which takes from Whitby (following Jerome) the misstatement that *the risen saints* "propagate their species," as the doctrine of the ancient Millenarians. Not *a particle of proof*, in the shape of a direct quotation from any of the Fathers, can be given to substantiate such an assertion. Surely, when this is lacking, simple honesty and justice demand the withdrawal of this mode of attack.

is a sad fact, that if many of the Apostolic and Primitive Fathers were now living, they could not, *with their views* of covenant and prophecy, be received as preachers in thousands of pulpits. In reference to Cerinthus, the student will do well to consider the temperate language of Mosheim (*Com. on the State of the Church*, etc.) respecting his doctrine, attributing much that is said of him to prejudice and hatred. For it must ever be borne in mind that what we know of Cerinthus (as holding Chiliasm) comes from the bitter adversaries of Millenarianism, while the Chiliastic opposers of Cerinthus never mention his holding so grossly to a carnal Millennium. Lardner (*Works*, vol. 2, p. 701) also thinks that Cerinthus is misrepresented in some things, and this is the opinion of Bh. Bull, Mede, and many others. Mansel (*Gnostic Heresies*, p. 114) says: "both Mosheim and Neander consider the accounts of the sensual Chiliasm of Cerinthus to be *misrepresentations*." The critical student can readily see *why* it is impossible to reconcile Chiliasm with his alleged views. Cerinthus, as all affirm, was a Gnostic, and his doctrine (as e.g. making Jesus in his humanity a transient vehicle or mere phantom, —which John opposed, although giving us Rev. 20 : 1–6) was utterly hostile to a Millenarian position. Hence Neander doubts the Chiliasm of Cerinthus as reported, simply because it would be antagonistic to his own system, and (*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 47) after giving in detail his doctrine, adds: "It may be a question, indeed, whether he entertained such gross and sensual notions of this Millennial Sabbath as Caius and Dionysius imputed to him; for such views would hardly be in keeping with his system as a whole. He spoke indeed of a wedding-feast—an image then commonly employed to signify the blessed union of the Messiah with his saints; but on such an image any one who was both unfamiliar with the figurative language of the East, and interpreted his language under the bias of unfriendly feelings, might easily put a wrong construction. Dionysius indeed says that, in speaking of festivals and sacrifices, he was only seeking to veil his own gross and sensual notions. But what warrant had he for such an assertion? If Cerinthus had really taught such a grossly sensual Chiliasm, there would be in this something so repugnant to the whole spirit of Gnosticism, and so strongly tending to the Jewish point of view, as to make it necessary for us to rank him with the Judaists, rather than with the Gnostics." As to Chiliasts, he says in relation e.g. to Justin (*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 423): "An antipathy to Gnosticism, and to the doctrines of Marcion, is strongly marked in both works; and with this feeling Chiliasm at that time readily sympathized." In other places he alludes to early Chiliasts being hostile to Gnosticism in all its forms. This is the candid statement of one who is no sympathizer with our doctrine, over against the repeated false misrepresentations of opponents at the present day, who, with delight, repeat the old oft-refuted statements respecting Cerinthus, but are very careful not to refer to such critical statements of scholars.

Obs. 4. This generally admitted view of the Kingdom entertained by the early churches, is supposed by many, especially at the present day, to form a decided objection to Christianity. Infidels exultingly parade it, endeavoring to take advantage of it to show that the teachers and members were alike fallible and ignorant men,—hence untrustworthy.[1] Christians endeavor to break its force by (1) denying its generality or asserting that but comparatively few held the belief[2] (2) by disconnecting the faith of the church from the teaching of the Apostles,[3] and (3) by ascribing it to a Jewish or heretical origin.[4] We, on the contrary, hold that, according to the truth, *it was impossible* for the first churches under the personal teaching and supervision of inspired men *to have any other faith* respecting the Kingdom than that which history ascribes to the first Christians. The belief of those churches is a *logical result, legitimate outgrowth* of previous teaching, and the only one that *harmonizes* with the most essential portion of God's Word, viz.: the Covenants.

[1] Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall Rom. Emp.*, ch. 15, p. 535), describing the Chiliastic view, and correctly noticing that "the ancient and popular doctrine of the Millennium was intimately connected with the Sec. Coming of Christ," finally remarks: "The assurance of such a Millennium was carefully inculcated *by a succession of fathers* from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, who conversed with the immediate disciples of the apostles, down to Lactantius,

who was preceptor to the son of Constantine." Our opponents in reply to Gibbon have very unfairly asserted that he was mistaken as *to the extent* in which it was held, when he adds: "Though it might not be universally received, it appears to have been *the reigning sentiment of orthodox believers*," etc. This has been repeated before and since, and the authorities given, which, to say the least, are uncontrovertible. The use made of it by Gibbon follows, that "The doctrine of Christ's reign upon earth was at first treated as a profound allegory, was considered by degrees as a doubtful and useless opinion, and was at length rejected as the absurd invention of heresy and fanaticism." Of course, the church and the truth suffer by such a comparison, for if the modern prevailing view is the correct one, *then* the Primitive Church was perpetuated by errorists and fanatics, or, if the Primitive Chiliastic position is one in accordance with the truth, *then* the modern rejection of it is a wide departure from the true landmarks. The student, unless he can show that Gibbon is mistaken (which none of his annotators have *ventured* to do), must in all candor consider this dilemma. The favorite tactics of many unbelievers is to contrast the modern prevailing view respecting the Messiah and His Kingdom with that of the apostolic and Primitive Church, point out the palpable discrepancies, and *then* deduce from it the conclusion, that the growing intelligence of the Church could not tolerate *the Jewish doctrine* which superstition and ignorance had perpetuated. Many works present this line of reasoning in order to disparage the founders of Christianity.

[1] Thus, to give an illustration out of a host: Lindsay (Art. Mill. in *Ency. Brit.*), in stating the belief of the early churches, says, in opposition to overwhelming testimony to the contrary: "the opinion does not seem *to have become general* in the church," and looking for proof in behalf of such a sweeping assertion, we are referred *to Origen* in these words: "Indeed, we are expressly informed by Origen that it was confined to 'those of the simpler sort,' and to such as, 'refusing the labor of intelligence, followed the superficial mode of literal interpretation.'" This is certainly uncandid, for we have here (1) nothing said of *the extent* of belief prevailing; (2) the testimony of an opponent, who in other places speaks well of Chiliasts; (3) the ebullition of feeling excited against opponents who would not receive Origen's spiritualistic and allegorical method of interpretation; (4) the virtual indorsement of Origen's system as "the labor of intelligence," over against that of his opponents; (5) and the allowing, through this indirect impeachment of folly and ignorance, that the Apostolic and Primitive Fathers holding Chiliasm, were, in comparison with Origen and his class, "the simpler sort," etc. (See for Origen, Prop. 76.) The only additional proof, also indirect, derived from Neander, is, that "the defensive attitude" assumed "by the advocates of the doctrine affords a strong presumption that it was not the doctrine of the church in general." This is *a mere begging* of the question, seeing (1) that the generality is based on the fact that for a long period the church Fathers, as far as known, *were express Millenarians;* (2) that this is *the direct* testimony of Justin, and is implied in the expression of others (as e.g. Irenæus conversing with others and gathering material from them, etc.); (3) that a difference of view among the orthodox believers is *never hinted at* as existing, as e.g. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, or Justin Martyr, in arguing and teaching enforce a unity of belief in the very manner of expression—as if the doctrine were general; (4) the upholding of the doctrine *so prominently* by the leading Apologists of Christianity (Justin) indicates its extent; (5) "the defensive attitude" is assumed, as Justin expressly asserts (not against orthodox), against "even those of that race of Christians who follow not godly and pure doctrine." Every tyro in church history well knows that Gnosticism, and other tendencies, opposed to our doctrine, were already working in the church and outside in the first century, and this abundantly accounts for the argumentative and defensive style adopted. More than this: it is explained by the simple fact that they thus better repressed the objections that Jews might allege against Christianity (comp. Prop. 193). Other illustrations will be given under Prop. 75, and we simply reproduce a challenge often made and repeated by the Editor of the *Prophetic Times* (vol. 1, p. 71): "We challenge our opponents to produce *the evidence* of the entertainment of anti-Millenarian views by any orthodox and acknowledged Christian teacher for the first two hundred years of our era." When this evidence *is produced* then Lindsay, Neander, and others may have something substantial to build upon; *until* it is produced we are slow to receive their statements. Hence such writers as Ueberweg (*His. of Philosophy*, vol. 1, p. 264, when referring to the early Patristic period) are most certainly incorrect, when they say: "There arose in Christianity, in opposition to the reality of the Kingdom of the world, the idea of a Kingdom of God founded on purity of heart. The expectation of the Messiah among the Jewish people was spiritualized," etc. Now the incontestable facts of history make this idea

of a Kingdom and this spiritualizing *a later development*—as we shall show—and Ueberweg and others take *the liberty* of transferring what belongs to a later period to an earlier one. Such works, of course, influence other minds to occupy a view unsupported by *historical fact*. A writer in the *Princeton Review* (Ap. 1851, p. 217), led on by *his zeal* against Millenarianism, remarks: "That the commission is to teach all nations without distinction that Christ is now King, that He occupies the throne of David, that the Kingdom is spiritual, that that Kingdom is the Church, that the agencies for preserving and enlarging it are purely moral and spiritual (except, of course, God's providential control of all things), and that it is to spread over the whole earth, *are truths which the Christian world has believed from the times of the apostles until now*." Indeed! we should like *to have the history for all this*, which thus loads the commission (see Prop. 175) with "truths" not contained in it. Such statements are not solely dictated by ignorance; other motives evidently prompt them, for we have a higher opinion of the historical knowledge of such opponents than to attribute the former to them.

[3] The critical student, desirous to secure truth, will notice *the lack of candor* in numerous Encyclopædias, Eccles. Histories, Dogmatics, etc., in tracing our doctrine. Thus e.g. reference as to its origin is made to a heretical source, the number of adherents are represented as insignificant as possible, etc., and not a single allusion is made to the doctrinal views of the apostles or disciples which they preached when sent out by Jesus, and which are admitted by all commentators and critics (in view of *Acts* 1 : 6, etc.) to have been intensely Jewish and *in full accord* with our doctrine. Let the mind, *unbiassed*, ponder Props. 43, 44, etc., and can a plausible reason be assigned *why* the views of disciples, under the personal instruction of Jesus, should be thus persistently ignored. Suppose even that they were in error, yet in *a historical account* of our doctrine, certainly such evidence ought not, in common justice, be omitted. But the uncandidness is manifested even to a greater extent. Killen (*Ancient Church*) professing to give (ch. 5, p. 445, etc.) "*The Doctrine of the Church*," during the first three centuries, *entirely ignores* the existence of our doctrine, although he can enter into details respecting trivial affairs—a sad defect in impartial history, evincing *prejudice* in the historian, and, may we add, *fear of the antiquity* of our views. In another place and connection (p. 369) he can, however, complacently reproduce Eusebius' disparaging remarks respecting Papias and Irenæus in connection with an allusion to our doctrine, without the slightest reference to other places where these Fathers are eulogized. The *design* is apparent. Others imbibe and exhibit, alas! the same unfairness, not realizing that they thus weaken their own ground and *strengthen* our position. We give another illustration: A writer in the *Princeton Review*, July, 1856, p. 541, tells us that Waldegrave has shown that after the Second Advent all the saints shall be transplanted into the third heaven, and that the only Kingdom to be realized is one eternal in the heavens above, and then adds: "Such is the clear, tried, *ancient Catholic holding of God's people, in all ages*, which is to be superseded by the sensuous imagery (Millenarianism) of an earthly Kingdom." The palpable *misstatement* of the first clause of the sentence is only equalled by the sneer levelled at God's own Purpose in the last one. Such wholesale affirmations can *only delude the ignorant*.

[4] Thus e.g. Milman in his notes on Gibbon can only say that (p. 533 and 535, footnotes) our doctrine is "purely Jewish" or "*a fable* of Jewish dotage." But this is no answer to Gibbon; it leaves the matter as it was before, without the least attempt to explain *how it comes* that churches, East and West, were for so long a time *intensely Jewish* in their views of the Kingdom (comp. Props. 68, 69, 76, etc.). Had the apostles and their immediate successors no power, if in error, to check, or at least to protest against, such a tendency? On the other hand, if derived from heresy, it only makes matters worse, for then *how is it possible to trace the pure orthodox Church*. If our opponents had only one, or two, or more, of the very early Fathers to sustain their position, *then, and only then*, might they frame something like a logical argument favoring such a derivation. But such writers are *not to be found* in the first and second centuries, and even in the third they are few in number. So, again, Dr. Lindsay (Art. "Mill." in *Encyclop. Brit.*) admits and argues (although leaving out the Scriptural basis of the covenant) *the Jewish origin* of our doctrine; that it was held from "comparatively *an early age*," etc.; and then, coming to the Christian Church, remarks: "From the Jews this notion of a personal reign of the Messiah with His saints on earth, was adopted *by several* in the early church, by whom the passage in the Apoc., above referred to, was confidently quoted in support of this opinion." What shall we say (1) to the *unfair* method of making the impression by the word "several" as if but a few, *very few*, entertained our view, over against Justin's *direct assertion that all that were orthodox* held to it; (2) and to the one-sidedness of the whole article, endeavoring to

indicate that our doctrine was obtained from Jewish sources *outside of the Scriptures*, and from a rigid literal interpretation of *one portion* of the Apoc. Why, in all candor and justice, does he not allow, e.g. Barnabas or Irenæus or Justin to give *the covenant and the prophecies* upon which they base their views? Is it right to ignore the express testimony of Scripture, which these and other worthies *allege* in behalf of their doctrinal position? (Comp., for Jewish belief before and at the First Advent, p. 240, etc., of *Freedom and Fellowship in Religion.*)

In reference to the charge of heresy (see Obs. 3, note 2), it may briefly be said that this originates from *an unacquaintance* with the history of our doctrine, from *an overlooking* of its Scriptural basis and the character of the men who have embraced it, from receiving the accusation from others without examination, or from pure malice and bigotry. Writers eminent for learning and ability, who are opposed to us, well knowing *how extensively* our views were held by men who lived and died for the church, are very guarded not to bring such a charge, seeing that if brought *it is impossible* to trace the church from the apostles saving through a "heretical" medium. In the early church Chiliasts were its preachers, defenders, and apologists. Indeed, we are indebted to many of our scholarly opponents (as e.g. Neander, Bush, etc.) for defending, ably, Millenarian Fathers against such a charge. And the defense is simple and just, seeing that these very Fathers were the men *who opposed directly* the heretical tendencies of the early age. Some Protestants might even learn a lesson of charity from Roman Catholics. While Romanism hates the doctrine and forbids its belief (because so antagonistic to its pretensions), yet some writers of this class are too wise to brand it as heresy. Although anxious for the sake of their church to make its numbers as few as possible, and its doctrines erroneous, yet Schlegel (*Philos. His.*, Sec. 11), calling it an "error or rather illusion" "in the history of those early ages of the church," adds: "Nor did its partisans constitute a sect, but it was merely the exaggerated opinion of some individuals *in the bosom of the church*, who were animated by no intentions hostile to Christianity." He calls them "*many virtuous and praiseworthy men.*" It is a fact that even the first prominent opposer of Chiliasm, Origen (e.g. Neander, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 551), speaks in language of toleration; the same is true of Jerome and others (comp. Prop. 76).

Obs. 5. Our doctrine has a Jewish origin, founded upon Jewish covenants, Jewish predictions, Jewish faith, and a Jewish Messiah (Prop. 68, 69, etc.). Many writers, whether intended as a reproach or as a historical fact, trace our doctrine to a Jewish source. This is correct, whether sarcastically or soberly presented. We have already quoted (Prop. 68), Shedd, Mosheim, Walch, Prof. Bush, Hodge, Milman, and Lindsay as attributing its rise to a Jewish faith. How could it be otherwise when, as we have shown and proven under previous Propositions, the Jews at the First Advent and the disciples sent forth to preach the Kingdom held precisely to our doctrines respecting the Kingdom and the reign of the saints; when, as Auberlen (Obs. 1) aptly said, all, including Jesus and the prophets, were Chiliasts.[1] Chiliasm is not doctrinally fixed by the duration of the reign (Prop. 159), but is determined by the nature of the Messianic Kingdom.[2]

[1] Out of the abundance of material, a number of additional references and quotations may prove acceptable to the reader. The Art. "*Millennium*" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, referring to Josephus (Art. 18, 1, 3; War 2, 8, 14), Daniel (12 : 2), Barnabas, Book of Enoch, Test. of Twelve Patriarchs, Sibylline books, etc., says: "*it was early adopted, especially by Jewish Christians*," and "it penetrated into the Gentile branch of the church and *spread extensively.*" Neander (*Genl. Ch. History*, vol. 2, p. 396, ascribes to *a Jewish origin* "the idea of a Millennial reign which the Messiah would set up on the earth," and this is several times repeated (we give a quotation from him under the Prop. of Jewish objections). In his *His. of Dogmas* he informs us that Millenarianism was generally taught, giving all the eminent church Fathers of the period as supporting it (Barnabas, Irenæus, Papias, Justin), and he endeavors to discriminate between a refined and a sensuous form in which it was taught, asserting "by many it was held spiritually, and clashed not with the Christian spirit" (but who those "many" were who thus held it purely, "spiritually," he does not inform us, and we must conclude them *imaginary*

persons, of whom we have no record whatever). He then traces the doctrine back to Judaism, "*for among the Jews* the representation was current that *Messiah would reign a thousand years on earth*," and he tells us that this notion was derived from Ps. 90 : 41, the symbolical character of the six days of Creation, and the seventh being a Sabbath (comp. Prop. 143, for testimony corroborating Neander). So cumulative and irresistible is the proof that we leave an opponent to sum it up, and give the details as follows : The *Princeton Review* (Ap., 1850, p. 329), in a hostile notice of Rev. Imbrie's sermon, "The Kingdom of God," pronounces our view "*the Jewish doctrine;* and by Jewish we mean *that actually held* by the Jews. They taught, 1. That the Messiah was to appear and reign in person gloriously in Jerusalem. 2. That all the Jews were to be gathered in the Holy Land. 3. That the pious dead were to be raised to share the blessings of the Messiah's reign. 4. That the Messiah and His people were to reign over all nations for a thousand years. 5. That at the end of that period Satan was to be loosed, and a great conflict ensue, after which were to come the general resurrection and final judgment. This theory was by *many* Christians, during the second and third centuries" (observe, he omits *the first*, as if none existed then, over against the positive testimony in our favor), "adopted bodily. The only difference was, that what the Jews expected to occur at the first coming, *these Christians anticipated at the Second Advent of the Messiah.*" We *most cordially* accept of this statement. Having already given extensive quotations respecting the Jewish views held (as in Prop. 20, etc.), we only need a few in addition. Ebrard (*Gosp. His.*, p. 2, ch. 2), in opposing Bruno Bauer's assertion that the Messianic idea originated with Jesus and was afterward elaborated, presents the "Data concerning the expectation of a Messiah," refuting so gross a statement by giving historical facts. These show that the Jews "looked for the promised *re-establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom,*" which was "*the Kingdom of the Messiah,*" and that "there was a distinct expectation of a personal Messiah, *a Davidic King, and a political Saviour.*" M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Kingdom of God," thus gives the Jewish view : "The Jews, at large, gave to these prophecies a temporal meaning, and expected a Messiah who should come in the clouds of heaven, and, *as King of the Jewish nation*, restore the ancient religion and worship, reform the corrupt morals of the people, make expiation for their sins, free them from the yoke of foreign dominion, and, at length, reign over the whole earth in peace and glory." The student is directed to an interesting Art. by Rev. Schodde in *The Lutheran Quarterly* (July, 1879), entitled "The Messianic Idea in Pre-Christian Apocalyptic Literature" (and he refers to Drummond's *The Jewish Messiah*, London, 1877 ; *The Sibylline Books* in Edinb. Review, July, 1877 ; *Excursus*, in Prof. Stuart's *Apoc.*, etc.). He declares that the Jewish Messianic idea prevalent at the First Advent was *incorporated in the Pre-Mill. view*, showing the similarity by various quotations. An extract may be in place. He mentions the "Psalterium Salamonis" or 18 Psalms, supposed to be written shortly before the First Advent, which laments the destruction of David's Kingdom, looks for the Son of David, and *a restoration* under him of a Theocratic Kingdom, with spirituality and external glory. This work speaks of the Messiah as God's "Anointed," and prays that God would hasten in mercy to raise up and inaugurate the long expected Kingdom of His Anointed. One prayer is : "God hasten His mercy over Israel, and deliver us from the uncleanliness of the impious heathen. The Lord Himself is our King to all eternity." They speak of this King being of the house of David, and fully recognize *the Theocratic nature* of the Kingdom. The "Assumptio Mosis," of which only fragments remain, refers to the Messianic Kingdom, and to the inaugurator as being the Celestial One, the Most High God, the Eternal One, i.e. God Himself. The student may well consider the statement of Shedd (*His. Ch. Doc.*, B.C., who received the merited strictures of Lillie, Shimeall, etc.), who speaks of our doctrine as "a *later* Jewish doctrine," and *then* adds : "The disciples of Christ, being themselves *Jews*, were at first *naturally infected* with these views." The simple historical fact, as noticed by Chillingworth and others, is this : that *the nearer* you come to *the apostolic* period, *the more generally* was it taught by the Fathers *as held by the Jews and disciples.* Jerome and others, consequently, in view of the agreement, call it "*Judaizing ;*" and our most bitter opposers (as e.g. Knapp, *Ch. Theol.*, p. 323) fully admit that the Jews as "*a current opinion*" held that "*He (Christ) would be a temporal deliverer and a King of the Jews, and, indeed, a Universal Monarch, who would reign over all nations. Thus they interpreted* Ps. 2 : 2, 6, 8, Jer. 23 : 5, 6, Zech. 9 : 4 seq." (He might have given many Scriptural passages thus used.) "*The apostles themselves held this opinion* until after the resurrection of Christ, Matt. 20 : 20, 21, Luke 24 : 21, Acts 1 : 6." Commentators find our view, *as Jewish*, in various other passages, as e.g. Luke 1 : 71, and 17 : 20 and 19 : 11. Acts 2 : 26, 30, etc. Indeed, there is not one but refers to our idea of the Messianic Kingdom as received by the Jews in the times of the First Advent.

[9] Chiliasm or Millenarianism (the former word derived from the Greek, and the latter from the Latin, expressive of a thousand years) is most generally used to denote the doctrine of the Pre-Mill. Advent of the Messiah, and His personal reign on earth, at least during the thousand years. Dr. Breckenridge (Pref. to Judge Jones's *Notes*) has well observed that the word "Millenarian" has become extremely "vague," as our opponents who hold to a future Millennium are also in a certain sense "Millenarians." Originally, however, it was exclusively employed to designate our doctrine (and thus it is still retained by many writers), incorporating with it the definite notion (Rev. 20) of the one thousand years (which, however, in the estimation of leading Foreign and American advocates, does not limit the reign—see Prop. 159). As others also have adopted a Millennium, the following designations have been extensively received and used to distinguish with greater accuracy the various beliefs: "Pre-Millenarian," one who holds to the Mill. age, introduced by the personal Advent and reign of the Messiah; "Post-Millenarian," one who has the same age brought in without the Advent, placing the latter at its close; "Anti-Millenarian, one who rejects the doctrine of such an era; "Past-Millenarian," one who locates the Mill. age in the past, or extends it from the past to the present in the course of realization (these last, however, are more frequently designated as "Anti-Millenarian," i.e. opposed to a future Millennium).

Obs. 6. The early church Theology on this doctrine—notwithstanding the sneers of Gibbon and his fellow unbelievers, notwithstanding the painfully apologetic language of Prof. Bush, Dr. Neander, and others—is not only reasonable, *but the most reasonable,* because of *its vital connection* with what preceded. Reuss (*His. of Ch. Theol. in Ch.*, "On Salvation") declares, that faith fastened on its "object the Lord Jesus Christ and His Messianic dignity, which *necessarily* included the assured realization of the promises *touching the Kingdom;*" and after repeatedly stating in his work that the early Theology was largely taken up with views respecting the Kingdom (for this naturally resulted from the views of *the Christship or Messiahship* of Jesus), he informs us, that the position of those who were the faithful was "obedience to God, which is to give us a title to the Kingdom, and faith in Jesus, *who will soon come to establish it.*" Faith and obedience inspired hope that *the covenanted promises, pertaining to the Kingdom,* would be verified through Christ at His coming again; any other position, in view of what preceded and surrounded them, would have been unnatural and opposed to the truth.

We will allow a Liberalist to state from his standpoint the Primitive belief. Thus e.g. Potter (*Freedom and Fellowship in Religion*, Essay 5, "Christianity and its Definitions") says: "In that childlike age, among a childlike people, something more was needed than a bare proclamation of moral and spiritual truth, with whatever power of personal genius. And this need was supplied by *the old Hebrew* conception of the speedy coming of *the Messianic Kingdom*—a conception that appealed with all the vividness of a drama to the spiritual imagination, and hopes and fears of man. This idea is *the one thread of unity* that runs through all the varieties of writings in the New Test. from Matt. to Rev. It was this that gradually lifted Jesus Himself out of all human and historic proportions into the colossal magnitude in which He has been seen by Christendom for eighteen centuries. It was the belief, after His crucifixion, *in His second Messianic Advent*—an event which His followers looked for in their lifetime—that gave *the immediate animating impulse* to their cause, and attracted such numbers of people to confess Him as the expected Christ; for *this Advent* was to solve all life's trials and perplexities; it was to bring redemption to the sinful, rest to the weary, wealth to the destitute, and comfort to the sorrowing. And around this simple, childish hope, which was *yet full to bursting* with the deep life of spiritual aspirations and yearnings, the first Christian Church was gathered—a sect of Judaism accepting *Jesus as the Messiah*, and *looking for His Sec. Coming* to complete and establish His Sovereignty." Compare in same work Abbot's "Genius of Christianity and Free Religion," in which "*the Messianic faith is the soul* of the entire New Test., giving unity to the Gospels, Epistles, and Apoc., and making

Christianity a vital organism ;" "*the Messianic idea is the great taproot* of Christianity." Martineau (*Nat. Review*, Ap., 1863) is approvingly quoted : " Whoever can read the New Test. with a fresh eye must be struck with the prominence everywhere of *the Messianic idea.* It seems to be the ideal framework of the whole—of history, parable, dialogue; of Pauline reasoning ; of Apocalyptic visions." Similar testimony to a large extent might be adduced, but this is sufficient to indicate how these men clearly apprehend the original and true meaning of *the Messiahship* as retained by the early church (which is incontrovertible), and from it deduce the fact (alas ! sadly evident in the church) *that the Messianic idea was changed.* This is true, but not in the way that they account for it, either as a logical change by development (so Abbot), or as a requisite accommodation to Gentilism by Paul (so Frothingham), or as a childlike opinion adapted to a transition period (so Potter). Allowing any of these results as legitimate (taken too from Christian Apologists), *undermines* the New Test. record, the inspiration and authority of the apostles, and *lowers* the Primitive faith to a mere childish standard. Our reply to all this will be found under various Propositions.

Obs. 7. The apologetic replies of those who reject our doctrine, given to infidels, etc., to account for the Primitive faith, *are unworthy* of churches established *under apostolic teaching and influence.* Eaton (*Perm. of Christ.*, p. 262) gracefully acknowledges the early church view, and rebukes Gibbon because he treats the early belief as a vulgar superstition, saying : " It does not seem to have occurred to this writer that the secret of the success of the Christianity may well have lain in *the harmony* of its doctrines with *the religious needs* of the time, the deliverance which it held forth from the impending ruin at the end of the world, by many deemed so near," etc. Aside from the inaccuracy of " the end of the world" believed in (for the early Christians had no idea of *the modern* view of such an end, but looked for *the end of the age or dispensation*, to be followed by another more glorious under Christ—(compare Props. 140, 137, 141, 138, etc.)—the rebuke falls harmless unless we take higher ground than the mere " needs of the time." Prof. Bush (*On Mill.*, p. 22) accepts of Gibbon's language that " for wise purposes, this error was permitted in the church," and argues that such views of the Kingdom were undoubtedly for the best in the early history of the church. If this is so, well may infidelity sneer at and ridicule the establishment of the Christian church. With inspired men as its teachers ; with apostles, supposed to know what the Kingdom is, its leaders ; with elders to whom the church was entrusted for guidance ; with the restrictions cast around error, the duty enjoined of holding the truth, the honor and faithfulness of God Himself connected with it—the church *needs no such unworthy defence, making "error" essential to its establishment, success, and progress.*

We have works written by able men, in which, in order to prevent the force of the evidence given in our behalf by the early church, under the heading of " *Judæo-Christianity,*" they frankly admit how generally our doctrine was held—even by apostles—and argue that, in the case of all these, it was *a necessary* precedence for the future development of the truth ; that as knowledge increased " the husk" was discarded, etc. Thus e.g. Reuss in his *His. of Ch. Theol. of the Apostolic Age.* This, stripped of its philosophical verbiage, simply means : (1) that these apostles and their immediate successors were in gross error, i.e. possessed the mere " husk ;" (2) that error is *a requisite* preliminary to bring out the truth ; (3) that error was a necessary—hence permitted—condition in that period of the church ; (4) that the true source of our knowledge is not in the teachings of the apostles (as e.g. Petrine school), but in the progress of knowledge through " the consciousness of the church ;" (5) that for the true doctrine of the Kingdom we are indebted, not to men *specially commissioned* to preach the Kingdom, but to uninspired men who afterward arose as teachers. Having already replied to this, these things are pointed out to indicate the *inconsistent and irreligious* shifts to which even good men are driven when denying *the truthfulness* of the early church view of the Kingdom. No one,

therefore, need to be surprised that the Millenarianism of the Primitive Church winged the shaft hurled at it by the Antinomian Perfectionists in the Confession of their Faith (published in their organ, *The Perfectionist*, quoted by the *Oberlin Review* for May, 1874). In Art. 24 they say: "We believe that the history which the Bible contains of the church after Christ's ascension, commonly called the Primitive Church, is a history rather of *the latter-day glory of Judaism* than of the commencement of Christianity." Prejudice can scarcely exceed this in the minds of professed unbelievers. Alas! how all this recoils upon the truth itself, and paves the way for numerous extravagances.

Let us take one of the most candid and charitable of men, Dr. Neander, who honestly supposes a difficulty (where none exists), and in endeavoring to soften or remove it, makes us conscious of an incongruity. In his efforts to clear Chiliasm (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1. p. 364, etc.) from Ebionitism (or else the church proper could only be traced through Ebionism) he adduces two reasons for the rise of the former: (1) a tolerance or reception of the letter in accordance with previous views; and (2) a sensuous element. This does not remove—it only increases—the difficulty. For how does it come that, under *the direct auspices* of the apostles themselves, this reception of "the letter" and of "a sensuous element" (as he is pleased to call it) occurs? If the early church were so generally under the influence of the letter, *what* churches had the Spirit? If the history of the church is, as he informs us, that in which the leaven works in its (i.e. churches) most impure state, *then* the succeeding stages ought progressively to rise in purity. But is this sustained by history? Do such explanations soften the charge of unbelievers that "error" extensively prevailed and was one of the means of success? To indicate how poorly prepared Neander was to vindicate his own hypothesis—to escape from the dilemma—unless to sacrifice to a fearful extent the integrity and authority of apostleship, it is only necessary to contrast two passages. Thus e.g. in *First Planting of Chris.*, vol. 1, p. 362, he thus correctly represents James's sentiments: "He considers the acknowledgment of *the Messiahship of Jesus* as essentially belonging *to genuine Judaism*, believers in Jesus as *the only genuine Jews*, Christianity *as perfected Judaism*," etc. Now, to get rid of James's connection, he deliberately gives him this Christian character: "We might infer (with Schneckenburger) that James wrote this Epistle at a time *when Christianity had not thoroughly penetrated* his spiritual life, during the earliest period of his Christian development; but it may be questioned whether we are justified in drawing such a conclusion, for no proof can be given that *he enlarged his doctrinal views at a later period*. It is possible that he remained confined in this form of *imperfect doctrinal* development, although his heart was penetrated by love to God and Jesus." Any theory of the Kingdom which in its support must thus lower *apostolic teaching* is most *certainly defective and dishonoring* to the Word. It may, indeed, do no serious injury to a man like Neander (see his faith in dedication) with his development theory, but it is fraught *with evil* to thousands. Such men as Bauer, Parker, etc., only find the strongest possible *confirmation* to their unbelief in such a line of reasoning, which undermines Scriptural authority, and leaves the inspired teachers ignorant of a leading, fundamental doctrine, to the preaching of which they were *specially called*. All the Apologetics, noticed in a course of reading, simply amounts, in this direction, to the following: an "error" is admitted; various reasons are assigned, attributable to a transition state, for its permission; and, on the supposition that the prevailing modern view is the correct one, a change is allowed as the result of increased light. When Dr. Mosheim and others acknowledge a Jewish origin, and then suppose that Christian teachers received it because they hoped by it to make the Jews more willing to embrace Christianity, they are opposed by the testimony of the Fathers; and so with all other suppositions which *degrade* the intelligence or the integrity of the Fathers.

Obs. 8. The important *historical position* (comp. following Propositions) that our doctrine thus obtains, should, in the mind of the theological student, possess *considerable weight*. If this link were missing—if our opponents could point to this faith lacking in the churches established by the apostles—then an *essential* one (required as *a logical sequence, a necessary result*) would be missing in our connected chain. We confess to a feeling of *satisfaction, of gratification*, that it thus exists, abundantly attested to by our opponents. While unbelievers deride it as uncouth and misshapen, while even believers regard it as of foreign forging, an excrescence, we, on the other hand, esteem it *as most desirable and precious*. This

early faith in the Kingdom, is *evidence of consistent divine teaching, of apostolic supervision, of God's determination to fulfil His oath-bound covenant, of the true Scriptural conception of the Messiah as covenanted, of the validity of adopting grace, and of our ultimately inheriting, at the Sec. Advent, "the sure mercies of David."*

In continuation of our illustrations drawn from a class of writers, who, in attempting to break the force of our historical position, more or less ignore the facts of history and allow themselves to build hypotheses upon unproven assertions, we select Dr. Knapp. In his *Chris. Theol.*, sec. 154, he admits that the Jews understood that the Messiah would restore the Davidic throne and Kingdom, etc.; that in the early churches "*many Christians*" indulged the same hope, even in the days of the apostles; that in the sec. century the belief also extensively prevailed; that "Origen in the third century was the first who wrote in opposition to the doctrine," etc. He then boldly asserts: "The apostles *wholly abandoned* the opinion *after* the ascension of Christ, and expected no other coming than that at the judgment of the world;" and again (Sec. 118): "The apostles never indulge in such expectations, but take *every opportunity to contradict them.*" To this, briefly, it may be replied: Knapp is not *very candid* in his statements respecting the extent to which our doctrine was held, so much so, that the American editor (who has no sympathy with us) refers to it. (2) Writers in abundance, such as Neander, etc. (who are no Millenarians), in direct opposition to Knapp, frankly acknowledge its generality, and that the apostles had not abandoned the idea (unless, *as some*, it be Paul), and appeal to the views held at Thessalonica, etc., as confirmatory of the same. (3) If the apostles "abandoned the opinion" and took "every opportunity to contradict them," *why* do it not decidedly when the whole question was called up by the Thessalonians, or by the Council at Jerusalem? *Why* continue to adopt "Jewish forms, ideas, and language?" (4) Knapp has conceded that the apostles did *not know* the truth respecting the Kingdom *until after* the ascension, although they had been *previously sent out* to preach the Kingdom (hence, they preached *error*, etc.); *why then* did they not apologize for their preaching an erroneous Kingdom, and tell us, if Knapp is correct, *how and when* they were enlightened? (5) If this process of enlightenment began, why put it off *until after* the ascension, *when previously* the mysteries of the Kingdom were given to them, and after Christ's death the Kingdom was the special topic of communication for forty days? (6) *Why* endeavor to make the impression that Millenarians do not link this coming of the Messiah with the Judgment (comp. Props. 132 and 133)? (7) And finally, if the apostles were so averse, as he alleges, to this idea of the Kingdom, how does he account for the strange fact, that under their *personal* supervision, and without a single recorded rebuke (they taking every opportunity to contradict it), the doctrine should *nevertheless* so extensively prevail that in the first, second, and third century no writer, no teacher appears, until, according to his own statement, Origen first opposes it? Surely, if Knapp's statements are to be received, *the exact reverse* of all this ought to have happened, viz.: his (Knapp's) notion ought to have prevailed, and Chiliasm brought in afterward as an attachment, etc. Indeed, in a multitude of works, especially designed for students of Theology, we find far more sweeping assertions than even this illustration affords; and, if we are to credit them, the apostles clearly taught *the most modernized ideas* respecting the Kingdom, but, unfortunately for their credibility, let them be examined, and *not one* gives an explicit, *direct passage* to support his theory—the proof alleged being either mere assertion or invariably and solely inferential. There are also numerous works which profess to describe what the faith of a Christian Church, modelled after one established by the apostles, should be. But a remarkable feature in nearly all such portraitures is the omission of the prevailing Millenarian faith, as not suited to a modern improved standpoint.

Obs. 9. This early church belief is to many *a tender subject*, one that they would gladly ignore, and hence it is either silently passed by, or kept as much as possible in the background, or else contemptuously dismissed. It is only the later attacks of unbelievers—as e.g. in the delineations of early Christianity by Strauss, Bauer, Renan, etc.—that has again prominently pressed the subject to our notice.

The power of prejudice, or the desire to soften history in behalf of supposed truth, is too palpably seen in this direction. Thus e.g. in some recent works (as in Killen's *Old Catholic Church*) where "the doctrine of the great body of believers" is referred to, this doctrine, once so generally entertained, is utterly ignored as if it had never existed. In Dogmatics, in Ecclesiastical Histories, in Theologies, etc., it is briefly noticed (while great space can be given to Gnosticism, Donatism, etc.) and made as if it had *no influence* in the formation of the church—to fall into the background. Some, as if fearful of its recoil upon their own theory, seem to be afraid to give even *a candid* historical statement of its generality. Even Neander and Mosheim, with all their concessions and frank admissions, do not allow it that pervading prominence which it certainly possessed (*according to their own admissions*) in the early church to mould the character and lives of the first Christians. These and other writers, in discussing the First Centuries, fall back upon the views afterward engrafted, and without *the slightest proof* to sustain them, assume them to have prevailed from the very beginning. In doing this they *necessarily* involve themselves in contradictions, which we expose under various Propositions. Some writers, again, when forced to make the admissions, endeavor to weaken their force by, as we have noticed, charging the Fathers as ignorant and superstitious (but excellent men outside of the Millenarian doctrine). A thousand pens have detracted these early advocates by disparaging them by way of contrast with succeeding Fathers, telling us that the former are not worthy to be compared with an Origen, Augustine, Jerome, etc. (forgetting Matt. 11 : 25-30, and that later Fathers, with all their ability and learning, introduced far greater errors into the church). The candid, reflecting student will in all this notice (1) that the repressing, withholding, or softening down of facts has nothing whatever to do with the real truth of doctrine ; (2) that the weakness, and even credulity, of men decides nothing respecting doctrine which finds its basis in the Scriptures ; (3) that if the personal qualifications of men are to determine the truthfulness of Scriptural doctrine, *then* the fancy, extravagance, and imprudence, more or less associated with every doctrine of the Bible by men, would leave but little for our acceptance.

Obs. 10. In our investigation of so important a doctrine as that of the Kingdom, we should be guarded, seeing that the apostle tells us that "the mystery of iniquity" began to work in his day, and that it would ultimately burst forth with increased and growing power. The leaven then working would extend and manifest itself *in perverted doctrine*—doctrine antagonistic to that once proclaimed and believed. That form of doctrine of *a later growth* which supersedes and takes precedence of the earlier form, should undoubtedly *be more subject* to the suspicion of being a perversion than the primitive view. Taking this position, then *the Alexandrian* doctrine of the Kingdom, so hostile to the older form, is, to the say the least, open to grave suspicion, and ought not to be received without careful examination and *decided proof* in its behalf.

Obs. 11. Many persons are prejudiced against our doctrine and its reception by the early church, on the ground that its first Christian patrons were "Jews" or inclined to "Judaism." This has already been answered, and reference is made to it in this place in order that the reader may notice this peculiarity perpetuated from the Apostles down through the Apostolic Fathers and their successors who were Chiliasts. While all these held that their doctrine was derived from *Jewish* Scriptures, *Jewish* Prophets, and a *Jewish* Covenant, corresponding with the faith *of pious Jews*, yet they at the same time resisted with all their ability *the errors* which had been engrafted on Judaism by Pharisaism, Sadduceeism, and Hellenism (as well as by Essenism and Samaritanism). Now many, influenced by the charge of "Judaism" and "Jewish," confound this impure historical Judaism (which ought rather to be called after its parentage, Pharisaism, etc.) with *pure Judaism*, i.e., that Judaism which was not

abrogated by the change of dispensation. They forget that Millenarians were *the very first* who opposed, on the one hand, the Jewish spirit of self-righteousness, and, on the other hand, the Jewish libertinism, as antagonistic to the religion of Jesus Christ. Herein consists *the injustice* of that spirit of criticism which refuses, persistently, to distinguish between these Primitive believers and their opposers, but classes them together. Dorner (*Person of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 409) is more discriminative and just when he derives Chiliasm from the Scriptures and in opposition to ritualistic Judaism says, "it may in part be more justly regarded as a polemic against Judaism on the part of Christianity."

Even the poor thieves on the cross cannot escape the censure of some, being denounced as "*Chiliastic enthusiasts*," just as if persons guilty of vice or crime could not also entertain proper views of truth. It is true that Lange (*Com.* p. 525) calls the one "a noble Chiliast;" and the reception and gracious promise given by Jesus to this Chiliast should put to shame the epithets, etc., that some believers are pleased to bestow upon us so liberally. We commend the learning and candor of Whitby (the leader of our opponents) in his account of the faith of the early Fathers (*Treatise on Tradition*, see it quoted in detail, *Proph. Times*, vol. 6, pp. 83-86), acknowledging *its universality* by naming the Fathers; its *orthodoxy;* its being professedly *derived* from Christ and the apostles; its embracing certain distinctive features which the named Fathers *teach;* its *being founded* on the sayings of the prophets, our Lord, and the apostles; its being not merely asserted as "a probable opinion, but as a thing which they were *certainly assured of*" (quoting Justin and Irenæus as declaring "*We know*," etc., and that it was "*most manifestly*" so "*without controversy*"); and then its being opposed *to all kinds* of heresy as evidenced by its writings, and against *ultra* Judaism as seen e.g. in Justin Martyr's reply to Trypho. It is true that he employs this line of reasoning, in detail, against the tradition of Rome—just as Chillingworth—but it is none *the less true*, and none *the less forcible* against his own "*new hypothesis.*" We append this intended bitter but delectable morsel (quoted by the *Luth. Observer*, Dec. 27th, 1878) from the pen of Dr. Hall, of New York, which gives our doctrine a Jewish origin: "This (Pre-Mill.) alleged scheme of interpretation—if anything so loose, variable, and undefined can be called a 'scheme'—*is very old*, older than the 'Fifth-Monarchy' idea, *older than Chiliasm* (!). It has its earliest exponent in *the mother* of Zebedee's children (Matt. 20 : 20-23). She came to the Messiah, worshipping Him, and desired a certain thing of Him. 'Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, *in thy Kingdom.*' She reflected the spirit of her countrymen, who adhered to Jesus at that time. Their hope was of a material, secular, powerful kingdom, *theocratic withal*—like Solomon's—with themselves as its 'nobility and gentry.' Like many sincere and honest persons, she was, at that stage of her intellectual and spiritual life, unable to comprehend the true state of the case, and the Great Teacher did not enter into explanations. He taught as His hearers were 'able to bear it.' The study of His answer ought to be profitable to Pre-Millenarians. The question is obviously in *the Jewish sense.* But the answer is as *obviously* in quite a different sense." We confess that we, as a Pre-Mill., have studied this answer with "profit," for we find that the mother was a *Chiliast*—of our faith—and that the Saviour *confirmed her in her Chiliasm* by *not* denying that such places were in store for some accounted worthy of them, but by affirming that *they would be given* by the Father at the proper time to the proper persons. We utterly fail to see Hall's "*obviously different sense*," seeing that Jesus left her re-established by His corroborative answer in her idea of the Messianic Kingdom. (Comp. Props. 154 and 156.) But while Chiliasm was thus in harmony with Jewish views, *based on the covenants and prophecies*, it was bitterly and unrelentingly hostile to mere Pharisaism, or the ritualistic Judaism. This is evidenced by *the Chiliastic treatises* written against the Jews. This is so plain, that Robertson (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 116) says: "Christian Chiliasm showed no favor to the fleshly Israel, nor even to the holy city." This e.g. is seen in their teaching the engrafting of Gentiles without circumcision, the continued punishment of the nation for the rejection of the Messiah, the existing times of the Gentiles, etc.

Obs. 12. The student, who is really desirous to see how extensively our doctrine was held, will consider these points of evidence adduced. (1)

How universally the Jews held to our doctrine, e.g. Prop. 20; (2) How this was confirmed by the Prophecies, e.g. Props. 21, 33, 35, 51; (3) how this belief grew out of the covenants, e.g. Props. 46, 47, 48, 49, 52; (4) that the preaching of John re-established the faith in many, e.g. Props. 38, 39, 40; (5) that the preaching of the disciples was calculated to increase the belief, as e.g. Props. 43, 54, 55, etc.; (6) that no controversy was raised on the subject, e.g. Prop. 44; (7) that the preaching of Jesus confirmed the faith in His disciples and hearers, as e.g. Props. 42, 43, 44, 54, 55, 57, 58, etc.; (8) how the continued faith in the same was preserved and perpetuated by the postponement taught, e.g. Props. 57 to 68; (9) that the death of Jesus did not remove the belief, Prop. 70; (10) how the preaching and language of the apostles was calculated to enforce the belief, e.g. Props. 71, 72, 73. (Thus far there is a connected chain, which indicates how generally our doctrine must have been entertained; but the proof is far from being exhausted. Candor requires the consideration of what follows. (11) That the doctrine was received through the apostles shown more clearly under Props. 73, in no controversy springing up concerning it; under Prop. 74 in the belief of a speedy Advent; under Prop. 75 in its perpetuation, and Prop. 76, gradual change.

Even this is only part of the proof, as much more will be found under succeeding Propositions, in quotations from the ancients and moderns, in doctrinal statements, etc. The reader will also notice that the concessions in favor of the extent of our view in the Primitive Church, are drawn chiefly, and in many instances exclusively, from able writers who are Anti-Chiliastic and unfriendly to our doctrine. The testimony is therefore the more *impartial and deserving* of attention. Our desire in all this is to elicit the truth, seeing that truth is useful—leading to other truth, avoiding bigotry, giving motives for action, forming character, commending us to God and man, and is eternal, while error is misleading and injurious. But may we not ask the reader to consider, *why it is* that so many men *hate and detest* our doctrine so cordially—heaping upon it the choicest of epithets expressive of its anti-Christian nature—when *their own* upon this subject is *not once mentioned* in the Primitive Church; when *their own* is *not orthodox*, but even falls under *the general condemnation* which embraces all views in antagonism. Surely *the historical superiority* of our doctrine in being thus taught and defended *in and by the Church* should lead *those great friends* of "Orthodoxy," who so readily raise the cry of "heresy," etc., to be more modest in their tone and mild in their manner. We, therefore, repeat, quoting Stackhouse (*Compl. Body of Divinity*): "It cannot be denied, indeed, but that this doctrine (Chiliasm) has *its antiquity, and was once the general opinion of all orthodox Christians.*" We may, therefore, appropriately repeat, what Dorner (*The Person of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 415) declares: "The primitive Chiliasm represented *a noble and precious* principle, and we may fairly demand for it *a juster treatment* in the future."

Obs. 13. We are abundantly authorized, by the amount of Scriptural and historical evidence adduced, to most earnestly protest against the continued uncandid and unscholarly attempts to fasten upon our doctrine an origin opposed to the plainest historical fact, and the numerous concessions of the most learned of our opponents.

Thus in religious newspapers, etc., it is again and again asserted that our doctrine is "heresy," that it originated with Papias, or with Cerinthus, or "a grovelling Judaism" (one writer not content with ascribing one origin, in the course of his article gives all three, and denounces it as "heretical"). Books of reference take up these false statements, and publish them as historical facts. The favorite charge, in order to make our doctrine unpalatable, is, that it is derived from Cerinthus; so e.g. Gerhard (quoted with evident relish by Brown) says: "The first author of the Chiliastic doctrine in the Church of the New Test. seems to have been Cerinthus, the pestilent heretic." (With this compare the remarks of Neander, etc., under Obs. 3, note.) We allow an opponent to our doctrine to testify as follows: Mosheim (*His. Com. First Th. Cents.*, vol. 2, p. 245,

etc.) says : " Among the ancients and the moderns, many have supposed that Cerinthus first propagated this error (the doctrine of a future reign of Christ on earth). Few, however, *will readily agree* with them, if they consider that this sentiment was embraced *by many*—e.g. Irenæus, Tertullian, and others—who abhorred *Cerinthus* and accounted him a pest to Christianity. Nor do I think that Eusebius is *to be trusted* when he tells that the expectation of a Millennium flowed down to the subsequent doctors from Papias, a bishop of Jerusalem in the second century. For, as Papias was not the first excogitor of the opinion, but received it from others, as Eusebius himself concedes, it is clear that *at least some Christians before* Papias had embraced this opinion. And Irenæus cites Papias, not as being the author of this opinion, but as bearing testimony to it. Pressense (quoted Prop. 74, Obs. 3, note) makes our doctrine to have originated in *the Thessalonian* church, which adopted " *Judaistic elements.*" Some few say that Chiliasm arose from the Apocryphal Apocalypses, but this is discarded by every critic of eminence, who make these to have originated just as the Apocryphal Gospels, viz. : perversions of previous existing doctrine, to accommodate the imaginary theory of the writers. Prof. Briggs refers to Papias, and then says of him : " Who can fail to give their assent to Schürer's (*the very highest authority* on this subject) judgment, ' The dreams of Papias respecting the Millennial Kingdom were derived from the Apocalypse of Baruch.' " In answer to the question, " Who can fail to give their assent?" the reader will observe our authorities derived from opponents, etc., as quoted, and contrast them with *the bitterly prejudiced* statement of a " heresy-hunter." For to indicate the " animus" of Prof. Briggs's series of articles (signed " Westminster " in *N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879), we have only to say that, not satisfied with this derivation of the doctrine, he gives us this *choice* historical information and application : " Those men of Corinth and Galatia, who claimed superior orthodoxy to the apostle Paul, are *the historical progenitors* of Cerinthus and Papias, and their followers in all ages, who propose, with the men of the late Conference" (that met in Dr. Tyng's church in N. York and included eminent representatives of the various Protestant churches, and among them over forty able and devoted men of his own church, the Presbyterian) " to bring back the Church to what they claim to be ' vital doctrine.' " (But this we must expect from a man who threatens his brethren in the ministry with eccles. trial and censure—as an argument (!). A writer in the *N. Y. Evangelist*, Dec., 1879, thinks that " trials of heresy may arise in our church (Presbyterian) over the doctrines of the Millenarians." The *Herald and Presbyter*, quoting this, significantly remarks : " We doubt it. Heresy-hunters are not numerous among us, and they are chiefly of the old school. *A good proportion of them, moreover, are Millenarians.* In all probability we shall escape the danger.")

Obs. 14. Let the careful reader answer the following question, and he will see how eminently consistent with fact is our doctrinal position. How could John, under Divine guidance, well knowing the Jewish views that were current (which our opponents fully admit as we have shown), pen down the portraiture of a Messianic reign (Rev. 20 : 1–6 and 11 : 15–18), which in its plain grammatical sense *corresponds so accurately* with the prevailing Jewish opinions, unless such a sense contains the truth? God would not, could not, take the dearest cherished Messianic hopes and parade them *in such an expressed sense* to deceive believers, when He intended a different sense to be placed upon the words. God does not undertake that which, if perpetrated by a man, we would unhesitatingly denounce as dishonest, disreputable, and cruel. (Compare Prop. 75, Obs. 5, and note.)

PROPOSITION 73. *The doctrine of the Kingdom preached by the Apostles and Elders, raised up no controversy with the Jews.*

Neither in the New Test. nor in any of the Patristic writings, do we find the least hint given that the doctrine of the Kingdom excited *any controversy* with the Jews; which it undoubtedly would have done *if antagonistic* to the Jewish view. This is strong, corroborative evidence that the doctrine was *in accordance* with the Jewish Messianic expectations. For, with the Jewish doctrine, drawn from *the Davidic covenant and prophecies* of a restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, prevailing, it would have been *impossible* to engraft the later and modern views without exciting bitter and unrelenting hostility.

No controversy arose between the Jews and the disciples before the ascension of Jesus (see Prop. 44), and this continued *after* the ascension, for the only subjects in controversy pertained to the Messiahship of Jesus (i.e. whether Jesus was "the Christ,") the call of the Gentiles, the Mosaic law, the sufficiency of repentance and faith in Jesus, etc. Indeed, as our argument shows (comp. Props. 69, 70, 71), the same gospel of the Kingdom was preached after the death and ascension of Jesus that was proclaimed before. And to this very knowledge of the previous proclamation, appeal is made as e.g. Acts 10:36, 37, thus indicating in the strongest manner that no change—as now advocated by the multitude—was inaugurated.

Obs. 1. Jews, indoctrinated into the covenants, were the first converts, and, with *their faith*, it would have been utterly impracticable to have influenced them *to receive Jesus as* "*the Messiah*," unless it was understood that these covenants were at some time in the future *to be realized through Him*. If the after-adopted Alexandrian and modern notion of the Kingdom is the correct one, *then*, in the very nature of the case, before such Jews could be moved, it must have been shown that the covenants were to be spiritualized, and that a Kingdom *very different* from that contained in *the grammatical sense* of the covenant was intended. But *where*, excepting in the later writings of Origen, etc., have we any such declarations? The reason for all this can only be found in *the original* Christian view of the Kingdom corresponding, so far as *the covenanted* Messiah's Kingdom is concerned, *with* the Jewish expectations.

Obs. 2. Consider (1) how large numbers of the Jews were converted to Christianity, accepting of Jesus as "the Messiah," because of the fact that they were led to believe (*a*) that *at the Sec. Advent* the glorious predicted Messianic Kingdom would be established, and (*b*) that the life and death of Jesus (His resurrection and exaltation included), evinced Him as *pre-eminently qualified* to be "the Messiah" and as possessing *the requisite power* to fulfil the covenant promises. (2) How, as the early doctrine became obscured, substituted, and finally driven from the field, the conver-

sions of the Jews became rarer and almost entirely ceased, excepting such as were produced under compulsion. How else account for so great a change, unless it be in *the gradual engrafting of other than Jewish ideas to the Messiahship of Jesus*, making the Messiah less and less in correspondence with the Messiah of the Old Test. Scriptures?

Abbott (*Freedom and Fellowship in Relig.*, p. 237), pertinently asks: "Was it an *accident* that the new faith took its name, not from the individual Jesus, but from His royal office?" This leads Abbott, by tracing back the name, to declare that "Christianity is developed Judaism." We only now say, that this selection of name would scarcely have been made, unless the believers were Millenarians, thus distinctively retaining in the very name *the continued* Jewish expectations which are summed up in "*the Christ*." It was the very name of "Messiah," retaining in force its original meaning, that was attractive and inviting to Jews. Thus e.g. with the Messiahship, as an integral part of its official meaning, was attached *the restoration of the identical Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom overthrown*. Such restoration as the prophets unitedly predicted, with the reign following, constituted the Messiah. There can be no doubt whatever, that the modernized doctrinal application of the name, now so prevalent, was at this period utterly unknown,—at least, no evidence exists in any writing of its having been entertained by any one in the form now usually presented by divines (comp. Prop. 205).

Obs. 3. The early Jews, instead of accusing Christians of rejecting such a Kingdom, charged the primitive believers with entertaining such a view, and sought to bring them, on account of the same, into difficulties with the Roman Emperors. The same accusation which malignancy urged so fatally against Jesus before Pilate, was repeated against His followers on several occasions. This indicates the kind of belief that was held.

Thus (Eusebius, *Eccl. His.*, B. 3, ch. 19) by a perversion (viz.: in its imminency, etc.) of the doctrine that Jesus would, at some future time, restore the Davidic throne and Kingdom, and obtain world-wide dominion, the fears of Domitian were excited lest he lose (so Hegesippus) his Empire (the same fear that operated in the mind of Herod). The Emperor, enraged at the belief that a descendant of David's would appear and set up a universal kingdom (Mosheim, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 56, Gibbon's *Decl. and Fall*, vol. 2, ch. 16), before which, of course, the Roman would have to submit, ordered all the posterity of David to be sought out. They were brought from Palestine (Eusebius), but as they disclaimed *any efforts of their own* to effect this, exhibited faith only in *a dead and buried* kinsman, were themselves poor, expected the Kingdom through God's power, etc., Domitian concluded that he had nothing to fear from them, and dismissed them with contempt. The belief, however, led him (and no doubt others) to look coldly on Christians and to persecute them. This incident, if a true account, indicates: (1) the belief of Christians concerning the Kingdom; (2) that they attributed its establishment to Jesus at His coming again; (3) that, being Theocratic, it was to be set up by His power, in a supernatural manner;—all of which, as it now does to multitudes, appeared highly improbable to the Emperor. Another instance is given thus by Pressense (*Early Years of Chris.*, p. 157), when referring to the troubles at Thessalonica: "Wresting the words that he (Paul) had spoken with reference to the Kingdom of Christ and His speedy Coming to reign, (Acts 17 : 7), they accused Him before the Prætor *of conspiring against Cæsar*." Here we have (1) the Jews endeavoring to take advantage of the received doctrine of Christ's coming Kingdom; (2) contrasting it as something that would be hostile to the Roman Power; (3) this could only be done by showing that they (the Christians) held *to a fulfilment of the Davidic Covenant* through the intervention and power of a Coming Jesus; (4) such a divine interference, connected with the resurrection of the dead, etc., was regarded by those in authority as a mere idle superstition. Let it be noticed, that in none of the answers given before Roman authorities, is the covenanted idea of the Kingdom ignored and the modern notion substituted by way of defence. Milman (*His. of the Jews*, p. 423, vol. 2) remarks: "The Christian Hegesippus relates that Vespasian commanded strict search to be made for all who claimed descent from the House of David, in order to cut off, if possible, all hopes of the restoration of the royal house, or of the Messiah, the confidence in whose speedy coming still burned with feverish excitement in the hearts of all faithful Israelites. This barbarous inquisition was con-

tinued in the reign of Domitian," etc. Milman does not sufficiently discriminate that these believers were Jewish Christians, as their replies evidenced. He correctly says (vol. 2, p. 425), "It is by no means improbable that its descent from Judaism, of which Christianity was long considered a modification, tended to increase the hostility against the unoffending Christians, which their rapid progress had excited." Salvador, a Jew (quoted by Milman, same page), tells us: "Jews and Christians were still, to a certain extent, confounded in the popular mind; and fear, political jealousy, and hatred do not sharpen the powers of just discrimination." How could this be so unless some things were held in common, as e.g. the covenants, prophecies, the idea of a Messiah and Kingdom, etc.

It is also noticeable that Chiliasts were persecuted when they rejected the claims of pretended Messiahs among the Jews. Thus e.g. when Barchocheba claimed to be the promised Messiah (A.D. 136), and raised the extensive revolt against the Romans, it is said that he endeavored to persuade the Christians—*when Chiliasm abounded*—to join him. But they, deeply imbued with the claims *of Jesus* to the Messiahship, with the past fulfilment of prophecy, with the predictions relating to *the manner* of establishing the Kingdom (as e.g. to be preceded by a resurrection of saints, etc.), refused to identify themselves with such a movement, and were, in consequence, cruelly persecuted by him.

Obs. 4. This, again, is sustained by the apostles' argumentation with the Jews. Aside from the usage of Jewish phraseology, without explaining it as moderns do; apart from the action of the apostles in Council (Acts 15), which cannot be made to accord with *the later* notions of the Kingdom; —it is found that the apostles *never* were compelled to combat the Jewish idea of the Messiah, or of the Kingdom. We have a noted instance of this in Paul, who disputed with the Jews (e.g. Acts 28 : 17–29), "*expounded and testified the Kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets.*" He speaks of "*the hope of Israel,*" "*preaching the Kingdom of God,*" and never once intimates that the Jews *were mistaken* in their views of the Kingdom as derived from the Covenant. The dispute (as we find e.g. Acts 26 : 1–23) was *not* concerning the Kingdom, but respected "*Jesus of Nazareth,*" whether He indeed be the Messiah.

This is so fully admitted by numerous writers that, on the ground of a future change being intended in the idea of the Kingdom, the charge of deception and perversion is urged against Paul by some (as e.g. the Duke of Somerset), while others gravely inform us that the Jews, owing to prejudice, etc., were unprepared for the truth, and hence Paul *accommodated* himself to their weakness. But all this lowers apostolic integrity and authority. The simple facts are as presented in the record: the Kingdom in the Jewish mind is the great object of hope, and therefore, in preaching to Jews it must be made prominent; this Paul does according to the manner in which it is covenanted and predicted, and then goes on to show that "Jesus of Nazareth," *even the Crucified One*, is the Messiah to establish the covenanted Kingdom at His Sec. Coming. In evidence of this, appeal must necessarily be made to the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus, the postponement of the Kingdom, the Second Advent, the prophecies illustrative of these things, the pre-eminent qualifications of Jesus as Messiah, etc. For, if it can be shown that Jesus *is truly* "*the Messiah,*" *then* the rest follows as a natural result—the Jew sees *how* the Kingdom can, and will, come, the covenant itself being renewed and confirmed by His death and resurrection.

PROPOSITION 74. *The belief in the speedy Advent of Christ, entertained both by the Apostles and the churches under them, indicates what Kingdom was believed in and taught by the first Christians.*

If it can be shown that the apostles and their converts believed in a speedy Advent, that they looked for it near at hand, as immediate and impending sooner or later, *then it follows* that the Alexandrian modern view of the Kingdom *could not* have been entertained by them. They then, of necessity, owing to the shortness of time intervening, must have linked the Kingdom they proclaimed with the Sec. Advent (e.g. 2 Tim. 4 : 1, etc.).

Let the student carefully consider this Prop. and following Obs. and notes, and he will find it logically proving that the Church-Kingdom view, and all other theories opposed to the Primitive one advocated by us, are radically wrong and unscriptural. Otherwise we are driven to the conclusion, that *inspired men*, the *founders* of the Ch. Church, were *in gross error*, and taught things irreconcilable with the idea of their mission and the perpetuity of their work; or that, in other words, directed by the Spirit and specially consecrated to proclaim the Kingdom of God, they still *totally failed* to appreciate the labor designed for them. By our line of argument, the intelligence, integrity, and authority of the apostles *are fully sustained;* by our opponents' concessions and abject apologies in their behalf, they are in these particulars correspondingly degraded. Infidelity looks on and laughs—laughs at our credulity, but still more loudly laughs at the straits and subterfuges resorted to by our opponents to save the credibility and inspired ascendency of the apostles. Every writer of ability and learning—whatever theory he may adopt respecting the Kingdom—acknowledges the apostolic and early belief in a speedy Sec. Advent. We append a few: Rothe (*Dogmatic*, 2 P. p. 58) remarks: "The apostles *unanimously expected the return of Christ*, to enter upon this Kingdom (Chiliastic) on earth." Donaldson (editor of *Ante-Nicene Library*), in his *His. Ch. Doc. and Lit.*, vol. 2, p. 261, declares, respecting the Pre-Mill. doctrine advocated by Justin: "The opinion just adduced is one in which *the whole Church* shared. *All expected Christ to appear on earth*, to raise His saints, to grant them the possession of the earth, and to bless them with uninterrupted happiness." Schaff (*His. Apos. Church*, p. 275) speaks of "*the expectation of the speedy return of Christ in glory*, as "probably one of Paul's favorite themes; that he exhorts the Thessalonians "to be *always ready* to meet the Lord, who shall come unexpectedly, like a thief in the night, and warns them, for this very reason, among other errors, against presuming to calculate the day and hour of His appearing." Similar testimony will be quoted in following Props. We now give one from an unbeliever—many such exist—who presents a historical statement with the purpose of lowering the teaching of the N. Test. and Patristic theology. Fiske ("The Christ of Dogma," in *The Unseen World*, p. 112) says: "The doctrine of the Messiah's Second Coming was also received without opposition, and for about a century (?) men lived in continual anticipation of that event, until hope long deferred produced its usual results; the writings in which that event was predicted were gradually explained away, ignored, or stigmatized as uncanonical; and the church ended by condemning as a heresy the very doctrine which Paul and the Judaizing apostles, who agreed in little else, had alike made the basis of their speculative teachings." Alas! how true in many respects is this presentation, and how merited the sarcastic allusion to the church's departure from "the old paths," once trodden in faith and hope. (Fiske's statement is a revamping of Gibbon's, ch. 15, *Decl. and Fall.*) So Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 266), in view of this, says that

"The first Christian generation lived entirely upon expectations and dreams," but that it required "more than a century" for the church to disengage itself (however, p. 251, more or less held afterward) from such views and "a fantastic Kingdom of God."

Obs. 1. Let any one, for a moment, consider the covenanted and prophetic portrayal of the Messianic Kingdom here on earth—its extension, universality, blessing, etc.,—and then regard the comparative brief period (in expectancy), allowed for the Advent by the Primitive church, and *it becomes absurd* to crowd the fulfilment of covenant and prophecy respecting that Kingdom *into the supposed brief period of time.* Take it for granted even, as we will show, that the apostles anticipated a longer time than their successors did to intervene; yet the very language, *expressive of shortness of time*, used by them still *amply sustains* our position. This expectancy of the Sec. Advent indicates (1) that they had *no idea* of an existing Messianic Kingdom; (2) that they looked for such a Kingdom *to follow* the anticipated Advent; (3) that they *did not regard* the church as the covenanted Kingdom, but as simply *provisionary.*

How strangely those who refuse to accept of the Primitive faith seek for apologies to shield their modern notions—to give them, if possible, an odor of traditional sanctity. Thus e.g. Pressense (*The Early Years of Christianity*, p. 407) says: "The destruction of Jerusalem was to have yet a further effect—it was to enlarge the views of the Christians as to the future of the church, and to give indefinite expansion to the horizon of prophecy. They had *until now* been living in daily expectation of the end of the world and the immediate return of Christ." He argues that, owing to this destruction, now Christians put off the Advent to the distant future, and that they believed "that a long future of conflict was before the church." To prove this last assertion he refers to "Hegisippus (Eusebius' *His. Eccl.* 2 : 32), relating that the Emperor Domitian, on questioning some Christians in Palestine (who were connected with the Saviour by ties of kindred) as to the Kingdom of Christ and His return, received this reply: 'His Kingdom is not an earthly kingdom or of this world, but a heavenly and angelic Kingdom, which will come in the fulness of the ages, when He shall return to judge the quick and the dead.'" But (1) *the indisputable fact* is, that the destruction of Jerusalem *greatly confirmed* the church *in its Millenarian* faith, for such a literal fulfilment of Christ's predictions led to an *increased belief* in His near coming and Kingdom. But this Pressense *himself*—contradicting his own theory—*fully admits*, when (p. 308) he says that "*the Millenarian doctrine became in the second century so widely diffused.*" Hence it was not the destruction of Jerusalem that checked it, but the later Alexandrian opposition. (2) In reference to the alleged proof, it is only necessary to say that it is the very language that *a Millenarian* can hold, who, for prudential reasons, does not enter into details—seeing that every Millenarian holds it to be *a Theocratic Kingdom of Divine institution*, etc., "which will come in the fulness of the ages." (Comp. Prop. 73, note.)"

Obs. 2. The Scriptures abundantly testify to this belief in *a near Advent*, and all of the apostles testify to the same, as e.g. Paul, Rom. 13 : 11, 12; Phil. 4 : 5; Heb. 10 : 25, 36, 37; Tit. 2 : 13, etc.; James 5 : 7–9; Peter, 1 Pet. 4 : 7; John, Apoc. 22 : 12, 20, etc. The most eminent writers, believers and unbelievers, *candidly acknowledge* this feature, however they may differ in accounting for it. It is doing violence to deny that which is so plainly stated. Neander (*Ad. to His. Plant. of Ch. Church*, vol. 2, p. 65, Bohn's Ed.) urges the fact that the apostles *did not look for* the conversion of the world *but for* the speedy Advent of Christ, and remarks: "*Every unprejudiced reader* of the New Test. *cannot fail to perceive* that such an expectation filled the souls of the apostles." Then showing how this view affected their notion of the church, he adds:—"It was not the idea of a renovated time that Christianity first attempted to realize, but everything appeared only as a point of transition to a new,

heavenly, eternal order of things which would commence *at the Sec. Advent.*"

We admire the candor of Neander, who so frankly gives us what is antagonistic to his own system. For additional statements on the Apostolic belief in the nearness of the Advent, see e.g. vol. 2, p. 5, his *Antignosticus, or the Spirit of Tertullian*, p. 251, *Com. on James*, Eng. tr., p. 106, etc. (comp. Prop. 49, Obs. 7, note 1). Prof. Bush (*Mill.*, p. 23), in referring to the early church looking for the Sec. Advent, says: "For aught we know, in fact, *the apostles themselves* might have been of the prevailing belief, as we have met with no reasoning which convinces us that they always understood the full reach and import of their own writings." (Thus the apostles are, to sustain a theory, reckoned ignorant of their own language! And these too are inspired men!) Renan (*Life of Paul*, p. 250) tells us: "The two Syriac words *Maran-atha* (the Lord is about to come) became *the watchword* of the Christians among themselves; the short, animated expression, which they passed from one to another *to encourage themselves* in their hoping." The *Westm. Review* (Oct., 1861, Art. 5, p. 249) declares: "Gradually there grew up in the early Christian community, grounded, it may be, on half-remembered sayings of the crucified Jesus, *an expectation of a Second Advent*, in which, as the mysterious being announced by Daniel, the rejected Hero of the human race *should reappear*, throned on a white cloud, to overthrow the last representative of the impious world Empire, and to institute the eternal Kingdom, so long desired, so often announced, so repeatedly postponed." The reader scarcely need be reminded that such quotations might be indefinitely extended. The sarcasm of the infidel and the reluctant, apologetic admissions of believers form a mass of material interesting to the investigator, but too unwieldy for our limits. In our researches we confess to surprise and pain that such a writer as Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 272) should sarcastically write of the early believers in this rude style: calling them "men who remained *quietly at home, waiting the Sec. Coming of the Lord, instead* of going forth to meet Him on the grand highway of human history." It will be a blessed lot, if Reuss, either in abundant labors or in journeyings for the good of man, will be found *equal* to many of the men that he ridicules.

That the apostles believed in a speedy Advent is the opinion of Hodge (*Sys. Div.*, vol. 3, p. 876), Olshausen (*Com.*, makes the extreme that even Paul expected to live until the Advent, vol. 4, p. 399, vol. 5, p. 280), Conybeare and Howson (*Life*, etc., *of St. Paul*, vol. 1, p. 401), Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, p. 333, etc.), Meyer's *Com.*, and Coms. generally. But Rees' Cyclop., Art. Mill., following the guiding of Whitby, asserts, without *a particle of proof* to sustain it, (1) that the apostles never believed in this personal reign of Christ or in Chiliasm (over e.g. against first preaching of Kingdom, and Acts 1 : 6); and (2) "that the apostles never entertained the delightful hope of seeing their Master coming into the world again" (which is too sweeping, unless we confine it, as the writer probably intended, to their day or lifetime; this, as we shall show, may be true, and yet does not affect our argument). Hase (*His. Ch. Church*, ch. 2, s. 43), to weaken the antiquity and authority of our doctrine, remarks on "Ecclesiastical Life:" "All hope of an earthly Theocracy was apparently destroyed by the death of Jesus, but Christians generally believed that Christ *was to return* to the world a second time, and many indulged the hope that they would live to witness His advent. This faith gave birth to the boldest expectations, partaking generally of a sensuous character, and while it seemed *a national necessity and a religious consolation to the Jewish*, it was a source of anxiety and perplexity to the Grecian congregations." To this we briefly reply: (1) The correspondence with Jewish faith is acknowledged; (2) a Theocracy on earth was postponed to the Sec. Advent; (3) this made the Advent itself so desirable; (4) many of the alleged "sensuous" expectations are only such to those who *spiritualize* the covenants and predictions; (5) that *the Grecian*, as well as the Jewish, congregations *loved* this Advent, and had correct views concerning it; (6) that Hase contradicts himself as to the universality and effect of the belief, as we shall show hereafter *by quotations from him*. Hagenbach (*His. of Doc.*, sec. 75), usually careful in his statements, falls into an error, when speaking of the Apologetic era extending to A.D. 254, saying: "The disciples of Christ having received from their Master the promise of the Second Coming, the first Christians *looked for* this event as near at hand, in connection with *the general* resurrection of the dead and the final judgment." The facts are, as he himself afterward particularizes, that the doctrine of a general resurrection was *of later* origin, developed by the Alexandrian school; the first Christians, as far as known, not advocating it, but holding to a first and second resurrection. Hagenbach impartially vindicates Justin holding to two separate resurrections, declaring (p. 214) "that Chiliasm did not come into the orthodox Church through Cerinthus," that (p. 215)

"Justin (*Dial.*, p. 306), writing at the time of Papias, says that it was *the general faith of all orthodox Christians;* and that only the Gnostics did not share it (comp. Irenæ. 5 : 25, 26, Tertul. c. Marc. 3 : 24)." He then quotes Giesseler's (*Ch. His.*, 1, 156, Dog., p. 231) emphatic declaration, that "in all the works of this period (the first two centuries) *Millenarianism is so prominent that we cannot hesitate to consider it as universal in an age* when such sensuous motives were certainly not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity." (Thus making "sensuous" error *necessary* to sustain the martyrs!) Hagenbach, to save his own Church theory, and give it some kind of ancient support, endeavors to weaken Giesseler's statement by saying: "Compare, however, the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch, in none of which Millenarian notions are propounded." Macdill ("The Instructor," May, 1879) reproduces this assertion, and says "no traces" of our doctrine are to be found in them. This is *misleading and unfair*, as will appear in a brief reply: (1) these writers have left but *little* concerning their views on Eschatology, and that little *corresponds* with Pre-Mill. views; (2) the correspondence is so great that *many of our opponents concede* these Fathers to us, as we shall show under Prop. 75; (3) the simple fact *they all looked for a speedy Advent is pre-eminently* in our favor; (4) they do not give *the slightest hint* of being opposed to our views; (5) they present *no trace* of the modernized notions; (6) the general statements of Irenæus, Justin, and Tertullian respecting the universality of our belief *includes them*, for otherwise—being prominent Fathers—an exception would have been indicated; (7) the burden of showing *by direct* quotations from them, that they were not Millenarian, *has never* been assumed by any critic or writer. Our opponents, by a resort to such subterfuges, making the impression on the ignorant that these men were in opposition to Millenarianism, only evidence *the weakness* of their cause. A scholar certainly will not permit himself to be deceived in this manner by *so shallow* an artifice, unworthy of the men who produce them.

Obs. 3. A number of ways have been devised to meet and interpret these expectations of a near Advent. (1) To receive them as the truth; (2) to designate them as "Jewish fables;" (3) to pronounce them mere human utterances, designed for a purpose, and unworthy of credence; (4) to call them "a husk," which contains a germ of truth to be afterward developed; (5) to define them as an accommodation to a transition period; (6) to hold them forth as longings inspired by enthusiasm and love for Christ; (7) to explain them as denoting an expected spiritual, instead of a personal, coming; (8) to interpret them as indicative of an anticipated providential coming in judgment. The system of interpretation adopted by us (Prop. 4), and the principles underlying the same (Props. 5, 9, 16, 17, etc.), exclude all these methods of explanation excepting the first.

It is not necessary to examine these theories in detail, seeing that our argument, as we proceed, fully meets them. Some few, as Noyes, the "Perfectionists," etc., hold that the Sec. Coming took place about 40 years after the crucifixion; others that (as Prince, Thomas, etc.) it was to be manifested in themselves; while still others contend that Christ, in some way unexplained, had come or was to come in and through them, either spiritually or by the conference of power, etc. The latter view is found in some mystical sects, who have even gone so far as to claim that, in virtue of such a coming, the New Heavens and New Earth, the New Jerusalem itself, was to be created and erected by themselves, or else was manifested through themselves (e.g. Swedenborgians, Shakers, etc.). We only now refer to a strange effort on the part of Pressense (*The Early Days of Christianity*, p. 308) to make the impression that Millenarianism *arose* in the Thessalonian church, and was from thence disseminated. He says: "The Thessalonians were in daily expectation" (see Prop. 160) "of the return of the Saviour, 1 Thess. 4 : 11, 2 Thess. 2 : 2, and 3 : 10. This was *the first manifestation* of the Millenarian doctrine, which became in the second century so widely diffused, and so strongly imbued with Judaistic elements." This is flatly contradicted (1) by *the Scriptural basis* of our doctrine; (2) by the history of it *among the Jews*, and its existence *at the First Advent;* (3) by the history of the doctrine in *the church at* Jerusalem (as e.g. the teaching of James in the Council); (4) by its history *in all* the churches as given in these Propositions; (5) by the teaching of the apostles, as Pressense himself admits, concerning the near-

ness of the Advent, etc. ;* (6) by the fact that this teaching of Millenarianism had permeated *the whole church* before the Gospels and Epistles were given, for otherwise we cannot account for its universality, as testified to in these pages by eminent men of all shades of opinion. Pressense, by this effort to give it an earthly and fanatical parentage, is *not candid*. We can well imagine, if he had been in Paul's place, what a letter *he would have written* to these Millenarian Thessalonians, censuring them for starting a doctrine found in God's oath-bound covenants, and the subject of a thousand prophecies.

Obs. 4. Among those who are believers in a literal Sec. Advent, various theories are proposed by way of explanation. Fairbairn's (*On Proph.*, p. 445) idea is, "that the real explanation of the matter lies in their singular *strength* of faith, and which led them, in a manner, to overleap the gulf of ages, to identify the present with the future, and to realize great events, whether near or remote, in their pressing magnitude and importance." But we see in this *far more* than mere faith and personal presentation of the truth. Neander's notion (*Com. on James*, p. 106) that it arose from a longing desire of the Apostolic church in a "transition point," and (*Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 65) that it was natural for them to do so, *not yet being fully acquainted* with the truth ; and Olshausen's view (*Com.*, vol. 2, p. 222) of its being *an accommodation* to Old Test. language, inspired by the lively ardor and desire of the Apostles :—these give but *a low estimate* of inspiration, and make the wishes and circumstances of the Apostles *the criterion* of truth. Olshausen also (*Com.*, Matt. 24) suggests that the predictions of Christ's speedy coming are conditional, being dependent on the repentance of those to whom they were addressed. But the positive language in which they are couched, and the events, continuous, connected with them *forbids* such a view (Prop. 18), which otherwise, with varied and constant repetition, would be well adapted to lead astray. The Apostles in their public and private instructions never give the least hint that it is to be thus understood, and none of their hearers or immediate successors entertained such a notion. There is, however, force in the suggestion, as we shall show, if the number of the elect is taken into consideration. Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, p. 126) says : "*It cannot be denied* that the Lord

* We give an illustration from the same work (p. 286) which involves singular contradictions, viz. : it makes Paul in the earlier part of his career the author of our doctrine, but which he afterward modified : "The views of the apostle (Paul) as to the nearness of the closing period of history, which is to be inaugurated by the personal return of Christ, seem to have undergone *some modifications*. In the first stage of His apostolic career He supposes, *with all the Christians of that time*, that but a very few years will intervene before the coming of the day of the Lord ; he is even persuaded that it will arrive before his own death, 1 Thess. 4 : 15. Subsequently, in the Roman prison, on the eve of sealing his testimony with his blood, he receives *new light*. This is very evident from his Epistle to the Philippians, Phil. 1 : 20-25. He learns before his death that centuries are to be granted to the Church for the fulfilment of its work, and for sowing the seed of the Gospel in the vast field opened to missionary labor." Observe, however, (1) he *contradicts* his statement respecting the Thessalonians ; (2) he allows *the universality* of belief ; (3) he makes Paul, specially enlightened, *guilty* of propagating error ; (4) he misapprehends Paul's allusion to nearness and his own death, Obs. 4 ; (5) there was *no such change* of view in the Roman prison, the passage referred to not giving *the slightest hint* of a change of view in the nearness of the Advent ; (6) if Paul was thus favored with a change, *why not* extend it to all the apostles, e.g. John, who repeated the nearness and warning respecting it ; (7) neither Paul nor any of the apostles believed in "the closing period of history, which is to be inaugurated by the personal return of Christ"—this is Pressense's view, derived from *spiritualistic* sources—Paul (Rom. 11, etc.) believed a grand history was only then to commence.

throughout His teaching, as well as in His last eschatological discourses, represents His coming as very near at hand. This was the natural consequence of the prophetic form of conception, in which the difference of time and space falls into the background, the exhortation to watchfulness and active labor receiving greater force from reference to the near, unexpected, and decisive future." There is propriety in the reason thus assigned, but it does *not cover* the entire ground, failing to tell us *why* this is "the prophetic form of conception."

To indicate how the leaven of infidelity is working, see the Art. of Rev. Dr. Buckley in the *Independent* (Dec., 1878), on "The Proph. Conference." He admits that the apostles frequently refer to the nearness of the Sec. Advent, saying, however, "As a result of this extraordinary language and other causes, *the apostles and early Christians fell into the error* of supposing that Christ's final coming would take place before that generation should pass away," and he quotes Isaac Watts and Albert Barnes to show that *the apostles* were in error. Now if these *inspired* men were in error on so important a point, what assurance have we that they are *not equally* in error on other important matters? We venture to say that on a missionary platform, advocating the conversion of the world by the present instrumentalities, Buckley will totally overlook this assertion of his, and eulogize the apostolic conceptions of the extent and perpetuity of their work in this Whitbyan direction. Watson (*Apol. for Christianity*) takes the same view of error, and then presents this exceedingly lame apology in behalf of the apostles: "Their *mistake* in this respect ought not in any wise *to diminish* their authority as preachers of the Gospel." Why not? Preachers, *appointed* to preach the Kingdom, *specially enlightened* to proclaim the truth, affirming that they received and gave *only that* which is true, to delude a vast body of believers by express affirmations, which are only "personal conjectures," "mistakes," "errors of judgment," and all this is in no wise to diminish our confidence in their authority, etc.? The apology is *self-contradictory and insulting* to the apostles. Better make none than to give one which *degrades* apostolic teaching, bringing them to an uninspired level. Beecher (*Ch. Union*, Sep. 5, 1877), in a sermon on "The Future Life," says: "He (Paul) expected to see Christ in this world before he departed; and all the apostles believed that they should; and there are some in our day who believe that they shall. I think that you will see Christ; but you will see Him on the other side. You will go to Him, He will not come to you. And your going to Christ will be spiritual, and not carnal. But the faith of the apostles, and of others, was that they should see Christ in their day. In this matter, however, they were *mistaken*. They believed that which facts and time overthrew. Their conviction was founded on a misinterpretation of the language of our Master." Alas! when eminent ministers thus deliberately degrade the apostles! What *then* becomes of the prayer and assurance of Jesus that they should be led into the truth? What value *then* can be placed upon the special bestowment of the Spirit to guard them against error? What assurance have we that they are not in error on other important points? No! never can we receive such dishonoring sentiments; and a system of faith which needs them is most certainly defective.

Obs. 5. The announcements made of a near Advent in such phrases, "*the Lord is at hand*," "*the coming of the Lord draweth nigh*," etc., has excited the ridicule of infidels as evidence of grave error; has provoked, in some instances, from professed believers reluctant acknowledgments of "mistakes," and, in other cases, lamely produced apologies derived from the personal status of the Apostles. The *real ground* for the usage of such language has been too much overlooked. A remarkable feature in this contest over the expressions and meaning of the Apostles is the following: unbelievers and believers both refer to the fact that the language is given in *the old Jewish prophetic form*. The ancient prophets (as e.g. Isa., Joel), spoke of the promised Salvation, the day of the Lord, the Coming of the Mighty One, as being near, close at hand, etc., when the fulfilment of prophecy shows *that centuries upon centuries* must intervene

before it is fully realized. No one has *objected to these forms* of prophetic expression, on the ground that they represented remote events as near because it was reasonably supposed that such phraseology was *in strict accordance* with a professed prophetic revelation given in *the largeness of time which must characterize the utterances of the Spirit of God. Precisely so* with the Sec. Advent; being a doctrine given by *the self-same Spirit*, it would *illy correspond* with His *previous utterances* to pronounce *it remote*, even if many (according to human measure of time) centuries intervened. For the latter, although distant to man, would not be so with God, to whom "*one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.*" We must, therefore, judge the Apostles' language, *not by a human, but by the Divine standard.* The Spirit—if of God,—does not measure time as we do; and it *is only fair and honest* to weigh expressions regarding time *given under the direction of that Spirit by the largeness of view* which characterizes God Himself. If the Spirit in the consciousness of Omniscience, Omnipresence, Eternity, the Infinite,—of previously given declarations corresponding to these,—had in the prophetic announcements of the Apostles employed, even to designate thousands of years, the language (to accord with human ideas) "remote," "far distant," "long time," etc., unbelievers would, probably, be *the very first* to point out the *inconsistency* of such phraseology with the Divine attributes, and justly claim that such expressions are *indicative of human infirmity.* We hold, consequently, that the declarations of the Apostles respecting the nearness of the Advent, *are in strict accordance with the truth*, and that, in themselves properly apprehended, they contain *decided evidence* of the Spirit having given them. And, as they sustain an intimate relation to *the perfection* of the Spirit, they cannot be interpreted, without undue violence, as an accommodation to human imperfection.

God's Word is not man's that presents this nearness; hence God, and not man, informs us according to *His own view*, whether it is near or distant. To God it is but a brief period, and this principle relating to time still future is recorded in various Scriptures. Thus e.g. that long (to man) period of Jewish tribulation, extending from the Babylonian Captivity down to Christ, down to our own times, is called in Isa. 54 : 7, "*a small moment.*" This whole dispensation is called "*a day*," etc. Now, the Primitive Church, after the apostles, instead of grasping this Divine mode of speaking, took the language as if characteristic of man's ideas of nearness, and apprehended this nearness as imminent, impending. What possibly increased this feeling in the early churches was the adoption of the defective (Sept.) chronology, by which it was supposed that nearly six thousand years had elapsed, and the Sabbatism was expected (compare candid remarks of Prof. Bush, *On Mill.*, p. 23 and p. 4). But against this, it may be alleged, that the apostles looked for the Advent during their lifetime. In answer, see Obs. 8. Two additional points may be suggested: (1) Prophetic time, either as to beginning, or ending, or both, is reserved by God as specially pertaining to Himself, and, therefore, any references to such time will be given according *to God's own estimate of time.* (2) The language is also adapted to the capability of salvation. Before the Advent and Kingdom appears, a certain predetermined number of the elect must first be gathered. As the destined seed of Abraham is raised up, the work, which to human estimation is a long one, to God is but a short one, and will be—to use the Spirit's estimate—speedily accomplished. Hence we can, and do, receive the comments of unbelievers, etc., excepting their deductions that the apostles were mistaken. Thus e.g. the author of *The Beginning of Christianity* (p. 366) says in reference to the speedy Advent: "This expectation is expressed by all the apostles in terms which fairly admit of no other interpretation. It is found in Paul (Rom. 13 : 11, 12; 1 Cor. 7 : 29–31; and 10 : 11; Phil. 4 : 5; 1 Tim. 6 : 14)." "The same expectation is expressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews (10 : 25, 37); in the Epistle of James (5 : 3, 8); in the Epistles of Peter (1 Pet. 4 : 7; 2 Pet. 3 : 3); in the first Epistle of John (2 : 18); and in the Apocalypse (1 : 1; and 2 : 11; and 22 : 7, 12, 20). To put any other construction on

these passages, as if *the parousia* to which they refer was anything else than the Sec. Advent of the Lord to Judgment, would introduce a dangerous license in the interpretation, and one which might be employed to subvert the principal doctrines of the Christian system. Under the general expectation of the apostles, mistaken though it might prove to be in the one particular of time, there lay a fundamental truth." From our standpoint, the apostles need no apology for employing such language ; for its use proves them to have been inspired.

Obs. 6. In accord with the truthfulness of the Divine statements in reference to time, a decided advantage is derived from them in the form given. The estimate of nearness given by God Himself, in measuring prophetic periods, throws around the Sec. Advent *a purposed indefiniteness*, a sufficiency of uncertainty, an impression that it may be near, to be conducive to watchfulness and piety, to excite vigilance, energy and labor, to impart wisdom, prudence and character, to incite to patient, diligent and faithful study. The evidently designed chasms in chronology, the selection of signs which more or less attend the history of centuries, the concealment of the number of the elect, the withholding the day and the hour, the speaking of things present owing to their certainty of arrival, although still future, the brevity of dispensations when compared with the ages of eternity,—these are all in the same line, suggestive that time is given to present *motives* of caution and action.

The salutary influence of this style of prediction in the first centuries has been admitted by infidels (e.g. Gibbon, etc.), by believers (e.g. Bush, etc.), and, we are told, was eminently adapted to confirm the early Christians under persecution. But it is just as available, just as hope and strength imparting to-day as ever ; and many, who sympathize with us or who reject our doctrine, forcibly acknowledge this feature. We append two illustrations. Van Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, sec. 29), speaking of Peter and the apostles generally looking for the Advent, remarks : " The day of the Lord's Parousia, not more nearly defined by the Lord Himself, remained and remains a point of individual expectation, upon which only time can shed the true light. If Peter shared in this respect the expectation of the whole apostolic age, the event which he looked for *remains not the less* the object of expectation for all future ages, and the hope commended by him is still *an inexhaustible fountain of consoling and sanctifying influence.*" Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 77) says : " The day itself was, therefore, purposely left in concealment ; it remained among the undiscovered secrets of the Godhead, and nothing more than probable and proximate signs were given of its approach, as of an event to be *ever expected and looked for*, yet never, as to the period of its actual occurrence, to be certainly foreknown." (Well may it be asked, *How* can Fairbairn reconcile his Millage of definite time to precede such an Advent, with the posture indicated by his language ?) Hence it becomes us, if we wish to imbibe the apostolic spirit portrayed, to occupy the attitude assumed by the apostles and their converts (comp. Prop. 182).

Obs. 7. In view of the inestimable purposes of Salvation connected with the Sec. Advent, the latter cannot be held up *too prominently*, being, as Holy Writ expresses it, " *the blessed hope.*" The nearness connected with the preciousness, makes the Advent so extremely desirable and the object of inspiring hope. Many who receive, and many who reject our doctrinal position, hold to the exceeding worth of this Advent, both to its imminency (may at any time occur), and to its desirableness (i.e. ought to be desired by the true believer).

Thus e.g. Lange (*Com.*, vol. 1, p. 433) says that it may occur " at any moment," and in various places speaks of its being the great object of heartfelt desire and hope. Neander (vol. 1, p. 182, *Ch. His.*) designates it as " fitted to be, not an object of dread, but of joyful, longing hope." So Barnes (*Com.*, 2 Pet. 3 : 12) and Dr. Brown of Glasgow (*Ch. Sec. Coming*) calling it " the polar star," besides a host of others (comp. Props.

173 and 182). Hence it is not correct to say, what a writer in *the Westminster Review* (Jan., 1873, p. 88) sneeringly asserts, viz.: that Christ represented His religion as "new wine," but "now it is old wine that has lost some of its original ingredients by evaporation," and among the things "evaporated" or lost he numbers "the anticipation, not to be laid aside for a moment, of *the immediate return* of Christ." Admitting that multitudes have removed, ignored, or perverted this doctrine, yet it is also true (aside from its unchangeable relationship to the Word) that many, even of our opponents, cordially receive it while *antagonistic* to their own system of belief—i.e. to their Millennial theory.

Obs. 8. To invalidate the credibility of the Apostles, some allege (even believers, as Olshausen, etc.) that "the apostles expected the return of Jesus in their lifetime." But this remains *unproven*, being only *inferred* from the phrase (1 Thess. 4 : 15) "*we*, which are alive and remain," and from the account given by John 21 : 22, 23. But the former, *as afterward* explained in the Second Epistle, and the latter as evidenced by John's *own interpretation* (v. 23), and afterward by the events delineated in the Apoc., *forbid* such an inference.

The "we" appears only indicative of *fellow-believers*, of Christians who should be successors—for the exhibition of the apostasy and Antichrist by Paul (including a series of events not to be compressed in a lifetime), the portrayal of future events in the Apoc. by John which were to transpire previously, the allusions to their own coming death as something to occur before the expected Advent—are *sufficient evidence* that the apostles, under the guidance of the Spirit, regarded the period of the Advent as indefinite in the future to follow certain events, which they knew (as seen by references to their own departure) were not to take place during their lifetime. (The passage Mark 9 : 1, Matt. 16 : 28, Luke 9 : 27, will be noticed in Prop. 153, on the Transfiguration.) One of the editors (either Dr. Brown or Dr. Valentine) in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1874, in Art. "Did the Apostles expect the Sec. Coming of Christ in their own day?" ably answers the unwarranted deductions of Olshausen, Oosterzee, Meyer, and others, conclusively showing that they did not anticipate the Advent *before* their own departure. This Art., overlooking what we have stated in relation to the Spirit's estimate of time, gives the following solution to the language employed: "The apparent nearness of this event may result from its transcendent importance and its relations to us as individuals. In such a matter the element of time is almost lost sight of, and we stand as in the presence of the august reality." This is enforced by illustrations and a quotation from Lange (*Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 81, 82).

Obs. 9. The apostles, *after* the res. and ascension of Jesus, *never used* the formula "*the Kingdom of heaven is at hand;*"—thus accepting of the change in the manner of Christ's teaching (Prop. 58, etc.), and linked by the phraseology adopted (Prop. 71, etc.), *the Kingdom with the Sec. Advent.* For, instead of the previous formula, they now tell us that "*the Coming of the Lord draweth nigh,*" "*the Lord is at hand,*" etc. They guard us thus, by the very choice of words, against the notion that the Kingdom *was already* established, or that it possibly could be set up *during the absence* of the King. Under the former preaching, Jesus being present, the Kingdom was announced; under the apostolic, Jesus being absent and the Kingdom postponed, *His Coming again, as the requisite prelude, is prominently proclaimed.*

A singular feature which has attracted the critical student is this: Owing to the belief in the speedy coming, the rapid development of Antichrist and his overthrow, the expected approach of the anticipated Kingdom, the history of the Church for several generations is, notwithstanding the progress made, almost a blank on questions now regarded as highly important, as e.g. those relating to church government, the exact progress, triumphs, and conflicts of Christianity. So much is this the case, that the first and second centuries have become a kind of battle-field between the various theories

of church government. No documents, such as appeared later, defining forms, looking toward perpetuity, etc., appeared. This very state—this very lack—supports our position. Uhlhorn (*Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, p. 337) refers to this, saying: "The Coming of the Lord was then believed to be quite near, and this hope dominated the whole life. No provision was made *for a long continuance* of the Church on earth, and all efforts were exclusively directed toward remaining in the world without spot till the day of Christ's Coming." (To which we add: and to urge others to receive this Jesus and be saved, for the spread of the Gospel indicates their missionary zeal, *not* as Reuss (Prop. 74, Obs. 2, note) has it that they stayed "*at home*," etc.)

Obs. 10. The Apostles occupied the very position regarding the Sec. Advent, *enjoined by the Divine Master;* to have employed any other language (e.g. in accord with modern ideas) than that used, would have been *a violation of His commands* (as e.g. presented Matt. chs. 24 and 25).

In the Scriptures referred to, in connection with the exhortations to watchfulness, we find an epitomized history of events running *from* the destruction of Jerusalem *down to* the Advent, and, in strict accordance with our argument, it gives *no hint, not even the slightest*, of a Kingdom until the period of the Advent arrives. The declarations of Jesus and those of the apostles are in harmony. The same will be found in other respects as we advance in the argument. If the modern views engrafted on the New Test. are correct, then we ought to find, instead of these exhortations, that "the coming of the Church in greater power and glory draws nigh," with cautions not to look and watch for the Advent, but for larger and still larger triumphs of the Church. The two positions are *utterly antagonistic*, and it is absurd to endeavor to blend them together. Either the New Test. teaches the one or the other—both are *irreconcilable* unless violence is done to the language. Let the critical student answer the following question, and it will be decisive: If inspired apostles were in error respecting the Sec. Advent, so that they could not locate with their views of it (as conceded by our opponents, as quoted) a conversion of the world, or even a long-extended missionary work with it, *what would* such inspired men, who professed to understand the prophecies, *do with* e.g. Ps. 22 : 27, 28, and a thousand similar predictions? Does it not, consistently and logically, follow, that if in their estimation fulfilled at all, *they must of necessity* be realized *after* the Sec. Advent, as held by the Primitive Church, and not *before* that Advent, seeing that they give no room for the same?

PROPOSITION 75. *The doctrine of the Kingdom, as held by the churches established by the Apostles, was perpetuated.*

This was done by the Apostolic Fathers, by succeeding Christian Fathers, and by other writers in the church. The same is corroborated by Jewish and Pagan authors, and also by Apocryphal books.

What Buckle (*His. Civil.*, vol. 1, p. 215) says of truth in general is applicable to that pertaining to this Kingdom: "No great truth which has once been found has ever afterward been lost."

Obs. 1. Our doctrine is traced *continuously* from the Apostles themselves, seeing that (Prop. 72, Obs. 3, note 1) the first Fathers, who present Millenarian views, saw and conversed either with the Apostles or the Elders following them. So extensively, so generally was Chiliasm perpetuated, that Justin Martyr *positively asserts that all the orthodox* adopted and upheld it. Justin's language is explicit (*Dial. with Trypho*, sec. 2); for after stating the Chiliastic doctrine, he asserts: "it to be *thoroughly proved* that it will come to pass. But I have also signified unto thee, on the other hand, that many—even those of that race of Christians *who follow not godly and pure doctrine—do not acknowledge it.*[1] For I have demonstrated to thee, that these are indeed *called* Christians; but are atheists and impious heretics, because that in all things they teach what is blasphemous, and ungodly, and unsound," etc. He adds: "But I and whatsoever Christians *are orthodox in all things* do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned and enlarged, according as Ezekiel, Isaiah, and other prophets have promised. For Isaiah saith of this thousand years (ch. 65 : 17) 'Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind; but be ye glad and rejoice in those which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem to triumph, and my people to rejoice," etc. Moreover, a certain man among us, whose name is *John, being one of the twelve apostles of Christ*, in that revelation which was shown to him prophesied, that those who believe in our Christ shall fulfil a thousand years at Jerusalem; and *after that* the general, and, in a word, the everlasting resurrection, and last judgment of all together. Whereof also *our Lord spake* when He said, that therein they shall neither marry, nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal with the angels, being made the sons of the resurrection of God."[2]

[1] This is the passage that has been tampered with in some MSS., the "not" being omitted (comp. Prop. 73, Obs. 3, note 2). For the genuineness of the passage, see e.g. Brooks' *El. of Proph. Interp.*, ch. 3. Semisch (Herzog's *Cyclop.*) remarks on it: "Chiliasm constituted in the sec. century *so decidedly an article of faith* that Justin held it up as a criterion of *perfect orthodoxy*." Numerous writers have made the same comment. This has, unfortunately, led some (as Shimeall, the Christadelphians, etc.) to apply it as a *measure* of orthodoxy at the present day. To avoid a wrong inference, we may add, that the criterion set up by Justin in his day might well answer the purpose at that

time, but is inapplicable to the present day. The reason is simple: those who rejected Chiliasm in Justin's time were also guilty of subverting *the essential, fundamental* doctrines of religion (and hence the force of his comparison), while this is not true of a large number of our opponents at this day. Such a comparison instituted, continued, and pressed, would be both illiberal and unjust (comp. Prop. 72, Obs. 1, note 2).

[2] Justin Martyr's testimony is *so overwhelming* that some of our opponents seek to break its force by various shifts, e.g. by disparaging the man, by advocating an interpolation, by silently passing him in the enumeration of Fathers, etc. Prof. Briggs, under the signature of "Westminster," in the *New York Evangelist*, professes to give an *utterly unfair and unscholarly* (as we shall prove again and again) history of Millenarianism. On the strength of Jerome omitting Justin's name in his list of Chiliasts, the Prof. jumps to *the sage* conclusion that Justin *was no Chiliast!* This is opposed by the writings of Justin, by all our standard Church historians, and by a multitude of able critics. It is conceded to us by numerous bitter and unrelenting opposers (such as Shedd, Prof. Stuart, Mosheim, etc.). The omission is readily accounted for by Mede (*Works*, p. 813), and by the character (Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 250, with which comp. Neander, Kurtz, etc.) of Jerome. To break the force of Justin's testimony by laying stress on general Eschatological expressions (which we can also cordially adopt), and avoiding the statements of Justin where he particularizes the order or manner of fulfilment, is correspondent with Briggs' entire series, which for unfairness, perversions, deliberate untruthfulness, and arrogance (in sadness we say it) bears off the palm. We only add: that Justin is far more competent (in view of the time he lived, his scholarship, his pre-eminence as an Apologist, his consistent Christian life sealed by martyrdom for the truth) to tell us what was "*the orthodox*' view in his day than "Westminster," with his heart filled with enmity and prejudice, is to-day. The reader will, we hope, dispassionately look at the evidence we give (much of it from learned and able opposers, who scorned to stoop to such devices), and then compare it with Prof. Briggs' reply to Dr. West. The latter asserted in "The Proph. Conference" (that met in Dr. Tyng's church in New York) that "a true Christian Chiliasm was *the orthodox faith* of the Primitive Church in its purest days." Briggs affirms that this is "unhistorical and false," and "that it was rejected among the earliest of heresies in its grosser forms and merely tolerated in its finer forms."

To give the reader a just idea (*in vindication* of the severity of our strictures) of the bigotry and intelligence of this "*heresy-hunter*," and his relish for "*bitter herbs*," as well as his charitable assumption of superiority and ecclesiastical authority, we reproduce this choice morsel: after threatening persecution, as against heretics, if Millenarians do not keep those views to themselves and desist in calling it "a vital doctrine," etc., his authoritative animus bursts forth as follows: "It depends entirely upon themselves what the future is to bring forth. If they will *abandon* their organization, *disband* their committee, *stop* their Bible and Prophetic Conferences, we doubt not that there will soon be a calm again, and they will remain undisturbed in their ecclesiastical relations; *but if* they are determined to go on in their aggressive movement, they will have only themselves to blame *if the storm should become a whirlwind that will constrain them to depart from the orthodox churches, and form another heretical sect.*" This is evidence that he, after all, has *not much* confidence in his one-sided argumentation, for if he trusted in the power of truth, he would not thus lose his temper, and speak of men (leaders) who are *pre-eminently superior* to himself in every qualification relating to scholarship, intelligence, usefulness, devotion to the service of the Master, etc. Suppose we should make such demands, and propose to secure "a calm" by asking them to abandon the publicity of their views, to stop their parade of the Whitbyan theory at missionary meetings, etc., they would *justly* pronounce it arrogant, claiming that views honestly and sincerely believed to be amply sustained by Scripture and history are not to be got rid of *by persecution*, but by solid Scriptural and historical reasoning. When argument is *weak* threats are resorted to in order *to prop* it up, thus repeating the painful history of the past. Do Post-Millenarians keep their views to themselves, as shown in thousands of books, pulpits, platform addresses, newspapers, Systematic Theologies, etc.? Can they justly ask us to refrain from giving equal prominency to our doctrine, if we deem it advisable, especially when we believe its proclamation to be *a God-commanded duty?* Would they make us, by threats of force, *dishonest* to conviction and *hypocritical* in belief?

Obs. 2. Numerous testimonies of friends might be adduced. A few are given by way of illustration (comp. those given under Props. 72–74).

Judge Jones, under the name "Philo-Basilicus" (*Lit.*, vol. 3, *Essays*, p. 73), says "*that all the Fathers*, whose writings have come down to us, previous to Origen, and some who were contemporary and subsequent to him, *believed this* (*Chiliastic*) *doctrine cannot be disproved.*"[1] Bh. Newton (*On Proph.*, p. 591–2) remarks: "In short the doctrine of the Millennium *was generally believed in the three first and purest ages*, and this belief, as the learned Dodwell hath justly observed, was one principal cause of the fortitude of the primitive Christians; they even coveted martyrdom, in hopes of being partakers of the privileges and glories of the martyrs in the first resurrection."[2]

[1] Shedd (*His. of Ch. Doc.*) endeavors to make the unfair impression that some of the Fathers, from whom we have but *a few fragments* of opinion, were not Chiliastic, saying that "there are no traces of Chiliasm in the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp." This is *uncandid:* (1) because their associates and followers were Chiliastic, and the language employed by the latter includes the former; (2) Justin's test of orthodoxy embraces them: (3) they allege in the fragments nothing against our doctrine, and much less anything favoring the modern (Prof. Shedd's) view; (4) they employ phraseology and language that can only *be justly* reconciled with a Chiliastic belief. In reference to their faith, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, Shimeall's *Reply to Shedd*, Seiss' *Last Times*, Ap. 2, etc., have quoted sufficiently from these writers to show that they were Chiliastic. Clement's allusion to "*preaching the Coming of Christ*," of Christ's Coming "*suddenly*" and "*quickly*," of "*every hour expecting the Kingdom of God* in love and righteous, because we know not *the day of God's appearing*;" Ignatius' speaking of "*the last times*," of "*expecting Him who is above all time*;" Polycarp's reference to "*reigning together with Him*;" all this, taking into consideration the prevailing usage, indicates what many, even hostile to us, admit, that they were Chiliasts. Shedd's idea is not only to unfairly represent our doctrine but to imply that the modern view *also prevailed*, of which there is not *the slightest trace*. Dr. Lillie, Dr. Brookes, and others, have rebutted his "singularly" (so Lillie) "inadequate, and I say it reluctantly, somewhat *unfair* chapter on Millenarianism." Prof. Shedd does not meet the issue, viz.: that it is "conceded that every one of the Apostolic Fathers, who says anything at all on the subject, is a Chiliast," but in view of the silence of some Fathers on the subject in *the very brief* writings of theirs in our possession, hastily concludes that this "tenet was not the received faith of the Church, certainly down to the year 150." The student will allow its "due weight" to such a conclusion, indicative of the fact that our historical position is pressing our opponents *sorely*, seeing that they can resort to such a method to weaken, if possible, its force (comp. Prop. 74, Obs. 2. note 1).

[2] Others are given for the student. Dr. Bennet (*Works*, vol. 2, p. 184): "The Millennial Kingdom of Christ was *the general doctrine* of the Primitive Church *from* the times of the apostles to the Council of Nice, inclusively." As the testimony of Millenarians might be regarded as partial or biased, the reader is merely referred to the following: Mede's *Works*. Greswell's *Exp. of the Parables*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, Brooks' *El. Proph. Interp.*, Seiss' *Last Times*, Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, Gill's *Com.*, Sir I. Newton *On Proph.*, Auberlen *On Proph.*, Bonar's *Apostolicity of Chiliasm*, Cox's *Millenarian's Answer*, besides many others. The following writers can also be advantageously quoted: Duffield, Bh. Henshaw, Tyng, Gaussen, Sherwin, Alstedius, Shaeffer, Maitland, Pym, McCaul, Brightman, Anderson, Manford, Bryant, Drummond, Hooper, Ogilvy, Homes, and others. Dr. West delivered a good paper on the "*His. of the Pre-Mill. Doctrine*" before the Proph. Conference at New York.

Obs. 3. The testimony of opponents (some having already been given, Props. 72–74) may properly be presented because impartial. We select for this purpose the originator and defender of the generally received view (comp. Prop. 175). Dr. Whitby (*Treatise on Tradition*) gives us the following often-quoted statement: "The doctrine of the Millennium, or the reign of saints on earth for a thousand years, is now rejected by all Roman Catholics, and by the greatest part of Protestants; and yet it passed among *the best Christians, for two hundred and fifty years, for a tradition apos-*

tolical; and, as such, is delivered by *many* Fathers of the second and third century, who speak of it as the tradition *of our Lord and His apostles*, and of *all the ancients* who lived before them; who tell us *the very words* in which it was delivered, *the Scriptures* which were then so interpreted; and say *that it was held by all Christians that were exactly orthodox.*" "It was received not only in the Eastern parts of the Church, by Papias (in Phrygia), Justin (in Palestine), but by Irenæus (in Gaul), Nepos (in Egypt), Apollinaris, Methodius (in the West and South), Cyprian, Victorinus (in Germany), by Tertullian (in Africa), Lactantius (in Italy), and Severus, and by the Council of Nice" (about A.D. 323). Even in his *Treatise on the Millennium*, in which he endeavors to set aside the ancient faith by his substitution of "*a new hypothesis*," he acknowledges, according to Justin and Irenæus, that (ch. 1, p. 61) there were "three sorts of men: (1) *The Heretics*, denying the resurrection of the flesh and the Millennium. (2) *The exactly orthodox*, asserting both the resurrection and the Kingdom of Christ on earth. (3) *The believers*, who consented with the just, and yet endeavored to allegorize and turn into a metaphor all those Scriptures produced for a proper reign of Christ, and who had sentiments *rather agreeing* with those heretics who denied, than those *exactly orthodox who maintained, this reign of Christ on earth.*"

Such evidence from Anti-Millenarians is cumulative. The reader may find it interesting to glance over others. Thus e.g. Bh. Taylor (*Liberty of Prophesying*, sec. 2) remarks (over against concessions made, as Brooks has noticed, in his Sermon on 1 Cor. 15 : 23): "that the doctrine of the Millenaries was in *the best ages* esteemed no heresy, but *true Catholic doctrine;* though since then it hath had justice (?) done it, and hath suffered a just (?) condemnation." Chillingworth (*Works*, p. 347), already referred to (Prop. 73, Obs. 1, note 2), says: "It appears manifest out of this book of Irenæus that the doctrine of the Chiliasts was in his judgment *apostolic tradition*, as also *it was esteemed* (for aught appears to the contrary) *by all the doctors, and saints, and martyrs* of, or about, his time; for *all* that speak of it, or whose judgments in the point *are any way recorded*, are for it; and Justin Martyr professeth, that *all good and orthodox Christians* of his time believed it, and those that did not, he reckons among heretics." His argument is, briefly, as follows: "That this doctrine (of the Millennium and Christ's personal reign on earth) was by the church of the next age after the apostles held true and catholic, I prove by these two reasons: first, whatever doctrine is believed and taught by *the most eminent fathers* of any age of the church, and *by none* of their contemporaries opposed or condemned, that is to be esteemed *the Catholic doctrine* of the church of those times; but the doctrine of the Millenaries was *believed and taught by the most eminent fathers* of the age next after the apostles, and by *none of that age* opposed or condemned; *therefore it was the Catholic doctrine of those times.*" Such testimony can be multiplied: for Mosheim (*Ch. His.*) speaks of it as "*the prevailing opinion;*" Gieseler (*Ch. His.*) tells us that it "*became the general belief* of the time;" Lardner (*Cred. of Gosp. His.*) informs us that "the Millennium has been *the favorite doctrine* of some ages and has had *the patronage of the learned*, as well as the vulgar, among Christians;" Münscher (*His. Dog.*) testifies: "*How widely* the doctrine of Millenarianism prevailed in the first centuries of Christianity, appears from this that it was *universally received* by almost all teachers;" Encyclopædia Americana (Art. Mill.) pronounces it "*a universal belief* among the Christians of the first centuries." The student desirous of additional references may consult for confirmatory statements Bush (*On Mill.*), Neander (*Ch. His.*), Burton (*Bampton Lec.*, 1829), Stuart (*Com. Apoc.*), Barnes (*Com. Rev.*), Bh. Russel (*Dis. on Mill.*), Hagenbach (*His. of Doc.*), Kitto (*Cyclop.*, Art. Mill.), Baumgarten (*His. Apos. Ch.*), Lechler (*Apos. and Post-Apos. Times*), Schlegel (*Philos. of His.*). Milner (*Ch. His.*), Jones (*Ch. His.*), Shaff (*Ch. His.*), Kurtz (*Ch. His.*).

The candid admissions of those who are no believers in our doctrine are so interesting that we append several more. Thus e.g. Dodgson (*Transl. of Tertullian*, vol. 1, p. 121-3) speaks of our belief, according to Irenæus and Justin, "as belonging to *the full soundness* of faith," that "Eusebius states it to have been *the prevailing doctrine* in the church," and that "until the early part of the third century; (it was) *held by most*,

questioned by none whose name has been preserved." Bh. Russell (*Dis. on Mill.*, p. 236) remarks: "so far as we view the question in reference to the sure and certain hope entertained by the Christian world that the Redeemer would appear on the earth, and exercise authority during a thousand years, there is good ground for the assertion of Mede, Dodwell, Burnet, and other writers on the same side, that down to the beginning of the fourth century *the belief was universal and undisputed.*" Dr. Nast (the Commentator) in an Art. in "*The West. Ch. Advocate*" (July 30, 1879) remarks: "Hase, distinguished for the accuracy of his statements, calls Chiliasm '*the great faith-article* of the Primitive Church.' Prof. Volk, in his masterly reply to Dr. Keil, says also, 'It was *fundamental* to the Church from the beginning.'" Our entire line of argument shows why, of necessity, it was thus "fundamental' and "the great faith-article" of the early Church.

Obs. 4. The evidence in favor of the general perpetuation of the doctrine is strengthened by the concessions of those who were among the first, and most bitter, opposers. Thus e.g. Jerome (*Com. on Jes.*, 19 : 10), says: "that he durst *not condemn the* (*Millennial*) *doctrine, because many ecclesiastical persons and martyrs affirm the same.*"

This is quoted by Brooks (*El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 48). Among my notes I find the following reference: See Jerome's *Pref. to Isa.*, 65, and his *Com. on Jer.* 19 : 10, where he admits that "*many Christians and martyrs* had affirmed the things that he denied; and that a great multitude of Christians agreed in them in his own day; so that though he could not follow them, *he could not condemn them.*" In another place he says: "a multitude of persons will be offended with me." Comp. also Brooks' (p. 49, etc.) statements concerning Eusebius, Augustine, etc. We fully admit in following Propositions that through such men as Jerome, Eusebius, and others—who like Eusebius could flatter the Emperors with the idea that the Millennial glory was already inaugurated under their sway, and that Rome itself was converted into the New Jerusalem—the doctrine declined. We also admit, as in full accord with predictions, that during the dark ages it remained, like many other precious doctrines, under an eclipse. The very opposition and decline here noticed is only an additional reason for retaining the doctrine, because if extensively popular and universally received, and *continued thus down to the present*, its history would *not harmonize* with the warnings, cautions, and predictions relating to it, showing that men would turn away from it. On this point it is only necessary to again quote Whitby (*Treatise on Tradition*, as given p. 86, *Proph. Times*, vol. 6) himself: "This doctrine (Chiliasm) was owned in the first ages of the church by *the greatest number* of the Christian clergy, as is confessed by Eusebius; that by the confession of St. Jerome *many* ecclesiastical men and martyrs had asserted it before their time (*H. Eccles.* 1, 3, c. 39, in Jer. 19), and that even in his days it was the doctrine which *a great multitude* of Christians followed (*Proem*, in lib. 13, *Com.*, in Esa.)," etc.

Obs. 5. The reception and interpretation of the Apoc., also indicates *the extent* of Millenarian doctrine. It being held to contain the hopes of a Kingdom to come, as we have shown, it was confidently appealed to in our behalf, and was universally received by the orthodox believers. This continued until some Anti-Chiliasts endeavored,—seeing no escape from its teaching,—to bring it into discredit; which opposition only ceased when it was found that its plain announcements might be *spiritualized.* Dr. Smith (*N. Test. His.*, p. 723, *On Rev.*) remarks: "The interval between the Apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called *the Chiliastic period* of Apocalyptic interpretation."

Gibbon (*His. Decline*, etc., vol. 1, p. 535) sarcastically alludes to this, saying: "A mysterious prophecy, which still forms a part of the sacred canon, but which was thought to favor the exploded sentiment, has very narrowly escaped the proscription of the church." He refers to the complaint that Sulp. Severus made respecting its neglect; for as Reuss and others have stated, the Greek Fathers, under the influence of the Alexandrian theology, from the time of the third century manifested an antipathy to the book, although previously it was held as the great and important Revelation from

Christ. It is supposed by some that Caius (about A.D. 210) first started the opposition to the Apocalypse ;* this was strengthened by the position of Dionysius (about A.D. 248), although he is forced, over against his doubting its genuineness, to say : "But, for my part, I dare not reject the book, since *many* of the brethren have it in high esteem," etc. (comp. Stuart's, Hug's, Michaelis', Barnes', and other Introductions for a detailed account). Gibbon refers to its omittal by the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 363). The contest over the book resulted from its supposed Chiliastic teaching (so Barnes, etc.), and Hug (Introd., p. 654) says : "It was amid the disputes concerning the Millennium that the first explicit and well-authenticated denial of the Apoc. occurred." Bh. Russel (On Mill.) states : "It is worthy of remark that so long as the prophecies regarding the Millennium were interpreted literally the Apocalypse was received as an inspired production, and as the work of the apostle John ; but no sooner did theologians find themselves compelled to view its annunciations through the medium of allegory and metaphorical description, than they ventured to call in question its heavenly origin, its genuineness, and its authority." Art. Apoc. (by Prof. Schem) Appleton's Cyclop., says : "The rejection of the canonical and apostolical character of the book was chiefly prompted by opposition to Chiliasm ; and when the interest in the Chiliastic controversies declined, the church generally received the Apoc. as the work of the apostle John." Hence Mede (*Works*, p. 602) said : "I have demonstrated that the 1000 follow the times when the beast and the false prophet, and consequently the times of Antichrist, which those who oppose the Chiliasts have found so necessary" (i.e. assume existing) "as to force them to deny the Apocalypse to be Scripture ; nor was it ever admitted until they had found some commodious interpretation of the 1000 years." We append Horne's (*Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 379) statement : "It is a remarkable circumstance that the authenticity of this book was very generally, if not universally, acknowledged during *the first two centuries*, and yet in *the third century* it began to be questioned. This seems to have been occasioned by some absurd notions concerning the Millennium, which a few well-meaning but fanciful expositors grounded on this book ; which notions their opponents injudiciously and presumptuously endeavored to discredit, by *denying the authority* of the book itself." (He quotes Sir Isaac Newton and Dr. Priestly as regarding it one of the best attested books of the New Test., which is the uniform opinion of the best critics, destructive and orthodox.) The student will find numerous similar testimonies in the Introductions to the Apocalypse (as e.g. Barnes, Lange, Alford, Lücke, etc.), so that (so Lange Rev., p. 64) in summing up "the Pre Constantinian Period" of Apoc. interpretation, it is thus given : "*Fundamental Thought : The Millennial Kingdom is to come ; according to the Chiliastic view, its coming is* imminent." M Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*, Art. "Revelation," remarks : "The interval between the apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called *the Chiliastic period* of Apocalyptic interpretation. The visions of John were chiefly regarded as representations of general Christian truths, scarcely yet embodied in actual facts, for the most part to be exemplified or fulfilled in the reign of Antichrist, the Coming of Christ, the Millennium, and the day of judgment. The fresh hopes of the early Christians, and the severe persecutions they endured taught them to live in those future events with intense satisfaction and comfort." Compare the statements of Herzog's *Encyclop.*, Appleton's *Cyclop.*, and others ; especially the Introd. by Dr. Elliott in his *Horæ Apoc.* Pressense (The Early Days of Christianity, p. 501, Ap., note L), advocating the authenticity of the Apoc., remarks : "The first doubts on this subject were expressed by the sect of the Alogi, who denied the divinity of Jesus Christ. These doubts were carried further by Caius, and finally by Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius 7 : 25), and more or less confirmed by Eusebius. But it is needful to study the grounds taken by Dionysius, in order to be convinced that he reasons entirely from *a priori* arguments, and that it is *fear of the Chiliasts or Millenarians* which leads him to throw doubt upon the book of Revelation."

---

* The student is referred to a contradiction—those who assert that Caius rejected the Apoc., ground such a rejection on the supposition that he esteemed Cerinthus the author of it—now, the Benedictines (Buckle, *Mis.*, vol. 3, p. 211) allege, that when the Apoc. was violently attacked by Cerinthus and other heretics, the early Fathers, as Justin, Irenæus, Theophylact, etc., believed it to be written by John. However this may be, two things are certain : (1) that if the doctrines of Cerinthus are correctly reported he could not be the author of the book, seeing it contains much opposed to the same ; (2) John being the author and the opponent of Cerinthus, would not adopt views endorsing, more or less, those of Cerinthus.

Obs. 6. The extent to which the doctrine prevailed is also apparent from the Apocryphal books. The counterfeit is based upon the genuine.

Thus e.g. Gieseler (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 100), after saying that "in the character of the spurious writings of this period (the Sec. Century) we can trace the peculiar features of the age; their purpose being either to encourage the persecuted, or to convince the unbelieving, and not unfrequently to give the sanction of antiquity to the tenets of a particular sect. In this way the old spurious writings of the Jews were interpolated by the Christians, as the Book of Enoch and the Book of Ezra; and others were new manufactured as the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Shepherd of Hermas. Of a different character were the books of Hystaspes, and the Sibylline Prophecies, which, as well as the Acts of Pilate, seem to have been chiefly intended for the heathen." "In all these works the belief in the Millennium is so evident *that no one can hesitate to consider it as universal* in an age, when certainly such motives as it offered were not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity. This belief rested mainly on the book of Revelation. The Mill. was represented as the great Sabbath which was very soon to begin, and to be ushered in by the resurrection of the dead." Prof. Stuart (*Com. Apoc.*, vol. 1, Introd., etc.) largely quotes from them, and shows their Chiliastic tendency. See also Greswell (*On the Parables*, vol. 5, Part 2) and numerous writers, such as Lawrence (who translated several), Corrodi, Lücke, Wieseler, Bleek, etc. Comp. Art. on *The Sibylline Books* in *Littell's Liv. Age*, Sept. 29th, 1877, taken from the Edinb. Rev., which says that Ewald, Bleek, and others have supposed that this Jewish expectation of a Messianic Kingdom was, more or less, based on Daniel's predictions. The writer says of these books that "they explicitly propound the idea of a Kingdom of the just upon earth *anterior* to the final resurrection and general judgment." We do not receive and vindicate those books as e.g. Whiston (*Vindic. of the Sibylline Books*), and we do not decry them as e.g. Justin (*Rem. Eccl. His.*), but simply receive them as indicative and corroborative of views largely held at an early period, preceding, at, and after the First Advent.

Obs. 7. This feature, in order to weaken the force of our Proposition, is asserted by some, viz.: that our doctrine was *confined to the Jewish* churches. Thus e.g. Shedd (*His. Ch. Doc.*, p. 291) declares: "it is not surprising to find that Millenarianism was a peculiarity of *the Jewish Christian, as distinguished from the Gentile* Christian church, at the close of the first century." The facts *as given* by history, and *attested to* by Neander, Mosheim, Lightfoot, Lardner, Whitby, and a host of others, *flatly contradict* this declaration. The Gentile Christian churches down to the third century (until Caius, Origen, and Dionysius), received it *just as freely* and entertained it *just as heartily as the Jewish* Christian. Prof. Shedd gives *no historical proof* to sustain his position. The contrary is clearly seen (1) by *the Gentile* churches which adopted it, as e.g. Thessalonica, Vienna, Lyons, Carthage, etc.; (2) by the Gentile Fathers, and their converts, which adopted it, of whom we have more than of Jews; (3) by the generality of view entertained, there being no recorded attack by any writer until the time of Caius, Origen, and Dionysius; (4) by both the Greek and Latin Fathers, the East and West, adopting it.

Such a concealment of facts, admitted too by many of our opponents, is evidence of *weakness and unfairness*. The simple truth is, that *both* in the East and the West, *both* in the Pauline and the other apostolic churches, *both* in minds previously imbued by the Jewish or the Hellenic culture, this doctrine of the Kingdom, still future, was cordially entertained. Dr. Neander (vol. 1, p. 364) makes some judicious remarks on this point, when he clears Justin of Ebionism. The drift of such assertions is very apparent, viz.: to make our doctrine odious under the impression that it is *exclusively* "Jewish" — overlooking what we have already said on this subject, and that the Chiliastic Fathers were themselves the opposers of the fanatical Jewish opinions and prejudices based on a servile observance of the Mosaic law. Even in the Pauline churches much was retained essentially Jewish in doctrine, but the candid student will

discriminate between this and what was regarded as non-essential. The extreme Jewish idea of the continued obligatory observance of the Mosaic ceremonial law was combated by the early Chiliasts, as e.g. evinced in their opposition to the Ebionists, but this was done *without discarding* doctrines founded on covenant and prophecy, and remaining untouched by the abrogation of the Judaic ritual. The critic will candidly distinguish ; the one-sided disputant will mingle together things that essentially differ. The plainest facts have no force with the latter, as e.g. the testimony of Justin (as given by Neander, vol. 1, p. 364) that Chiliasts were found among the converted Pagans. The student will not fail to observe how, in their eagerness to find some leverage against us, our opponents present directly hostile theories to account for the historical origin of our doctrine ; thus e.g. Pressense, as we have previously quoted, ascribes its commencement to the *Gentile* Thessalonians, and Shedd to the *Jewish* churches.

Obs. 8. Various methods, lacking candor and fairness, are resorted to in order to avoid giving our doctrine its *pre-eminent historical status.* Some of these have been referred to (see Props: 72–74), others will follow.

1. Some writers, seeing the preponderance on our side, purposely lower Patristic learning (Prop. 72). Hamilton, Shedd, etc., only lower the *quite early* Fathers (Chiliastic), and give their decided preference to *the later* ones (with all their monkish, popish tendencies), on the plea that "their learning and talents far surpassed any in the first centuries of the church." Just *as if* Scriptural doctrine depended on human learning and talent, and *not* on divine declarations. The student will notice, that when the Reformation restored the right of private interpretation and judgment, it also resulted in depreciating Patristic works. The Reformers attacked Origen, Jerome, and others ; criticism assailed the enthroned *later* Patristic Theology, pointing out its palpable contradictions and errors. The result was, that for a time all—without discrimination—fell into neglect, the scathing rebukes of the Reformers and the searching tests destroying their reputation and authority. But after a while a reaction set in ; their works were again read and quoted, and found to be valuable, if not in imparting authority, at least in giving *the history* of doctrines and of the church. The republication of them in various forms, the desire that every writer has to have them sustain a discussion of doctrine, the numerous quotations found in able works, the exhaustive researches in early history through their aid, fully indicate the esteem in which they are held. After repeated disputes concerning their merit, it is finally conceded by the best critics that while all may be, more or less, defective in some points, the nearer the Fathers are to the apostles the purer the doctrine promulgated (i.e. less of error is imparted), and, provided a unity exists, the greater weight it should possess. In depreciating the earlier Fathers, as some do, we lower, in a measure, Christianity itself—i.e. it can only be legitimately traced in its continuity *through such disparaged* Fathers. The Fathers are only worthy of reception *in so far* as their writings *correspond* with the Scriptures, and are valuable in giving us an idea how the Scriptures were interpreted and understood. To uphold them as infallible, or to decry them as unworthy of attention is to entertain an extreme ; to treat them as Stuart, and others, is to give force to the sarcasm of Chillingworth, that divines "account them as Fathers when they are for them, and children when they are against them." On the Fathers, compare "*The Ante-Nicene Library,*" Daillé "*On the right use of the Fathers*" (Hallam's *Introd. Lit. of Europe*, vol. 2, p. 404), Riddle's *Manual Ch. Antiq.*, Wake's *Epis. Apost. Fathers*, Whiston's *Prim. Christians*, Middleton's *Free Inquiry*, and *Eccl. His.* in general.

2. Cyclopædias in articles written by persons, either hostile to our doctrine or unacquainted with its history, give a very *one-sided* description of it. In addition to the instance presented under Prop. 73, others can readily be given. Thus e.g. Appleton's *Amer. Cyclop.* appears reluctantly to say : "It is admitted on all sides that Millenarian views were, if not general, at least *very common* in the ancient church," and while correctly giving the Fathers who supported them, it artfully associates with them Montanism, etc. It perverts the language of Justin (comp. Prop. 72), saying that he "knew many orthodox Christians *who were not*" Millenarian, when the exact reverse is true (comp. Brooks *El. Proph. Interp.*, Seiss' "*A Question in Eschatology,*" p. 17, foot-note, who refers to Daillé, Münscher, Münter, Schwegler, etc.). Forgetting the distinctive teaching of Millenarianism, viz.: that of the personal Advent followed by the Kingdom of the Theocratic King here on earth introducing the promised Mill. glory, the article introduces the belief in *the end of the world* at the tenth century and afterward, Millerism, Swedenborgianism, etc.—*all of which rejected the Chiliastic teaching* on the subject

of the Kingdom. While interesting and candid facts are given, it is apparent that the writer had *no distinct idea* of Millenarianism *doctrinally*, or else he certainly would not have attempted to identify with it those (1) who had only one single point of union with it, viz. : in the belief of a personal Advent, and (2) who had no sympathy with it even in a single point, viz. : spiritualizing, even the Advent as the Swedenborgians and Shakers. In the Millenarian doctrine the personal Sec. Advent is only the grand means for introducing the glorious Kingdom and reign here on earth ; in the theories thus engrafted upon us it is either spiritualized away as something of the past, or it is supposed to end all sublunary things by a general judgment and destruction. Such works being specially designed for reference, lead, unintentionally, many to be prejudiced against our doctrine. Take Buck's *Theol. Dic.*, Art. "Mill.," and as introductory—prejudging the matter and prejudicing the reader—our faith is represented "according to an ancient tradition in the Church, grounded on some doubtful texts in the Apoc. and other Scriptures." Then to neutralize its historical force, its extensiveness is thus underrated : "Though there has been no age of the Church in which the Millenrium was not admitted by *individual* divines of the first eminence, it is yet evident, *from the writings of Eusebius, Irenæus* (?), *Origen*, and others, among the ancients, as well as from the histories of Dupin, Mosheim, and all the moderns, that it was never adopted by the whole Church, or made an article of the established creed in any nation." (But admit this, and if it forms *a valid* reason for rejecting the doctrine, *how then*, tried by this test, would Buck's modern Whitbyan theory fare? Our opponents are exceedingly careful not to make a trial of this test of orthodoxy.) After giving some Mill. tenets, as mainly founded on Rev. 20 : 1–6, he says : "This passage *all* the ancient Millenarians took in a sense grossly literal, and taught, that, during the Millennium, *the saints on earth were to enjoy every bodily delight.*" With this *utterly unfair, disrespectful, and erroneous representation*, our doctrine is contemptuously dismissed, and *the spiritual* view given. We abundantly refute his statements in the quotations given (even from opponents), and show by direct citations from the Fathers that they founded the Messianic Kingdom, which they expected, *on the covenants and prophecies*, and that they carefully discriminated between the glorified saints and the nations in the flesh, and in their holding to inestimable spiritual and heavenly-derived blessings connected with the Millennium. Such *unpardonable*, professed historical representations, making our belief ridiculous at the expense of *scholarship or honesty*, can be multiplied. We append an illustration, to show how Chiliastic Fathers are treated. In the Art. "Irenæus," M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclop., the writer (Prof. J. H Worman), after highly eulogizing Irenæus, and in evidence of his deserving the same giving his doctrines held, passes to his Millenarian views, saying : "The peculiar Millennial views of Irenæus, which stamp him, by his close adherence to Papias, as a Chiliast, we hardly care to touch ; they are certainly the weak spot in our author, but deserve to be passed not only *without comment, but even unnoticed.*" Alas ! what *prejudice* will effect.

3. Editors in critical notes appended to works, frequently give unhistorical statements which practically degrades the belief of the early church. Thus, to illustrate : Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, etc., vol. 1, p. 532) remarks : "It was universally believed that *the end of the world*" (Gibbon ought to have said, to be correct, "*end of the age*") "and the Kingdom of heaven were at hand," etc. The Editor, Milman, remarks in a note : "this was, in fact, an integral part of the Jewish notion of the Messiah, from which the minds of the Apostles themselves were but gradually detached. See Berthold, *Christologia Judæorum*, concluding chapters." Here, without the least proof being assigned, and with a reference to the Jewish view which must have highly colored the previous preaching of the apostles, Milman takes an important supposed change for granted (which, if true, places the apostles during their discipleship in the position of ignorant preachers of the Kingdom), and one too, which, if it really occurred, places the believers of the first centuries in a false attitude, of direct antagonism to the apostles. The remark does not help, in the least, to invalidate Gibbon's statement, but only makes it the more formidable, seeing that the prevailing belief under apostolic supervision is left unaccounted for and unexplained. Such loose criticisms, with just *such lack* of proof, abound in numerous works, and are received, without examination, by many solely on the reputation of the critic, and the result is that our doctrine suffers.

4. While some Eccles. Historians candidly give a tolerable fair statement of the early view, its generality and the names of the Fathers who held it, etc., there are others who grudgingly and in the briefest manner adhere to it. Thus e.g. a student not posted in the history of the doctrine could not possibly infer from the brief account of Kurtz (*Ch. His.*) the extent and perpetuation of our faith. Others, again, mention it but with words of disrespect and condemnation, even when expressing no personal opinion on

other alleged errors. Others, refusing to consider the important influence that it exerted in the early church, almost entirely (some entirely as Jones' *Ch. His.*) ignore it, until they come to the history of the Anabaptists. Such authors are read by many incapable of discriminating, and thus necessarily *prejudice* other minds against us. Even Mosheim (whom we largely quote) is rebuked by Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, vol. 1, p. 535, note 66) as a "learned divine not altogether candid," for the manner in which he presents this matter. But Mosheim makes far greater admissions in *Com. de Rebus Chris.*, and does justice to the prevalence of the doctrine. The reader must consider, what was said under Prop. 73, viz: that the early belief is *a tender subject* to many, seeing that *they cannot reconcile* its existence and prevalence with their modern notions. Hence, with the best of motives, they hastily pass over it in order that the contrast between the early and the later faith may remain, as much as possible, *in the background*. Others, however, exhibit the unfriendliness felt, by carefully mentioning Chiliasm *in connection* with enthusiasts and fanatics, but not the slightest reference is allowed when the names of eminent scholars and divines, who held it, are mentioned. The concessions, seemingly forced by historical necessity, are reluctantly given, and as tersely as possible. Thus to illustrate: Hase, *His. Ch. Church*, omits a proper detailed (such as the subject demands) mention of Primitive Chiliasm, and thus violates his affirmation in the Pref., p. 12. For, when explaining what might safely be omitted in a Church History, he remarks: "No particular event connected with theological science ever needs to be noticed, except when it becomes important as *a prominent circumstance* belonging to the age, and may properly be regarded *as characteristic* of the times." He slightly notices Chiliasm, and then in connection with Cerinthus, Montanus, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Large space can be given to heresies, to inferior doctrines and events, while *the briefest* allusions are penned respecting this doctrine once so prominent, belonging to an age, and characteristic of the times."

5. Professed writers on Chiliasm are recommended, although admitted to be *very unfair* in their statements. Thus e.g. H. Corrodi's *His. of Chiliasm*, which one of our opponents (Prof. Stuart, *Com. on Apoc.*, latter part) characterizes as a book that must be read with caution, being uncandid and unreliable, is extolled by others. Such works, with their sweeping assertions, and their efforts to link with our doctrine opinions and parties in nowise related thereto, practically degrade the belief of the first churches, giving force to the sarcasms of unbelievers. Corrodi (whose views Dorner, *Person of Christ*, v. 1, p. 240, rejects, as too blindly followed by others) has merely given a caricature of our doctrine, allying with it many (as we shall show hereafter) whose opinions are utterly antagonistic to Chiliasm, and far more in accord and sympathy with *his own* doctrinal position than ours. He lays great stress on the vagaries incorporated by some fanatics, just as if his own doctrine, as well as all others, had not in like manner been perverted. The professed histories of Prof. Briggs in the *N. Y. Evangelist* (1879), of Dr. Macdill in *The Chicago Instructor*, are of a similar nature, corresponding with the brief mention of Prof. Stuart (*Apoc.*) and others. The simple fact that the histories of Millenarianism in such works, cyclopædias, reviews, etc., are one-sided and unjust led Appleton's *Amer. Cyclop.* to assert that a His. of Chiliasm was still a *desideratum*, saying: "A *good history* of Millenarianism in the Christian Church *is still a desideratum*, as the works published do not exhaust the subject" (it is to be hoped that a scholar, properly qualified, and able to discriminate between our doctrine and that of others, will yet supply this acknowledged want). We are indebted on our side to compressed statement as given by Mede, Brookes, Bickersteth, Greswell, Seiss, Shimeall, West, Moorehead, and others.

6. Writers on the His. of Ch. Doctrine, Dogmatical Theology, Eschatology, Sys. Divinity, etc., have given rather *a caricature* of the history of this doctrine than a correct account of the facts as they existed, although a few concede largely in our favor. Having given some specimens already, we only refer to a recent illustration. Prof. Shedd, in his *His. of Ch. Doc.* (an admirable work in many respects), unquestionably misstates a number of things in reference to our belief. This is clearly seen from the evidence that we have thus far produced. The reader is referred to Shimeall's *Reply to Shedd* for strictures on some of his statements. This mode of procedure necessarily injures our view in the estimation of persons to whom *the historical facts* are unknown.

7. Writers against our doctrine, seeing the historical force that it sustains in its relationship to the first centuries, *carefully avoid all allusion* to it. Thus e.g. Brown (Christ's Sec. Coming) makes no reference to the church history of the doctrine; and many, ignorant of the real facts, are deceived in supposing that it was confined, as an error, to comparatively a few persons. In addition, it may be remarked, that if

Brown's reasoning is correct, viz. : that Chiliasm is unscriptural, then it only increases the difficulty of reconciling the prevailing Primitive Church view with the apostolic supervision and the purity of transmitted doctrine. It is evident acknowledgment of weakness, when a work specifically directed against us passes by this Primitive belief without, at least, attempting to explain the same. But this is true of numerous works.

8. Some authors, with all their candid concessions, attempt (as e.g. Bush, *On Mill.*, p. 12, etc.) to make the impression that the *very early Fathers* were divided into two parties, one holding to a literal, the other to a spiritual, interpretation of the Kingdom. But, unfortunately for themselves, in the enumeration *they are not able* to present on the side of the latter *a single one of the earliest Fathers.* To illustrate : we give the Fathers cited by Bush himself as follows: on the literal side Barnabas, Justin, Irenæus, Cyprian, Tertullian, Lactantius, with Bh. Bull, and Lardner as apologists for them ;—on the spiritual side, Origen, Epiphanius, Genadius, Augustine, Jerome, and Dionysius. The ordinary reader not conversant with dates is apt to be deceived, regarding these as *contemporary*, when the truth is, that the Spiritualists *only arose* in the third and following centuries.

9. Other writers present this in a still more offensive form in order to delude the unwary. Thus e.g. Hamilton in his work against Millenarians (p. 308) *boldly* remarks : "that its (Chiliastic) principles were opposed and rejected *by almost every* Father of the church, *with the exception* of Barnabas, Clement, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Nepos, Apollinarius, Lactantius, and Tertullian." This, of course, *cannot deceive* the scholar, who well knows that Hamilton cannot produce *a single Father before* the third century in opposition to us, but it is *eminently calculated* to deceive and prejudice the unlearned.

10. Some, who are evidently afraid of the antiquity of our doctrine, proceed to even greater length, entirely ignoring the earlier Fathers. Thus e.g. Jones ("Lec. on the Apoc.," p. 9, Pref.), speaking of the same, says : "we will concede to you that these opinions are not novelties ; we can trace them as far back as *the beginning of the third century.*" This unscholarly procedure, in the face of abounding testimony to the contrary, merits a severe rebuke.

11. Another favorite method to disparage our views is the giving, in a professed account of the early belief, an exceedingly weak and one-sided exhibition *of the Scriptural basis* upon which it rests. Thus e.g. Lindsay (*Ency. Brit.*, Art. Mill.) entirely omits the covenants and prophecies *as quoted* by the Fathers (which we reproduce in this work), and confines himself almost exclusively to Rev. 20, just as if that really was *the foundation* of our system of belief, forgetting that Chiliasm, based on covenant and prophecy, existed before the Revelation was given. Even an opponent like Bh. Russel (*Dis. on the Mill.*, p. 39) pointedly says, that there is "no room for doubt that the notion of a Millennium preceded by several centuries the introduction of the Christian faith" (comp. Shimeall's *Eschatology*, or a *Reply to Prof. Shedd*, p. 59, etc.).

12. Various other methods are resorted to in order to diminish the force of our doctrinal position in the early faith of the church, and as these have already been referred to, the briefest enumeration must suffice. (1) Our doctrine is dismissed as Judaic or Jewish (Props. 69-73), just as if that settled the whole question ; (2) that good and great men did not receive it, just as if doctrine, Scriptural, depended upon man's reception of it ; (3) that fanatics and enthusiasts held to it, thus overlooking the fact that this is true of almost every doctrine, and that this is no test of the truth of any doctrine ; (4) the Fathers are made out as credulous, superstitious (Prop. 72, Obs. 1, note 4), while the greater defects of Anti-Chiliastic Fathers are ignored ; (5) they are made to say what they never wrote (Prop. 73, Obs. 1, note 4), so that even Prof. Stuart (*Com. Apoc.*) refers to it as a fact that sentences indorsing Millenarianism have been altered, omitted, or others substituted (as e.g. Victorinus spiritualized by Jerome) ; (6) the Fathers are made out to be the followers of Cerinthus (Prop. 72, Obs. 1, note 4) or of Papias, or the advocates of Montanism (when some of them lived long before Montanus arose), or else they are simply discarded as errorists, unworthy to be followed ; (7) they conceal the actual views held by the Fathers who opposed, because such opinions are likewise antagonistic to their Whitbyan notion ; (8) they, without positively saying so, leave the impression, by the artful opposition presented, that the modern notions respecting the Millennium *were then also* entertained in the Apostolic and Primitive Church, although unable to quote any one favoring the same.

13. Still another method is to make Millenarianism *responsible* for the vagaries of every writer (forgetting to apply *the same rule* to the still greater absurdities of our opponents). One of the editors of *The Proph. Times* (vol. 5, No. 6, p. 90) has well said, "that on the basis of this method of reasoning, Bossuet's *Histoire des Variations* is conclusive against Protestanism."

14. Others prominently present the disagreements between Millenarian writers *in details*, etc., and from thence illogically draw the conclusion that the whole is erroneous, forgetting that the same reasoning would destroy the credibility of any or all of the great doctrines of the Bible (as the Atonement, Lord's Supper, etc.). Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 19) shows that there is *far more agreement* between Pre-Millenarians than between Post-Millenarians, and that Pre-Millenarians are in agreement on the grand outlines although belonging to all the various differing denominations. These outlines in which they agree are the Pre-Mill. Personal Advent, the first resurrection Pre-Millennial, the Messianic Kingdom Millennial, the future Millennial reign of the saints, the restitution, etc. Our opponents differ among themselves as to the Sec. Advent, the location of the Millennium, etc., so that they are divided into various parties with antagonistic theories, and no bond of union—saving hostility to Chiliasm—to unite them. (Those differences will be shown by us hereafter.)

Obs. 9. Although the doctrine was opposed in the third and following centuries, yet it continued for some time to have *many* who held to it. The custom of Christians, as Tertullian informs us, to pray "*that they might have part in the first resurrection,*" was not easily rooted out, for, as *Cyprian* (about A.D. 220) tells us, the thirst for martyrdom was increased by the hope that suffering for Christ would entail a more distinguished lot in His coming Kingdom. Nepos, Lactantius, Methodius, Paulinus, Gregory of Nyssa, Victorinus, Apollinaris, taught the Millenarian doctrine.[1] Seiss (Ap. Ch. 2, to *Last Times*) gives additional, Hippolytus, Commodian (of whom Clarke, *Sacred Lit.*, p. 194, says: "he received the doctrine of the Millennium, which was *the common belief* of his time"), Cyprian, the Council of Nice, and Sulpicius Severus. Shimeall (*Eschatology*) adds to these, Melito (one of the earlier Fathers, contemporary with Justin, Bishop of Sardis, whom Jerome and Gennadius affirm to be Millenarian), and Coracion. It makes, however, no material difference how many names may be added as writers in the third and fourth centuries, since (1) it has been shown to have been *the prevailing belief previously*, and (2) *a falling away from the faith*—the early faith—*is predicted*, and believers are warned (e.g. 2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4, etc.) against it.

[1] Undoubtedly many others could be added, if we possessed their writings. Brooks (*El. Proph. Interp.*) gives these, and thus alludes to Epiphanius (about A.D. 365) as mentioning "the doctrine being held *by many in his time*, and speaks favorably of it himself. Quoting the words of Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, concerning one Vitalis, whom he highly commends for his piety, orthodoxy, and learning, he says: 'Moreover, others have affirmed that the venerable man should say, that in *the first resurrection* we shall accomplish *a certain millenary* of years,' etc., on which Epiphanius observes, 'And that indeed this millenary term is written of, in the Apocalypse of John, and is received of *very many of them that are godly, is manifest.*'" Lib. 3 : 2. It is in view of such testimony that Appleton's Cyclop., Art. Mill., remarks: "The old view continued to find advocates during the third century, among whom Tertullian, Nepos, bishop of Arsinoë, and Methodius, bishop of Tyre, were prominent. In the fourth century, though *it had still many adherents* among the people, it found no longer any advocate of note among the Christian writers, yet Jerome, who did not believe in it himself, did *not dare to condemn it.*" An indirect argument is employed to denote the continued prevalence of the doctrine by Millenarian writers (as Brookes, Bickersteth, Greswell, and others) in the course adopted by the Nicene council. Although the council was busy settling disputed questions, yet nothing was said against our view, which implies (1) that many among the council must have held the doctrine, or (2) that they regarded it as so far based on Scripture and the tradition of the church that those who held it were orthodox brethren, or (3) that it was so extensively held outside of the council among Christians that prudence dictated no utterance against it.

Obs. 10. The apologies that those make who admit the prevailing early belief and yet regard it as erroneous, are *derogatory* to the truth,—to

Christianity itself. Having alluded to this (see and compare Prop. 72, Obs. 4, and note), it is sufficient to say, that it will not answer, in order to get rid of this early church view, to do as Grotius (whom Gibbon, *Decl. and Fall*, vol. 1, p. 533, approvingly quotes) does, who "ventures to insinuate that for wise purposes, *the pious deception* was permitted to take place," or as a later writer (Bush, *On Mill.*, p. 21), who thinks that owing to "special trials" and "*uncultivated minds*," the error was winked at because "*the error in itself was an innocent one.*" Such apologies *are worse* than none, recoiling back with fearful force (as infidels exultingly see and enforce) upon *the founders* of the Christian church, under whose *direct auspices* it was extended. The reason for all this *unnecessary apologetics* springs from a supposed better belief substituted in place of the earlier.

In reference to so important a matter as the Kingdom, we unhesitatingly adopt the language of Eaton (*Perm. of Chris.*, p. 46), "we cannot, however, accept, we can only repudiate and challenge all asserted improvements, whether by substitution or omission, in the subject matter of Christianity itself, effected by alleged advances in knowledge and civilization." The doctrine of the Kingdom, related as it is to the true conception of the title "the Christ," is a *vital part* of "the subject matter of Christianity," and, properly considered (as will be shown), cannot be set aside by such *dishonoring* reasoning. Hence we must reject as a pitiful exculpation, Prof. Briggs' idea that in the early Church the Millenarian error was probably needed to advocate a principle against Gnosticism, and, therefore, in Irenæus, and some more, it may be overlooked and forgiven. From this it appears that error and falsehood may *be profitably* employed to advance the interests of Christianity; this is not the first time that the notion was entertained.

Obs. 11. It has been observed by some that this doctrine of the early church, if true, should have been continuously presented in a prominent orthodox form (i.e., confessionally), and because not so held, it cannot be true. But this entirely overlooks the predicted *defection* from the truth (as e.g. 2 Thess. 2, 2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4, etc.), and the warnings given to us to return to the truth as *previously* imparted; it elevates the mere deductions and confessional position of the church above *that of the Scriptures* in its covenants and prophecies; it forgets that the probationary attitude of man and the exercise of his will has *an important* bearing, making a rejection of truth possible; and it ignores the fact, that precisely the same line of argument which applies to a foretold apostatizing from truth, and to the propriety (necessity) and good results of a revival of doctrine by the Reformation, can, *with equal force*, be used in the defence of this single doctrine.

The student will observe that the very persons who urge this objection are very careful to conceal from the ordinary reader two important facts connected with this matter, viz.: (1) that the earliest creeds were so worded, by simply taking *Scriptural phraseology*, and without entering into the order or manner of fulfilment, that *all, Millenarian or Anti-Millenarian*, could subscribe to them; and (2) that *the modern* notion of the Millennium *is not found* in any of the ancient or more recent confessions (see Prop. 78). If the objection has propriety it certainly *must include* their own doctrine. Hence the reasoning of Prof. Briggs, demanding *a confessional* standard in the Primitive Church has not a particle of force, but is *positively condemnatory* of his own doctrine, seeing that neither his doctrine nor ours is confessionally presented, but that both of us can accept e.g. the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, which only deal in generalities. He keenly feels this, and, therefore, lays stress *on later* developments.

On this point it is eminently proper to present the misleading statements of eminent historians who, *opposed to* Chiliasm, seek to apologize for its existence by way of belittling its extent of belief. Neander (*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 397), with all his concessions

and his defence of Chiliasts, is *unfair* in this: "What we have just said, however, is not to be understood as if Chiliasm had ever formed *a part of the general creed* of the Church. Our sources of information from the different branches of the Church in these early times are *too scanty* to enable us to make any positive assertion on this point. Wherever we meet Chiliasm, as in Papias, Irenæus, Justin Martyr—everything seems to indicate that it was diffused from one country and from a single fountain head." Now this is *uncandid and unhistorical* for the following reasons: (1) there was *no general creed* of the Church published in those *early times* with which Chiliasm can possibly be compared; (2) he mentally forms a creed *of his own* development (a later one) *with which* he institutes such a comparison; (3) he presumes on an Anti-Chiliastic tendency which *he himself* (as we shall hereafter fully quote) admits broke out *later*, but which he here *presumes*, against history, to have previously existed; (4) his sarcastic reference to the one country and one source (Phrygia) is abundantly rebutted *by his own statements* respecting its Jewish origin and the Scriptures quoted; (5) he makes a positive statement with not *a single historical fact* adduced to sustain him in his assertion; (6) on the other hand, his declaration is *most positively* contradicted by Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian—now which are we to credit, Neander's *assumption* at so late a day or *the Fathers' statements who then lived?* The Art. "*Mill.*" in M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.* admits that Chiliasm was "early adopted," and was especially held by "Jewish Christians;" that it "spread extensively among the Gentiles," as shown by the Fathers quoted in the Art. But, after these statements, it is added: "Notwithstanding the extensive spreading of the Millenarian tenet, it would be a rash inference to assume that it was universal, or accepted *as the creed* of the Church." To this Art. written by Prof. Fisher (*a Post-Mill.*), the strictures above apply, because we have no evidence that other than Gnostics opposed us in the early Church, and that the belief *of every* Father who, in detail, referred to Eschatology, shows plain enough *what was the accepted faith* of the Church. Such pleadings are *a begging* of the question, and only proclaim the weakness of others. It is therefore with amazement that one reads Macdill (*Instructor*, May, 1879), who speaks of the Chiliasm of the Primitive Church as "monstrous and absurd," and to sustain such assertions quotes the prejudiced and bitter taunts of opponents (who desire by any means to rid themselves of Chiliasm), and of a Pre-Millenarian, Kelly (who endeavors to sustain a certain scheme of his own by depreciating others), avoiding the temperate judgment, concessions, etc., of scholars, critics, and others. In his partisanship, he thus coolly bestows the following advice: "We think that modern Pre-Millenarians would lose nothing, and that the cause of Christ would gain something, if our Pre-Mill. brethren would along with Origen, and Augustine, and Lardner, and Neander, and Kelly believe that ancient Chiliasm was *a reproach* to Christianity, and admit that *many* Christians were all along opposed to it." Thus, we are to allow *opponents* to judge and mould history, for us, so as to accommodate their respective theories. Thus, to get rid of a man by suicide, we are to urge him to the same, and then tender him the rope by which he is to hang himself. *Who were* these "many Christians," and what history or document gives us the slightest clue to them in the first and second centuries? Even if it could be regarded as gain (?) to Pre-Mills. to confess this "reproach" (?), it would be a serious loss to Christianity to make the very men—confessors, martyrs, apologists, and writers—through whom Dr. Macdill *can alone trace* the orthodox Ch. Church, so contemptible as to embrace "a scheme, so unscriptural and repulsive, so absurd and shocking." What a difference there is between the spirit of this man and many of our scholarly opposers whom we also liberally quote and criticise; the one, under prejudices and passion *distorts* historical facts—the other, impelled by love of truth, *presents* them however adverse they may prove to his own belief.

Obs. 12. It has been alleged by others, that, taking the church as a whole, and considering the vast multitude since the days of the apostles that have rejected the doctrine, but comparatively *a small number* have held to this view of the Kingdom;—and, hence, it ought to be rejected. We reply, that as numbers are *no test* of religions; as truth is not established *by majorities;* as doctrine is to be found in its purity *in Scripture* and not in the voice of the multitude; as Christ Himself has confined the reception of His words to "*a few*," "*a small flock*," even to "*babes*," and not to the "many;" as the warnings of *a widespread* defection are plainly imparted, we are *not concerned* either in defending our numbers,

or in admitting our minority. Historical facts, abundantly verifying predictions, *are sufficient* to satisfy us. It is to be admitted, however, that—to escape the notion of *a novelty* or *a later* substitution,—it is *a source of gratification to find so many advocates* of the truth pertaining to this subject, and especially to find them in *the very period* of the church's history, where, reasonably, they *ought* to appear as witnesses.

Many of our opponents strenuously protest against our making Chiliasm *universal* in the Apostolic and Primitive Church. Now, in this, as our quotations show, we only follow the declarations of *scholars* who, without any doctrinal bias, give their decided opinion respecting its extent. For the reason assigned in the Obs. we are not concerned in pressing this universality or insisting upon it as a decided fact, although stated as such by Justin and Tertullian. 1. We are satisfied with its being *the common, prevalent faith* of the orthodox Churches, East and West, North and South, as the evidence *conclusively* shows. 2. We have, no doubt, that Gnostics, and errorists, and probably some Christians (more or less leavened) opposed the doctrine from the beginning (for doctrine of every kind finds its opposers or perverters in every age), for such antagonism we must reasonably expect. 3. The universality is only apparent in this: that while the early Fathers advocated it, *not one of the early* Fathers—contemporary—opposed it; such opposition proceeding *from later Fathers*. 4. This earnest protest against the universality by our present opponents, holding to the Whitbyan theory, does not help their cause *in any respect*, seeing that the alleged hostility to our doctrine *did not spring from* a regular, systematic defence of *the Whitbyan doctrine;* for every opponent (as we shall show) arising from the third century advocated a Millennial theory which they (the Whitbyans) *do not receive*. It follows, therefore, that the men who first set themselves against our doctrine were likewise in error (although they must be profusely eulogized, as done by Prof. Briggs—because they opposed alleged error with error). 5. The result of this contest over the universality of our doctrine, as thus developed, shows, if we are to credit our antagonists, that the Universal Church was in decided and grievous error—a portraiture certainly not very complimentary to a Church founded and just perpetuated by inspired men and elders consecrated by apostolic hands. Our position takes *a higher view of the doctrinal position* of the Church, and gives it *that dignity and honor* which belong to it; that of our opponents simply *belittles and degrades* it. The abundant quotations presented by us *confirm* this statement.

Obs. 13. Since many of our opponents, in order to make an erroneous impression on those unacquainted with Eccles. History, *purposely mingle the later* Fathers with *the earlier* (as if they were *contemporary*), it will be proper to give the Fathers *in chronological* order, so that the ordinary reader can see *for himself* when they lived, and *form his own judgment* respecting their position in history. This decides the question *of priority*, and also that of *the later* introduction of opposing influences. We will, therefore, mention those that are *expressly named* by both ancients and moderns.

1. *Pre-Mill. Advocates of the 1st Century.*

a 1. (1) *Andrew*, (2) *Peter*, (3) *Philip*, (4) *Thomas*, (5) *James*, (6) *John*, (7) *Matthew*, (8) *Aristio*, (9) *John the Presbyter*—these all lived between A.D. 1–100; John, it is supposed—so Mosheim, etc.—died about A.D. 100. (All these are cited *by Papias*, who, according to Irenæus, was one of John's hearers, and intimate with Polycarp. John is also expressly mentioned *by Justin*. Now this reference to the apostles *agrees* with the facts that *we have proven: (a)* that the disciples of Jesus did hold the Jewish views of the Messianic reign in the first part of this century, and *(b)* that, instead of discarding them, they linked them with the Sec. Advent.) Next (10) *Clement of Rome* (Phil. 4:3), who existed about A.D. 40–100. (His Chiliasm, in the small remains left, is apparent from three particulars: *(a)* "preaching *the Coming* of Christ;" *(b)* rebuking scoffers

at the alleged *delay of that Coming*, and expressing the hope "*that He shall come quickly and not tarry*;" (*c*) and occupying the Chiliastic posture of "*every hour expecting the Kingdom of God.*" Such sentiments *only accord* with the then prevailing Millenarian views; if opposed to it, as some too eagerly affirm because no detailed expression of eschatological opinions have reached us, *how* could he, when Jewish views were all around, thus employ language *pre-eminently* adapted to confirm Chiliasm, unless *in sympathy* with it.) (11) *Barnabas*, about A.D. 40–100. (Whether the Epistle is that of Barnabas who was with Paul, or of some other one, makes no material difference, seeing that all concede him to us, and admit that it was written *quite early, and must be* indicative of the views then held.) (12) *Hermas*, from A.D. 40 to 150. (We give this lengthy date to accommodate the dispute respecting the Hermas who is the author of the Pastor. Some who do not receive Chiliasm make him the earlier mentioned Rom. 16 : 14; others, a later Hermas, who wrote about A.D. 150. All agree that he is a Chiliast, and his location as to time is, probably, decided by our doctrinal preferences.) (13) *Ignatius*, Bh. of Antioch, died under Trajan, about A.D. 50–115 (some date his death A.D. 107). (His references, in the brief fragments, to "*the last times*" and the exhortation in those times to "*expect Him*," is in correspondence with our doctrine.) (14) *Polycarp*, Bh. of Smyrna, a disciple of the Apostle John, who lived about A.D. 70–167. (In view of his association with Chiliasts, and, in the few lines from him, locating the reigning of the saints *after* the Coming of Jesus and the resurrection of the saints, has led Dr. Bennet and others to declare him a Millenarian.) (15) *Papias*, Bh. of Hierapolis, lived between A.D. 80–163. (His writings come chiefly through an enemy—Eusebius—but all concede him to be a Chiliast, and declare that he was *the disciple and pupil of St. John*, and the companion of Polycarp.) This is the record of names in favor of Millenarianism,—names that are held in honorable esteem because of their faith and works in the Christ, extending to death.

b 1. Now on the other side, *not a single name* can be presented, which (1) can be quoted as positively against us, or (2) which can be cited as teaching, in any shape or sense, the doctrine of our opponents.[1]

2. *Pre-Mill. Advocates of the 2d Cent.*

a. (1) *Pothinus*, a martyr, died aged 99 years (A.D. 177, Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 120), hence A.D. 87–177. (His Chiliasm is evident from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, over which he presided, being Chiliastic, from his associate Irenæus being his successor, who describes the uniformity of faith, *Adv. Hæres*, 50, 1. 10.) (2) *Justin Martyr*, about A.D. 100–168 (although others, as Shimeall, give A.D. 89–165). (He needs no reference, as we largely quote him. Comp. Semisch's Art. on him in Herzog's *Real Encyclop.*) (3) *Melito*, Bh. of Sardis, about A.D. 100–170, a few fragments alone preserved. (Shimeall, in his *Reply*, says, "*Jerome and Genadius* both affirm that he was a decided Millenarian.") (4) *Hegisippus*, between A.D. 130–190. (Neander, *Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, pp. 430, 432, designates him "a church teacher of Jewish origin and strong Jewish prepossessions," and an advocate of "sensual Chiliasm.") (5) *Tatian*, between A.D. 130–190. (He was converted under Justin, and is designated by Neander as "his disciple.") (6) *Irenæus*, a martyr (being, Mosheim, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, Amer. Ed., note, p. 120, "born and educated in Asia Minor, under Polycarp and Papias, must therefore be), about A.D. 140–202. (We frequently

and largely quote from him.) (7) *The Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, in a letter A.D. 177 (which some attribute to Irenæus and others to a Lyonese Christian—author unknown) has distinctive traces of Chiliasm in the allusion to a prior or first resurrection. (8) *Tertullian*, about A.D. 150–220. (We frequently give his views.) (9) *Hippolytus*, between A.D. 160–240. (He was a disciple of Irenæus, and—according to Photius—he largely adopted Irenæus in his work against Heresies, and in his *Com.* on Dan., fixed the end of the dispensation five centuries after the birth of Jesus.) (10) Apollinaris, Bh. of Hierapolis, between A.D. 150–200. (He is claimed by us, and conceded by e.g. Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, Sec. 139.) Nearly every witness is a martyr.

b. Now on the other side, *not a single writer* can be presented, not even a single name can be mentioned of any one cited, who opposed Chiliasm in this century, unless we except Clemens Alexandrinus (see 3); much less of any one who taught the Whitbyan view. Now let the student reflect: here are *two centuries* (unless we make the exception stated at the close of the 2d), in which positively no direct opposition whatever arises against our doctrine, but it is held by *the very men*, leading and most eminent, *through whom we trace the Church*. What must we conclude? (1) That the common faith of the Church was Chiliastic, and (2) that such a generality and unity of belief could only have been introduced—as our argument shows by logical steps—by the founders of the Ch. Church and the Elders appointed by them.

3. *Pre-Mill. Advocates of the 3d Cent.*

a. (1) *Cyprian*, about A.D. 200–258. (He greatly admired and imitated Tertullian. We quote him on the nearness of the Advent, the Sabbatism, etc. Shedd, in his *His. of Doc.*, vol. 2, p. 394, says that "Cyprian maintains the Millenarian theory with his usual candor and moderation.") (2) *Commodian*, between A.D. 200–270. (Was a decided Millenarian. Comp. e.g. Clarke's *Sac. Lit.* Neander, *Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 448—censures him as follows: "The Christian spirit, however, in these admonitions, which otherwise evince so lively a zeal for good morals, is disturbed by a sensuous Jewish element, a gross Chiliasm; as for example, when it is affirmed that the lordly masters of the world should in the Millennium do menial service for the saints." Neander overlooks how early childlike piety might contemplate Ps. 149:5–9; Isa. 60:6–10; Mic. 7:16, 17, and kindred passages.) (3) *Nepos*, Bh. of Arsinoe, about A.D. 230–280. (Jerome, Whitby, Shedd, etc., make him a pronounced Chiliast.) (4) *Coracion*, about A.D. 230–280. (He is always united with Nepos by various writers, comp. Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*) (5) *Victorinus*, about A.D. 240–303. (He is expressly called a favorer of Nepos and the Chiliasts by Jerome, *de Viris Ill.*, c. 74.) (6) *Methodius*, Bh. of Olympus, about A.D. 250–311. (Of whom Neander—*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 496—says, he had "a decided leaning to Chiliasm." Conceded to us by Whitby, Hagenbach, and others.) (7) *Lactantius* (although his works were chiefly composed in the next cent., yet being contemporary with Chiliasts so long in this century, we include him), between A.D. 240–330. (We quote from him, although Jerome ridicules his Millenarianism. Prof. Stuart calls him, "a zealous Chiliast.") Others, whom we strongly incline to regard as Millenarians, owing to their constant association with Chiliasts, etc., we omit, because the remains and the statements that we have are so meagre as to make it impossible to give a decided expression of opinion.

b. In this century we for the first time, unless we except Clemens Alexandrinus, come to opposers of our doctrine. Every writer, from the earliest period down to the present, who has entered the lists against us, has been able only to find these antagonists, and we present them in their chronological order, when they revealed themselves as adversaries. They number four, but three of them were powerful for mischief, and speedily gained adherents (comp. Prop. 76). The first in order is (1) *Caius* (or *Gaius*), who is supposed, by Kurtz (*Ch. His.*), to have written about A.D. 210, or as Shedd (*His. Doc.*), in the beginning of the 3d cent. (Much that he is alleged to have said comes to us through bitter Anti-Chiliastic sources, and must be correspondingly received with some allowance.) (2) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who succeeded Pantænus (died A.D. 202, so Kurtz), as preceptor in the Catechetical School of Alexandria, and exerted a powerful influence (on Origen and others) as a teacher from A.D. 193–220. (He became a Christian under Pantænus, after having devoted himself to Pagan philosophy, and only during the latter part of his life made the disciples, who so largely moulded the subsequent interpretation of the Church.)[1] (3) *Origen*, about A.D. 185–254. (We shall refer to him under the next Prop.) (4) Dionysius, about A.D. 190–265. (See next Prop.) There is no doubt but others were largely led to accept of Anti-Chiliastic teaching (seeing what an opposition sprung up in the 4th cent.), but these are *the champions* mentioned as directly hostile to Chiliasm. Now let the student carefully weigh this historical record, and he will see that the Church history indubitably *seals our faith as the general, prevailing belief*, for the most that can possibly be said respecting the opposition is, that in the closing years of the 2d century men arose who started an antagonism distinctively presented and urged in the 3d cent., and which culminated in the 4th and succeeding centuries. Hence, our Prop. is *abundantly confirmed* by the doctrinal status of the early Church; indeed, it is—if our line of argument respecting *the apostolic belief* remaining unchanged concerning the Kingdom is conclusive—*the very position* that the Church in its introduction *must occupy*. How illogical and unscriptural, therefore, for men to strive to weaken the testimony of those Fathers, and to apologize in their behalf, by making them ignorant, superstitious, sensual, etc., thus tracing the Church, established by inspired men and their selected successors, though ignorant, superstitious, and sensual believers, until the learned, enlightened, and spiritual Clemens, Caius, Origen, and Dionysius arose and brought light which "*the consciousness of the Church*" appreciated.

[1] Prof. Shedd (*His. Ch. Doc.*) endeavors to take from us Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, on the ground *of silence*. To this Shimeall in his *Reply* has well answered, showing the traces of Chiliasm by quoting, and laying stress on their associating familiarly with Chiliasts. Indeed, the express manner in which Irenæus and Justin speak of *the unity* of faith includes them, or else, in respect to persons so eminent exception would have been made. Prof. Briggs (*N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879) is not satisfied with Shedd's seizure, but also claims, on the same ground, Hermas. But all this does *not help* the doctrinal status of either Shedd or Briggs. If simple silence, in the briefest, fragmentary writings, is *a test* of opposition or of Whitbyism, we have *yet to learn this rule and the reasons* upon which it is supported. In reference to Polycarp, it may be added, that he is so referred to *by Irenæus* in a letter to Florinus (*Euseb.*, v. 1, c. 20), who professes to receive the same doctrines held by him, that many class the master and disciple together. Prof. Briggs is unfortunate in his efforts to take adherents from us, such as Cyprian, Apollinaris, Melito, Methodius, Victorinus, and others, because the most unrelenting opponents *concede them to us*, fully admitting their Chiliastic teaching. But such efforts should not

surprise us, when against the uniform testimony of ancients and moderns, as well as the writings open to all, he even attempts to take Justin Martyr from us! A faith must *badly need propping* when it calls for such desperate and suicidal efforts. Let the reader ponder this fact, that neither Shedd nor Briggs *can quote* the direct language of any writer of this period, and later, *who advocates* their modernized ideas of the Millennium. This fact they artfully conceal.

[2] We allow Clemens as against us, simply on the ground of his supposed influence in making Origen Anti-Chiliastic, because he was his teacher. But we do this under *a protest*. We find him enumerated as among the Chiliasts by a number of writers. It is admitted, on all hands, that there is nothing decided from him respecting a Mill. theory on the one side or on the other. Therefore he cannot be quoted by either party as positively favoring Chiliasm or Anti-Chiliasm. On the other hand, he is claimed as Chiliastic because (comp. Burnet's Theory of the Earth, vol. 2, p. 188, Duffield *On Proph.*, p. 29, *Prop. Times*, vol. 1, p. 73, etc.) he still holds to the Chiliastic ideas of the 7th Milliad introducing "the Rest," and of the Kingdom being introduced by judgments. It *is certain* that more in harmony with Chiliasm can be quoted from him than that which is hostile to it. But this serious objection inclines us to be sufficiently generous to place his name in *the limited* list of our opponents, viz.: his system of interpretation, which formed afterward, in the hands of Origen and his successors, such a leverage against our doctrine. While Clemens could not, with the introduction of his system, *entirely rid* himself of Chiliastic views on some important points, yet—whether he foresaw it or not—its entire tendency, as the development showed, was to form the weapons subsequently so freely used in crushing our belief.

Obs. 14. When surveying the historical ground, which so accurately corresponds with the Scriptural, we are forced to the conclusion that those writers—both friends and foes—who insist upon the great extent of Chiliasm in the Apostolic and Primitive Church *are most certainly* correct. We, therefore, cordially indorse those who express themselves as Müncher (*Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 415), that "it (Chiliasm) was *universally received by almost all teachers*," and (pp. 450, 452) refers it, with Justin, to "*the whole orthodox community*," summing up with this decided conclusion: "With these observations, the result of criticism is manifest, that in the Catholic Church the doctrine of the 1000 years' Kingdom was *the dominant doctrine*, and the rejection of it was regarded as an approach to Gnosticism. That the defenders of Chiliasm were fewer than Justin has represented—as Schroeckh asserts—*is a position which cannot be historically maintained.*" With this statement every *unbiassed, unprejudiced* mind must coincide when regarding the historical facts which support it.

It is worthy of notice, that men, who, like Newman, Pusey, etc., make *much* of tradition, elevating it to a Romish position, are very careful—following thus the Romish Church—to reject *the earliest tradition* pertaining to the Kingdom. Chiliasm, being *so hostile to their exclusive* Church-Kingdom view, which forms the foundation of their system, is *particularly unwelcome and offensive*. This is true of all who are inclined to a mystical, Romish belief of Church authority and salvation. But here is an evident and palpable *inconsistency*, taking their own doctrinal position for granted, because they forsake *the earlier* tradition for *the later*, and deny that to be orthodox which once was promulgated as a test of orthodoxy. This only indicates that for the sake of some system of belief, sincerely held, and filling the mind with prejudice, not only *the plainest* Scriptures but *the most evident* historical facts will be ignored or set aside. They even in their ardor for the later tradition pronounce Chiliasm a "heresy," when it is noteworthy, as Chillingworth, Lardner, Greswell, Neander, and many others have observed that these very Chiliastic Fathers were *the bulwark* of the Church against all kinds of error, especially Gnosticism in all its forms, several having specially written against heresies then prevailing.

PROPOSITION 76. *The doctrine of the Kingdom was changed under the Gnostic and Alexandrian influence.*

What the doctrine was in the first churches, viz.: a belief that in the millennial age, still future, Christ would personally come and reign, restoring the Davidic throne and Kingdom and fulfilling the covenant promises, has been shown; now to prove the defection indicated in our Proposition, in order to strengthen our argument, we shall rely upon the testimony of writers who are not in doctrinal sympathy with us. It would be an easy matter to bring a large number of witnesses to testify, but a few, prominent for learning and ability, will suffice to show the truthfulness and force of the same.

Obs. 1. The student will carefully notice that with the view the early church had of "*the Christship*," of *the Kingdom* as expressly covenanted and predicted, of *the postponement* of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent, of *the speedy Coming* of the Messiah to inaugurate the Kingdom, of *the period of trial* intervening, etc., it was *simply impossible* for the early believers to identify the church as, in any sense, the Kingdom of God as covenanted and prophesied. It was only *when* the Scriptures and the promises were spiritualized, *when*, under the influence of release from persecution and incoming churchly prosperity, the church itself was exalted through civil patronage, that the Primitive doctrine was gradually but surely set aside, and *the church itself* was made (as by Origen) "*the mystic Kingdom of heaven*," or (as by Eusebius) "*the very image* of the Kingdom of Christ," or (as by Augustine) "*the City of God.*"

Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 536) quotes Bengel as saying: "When Christianity became a worldly power by Constantine, the hope of the future was weakened by the joy over the present success." Auberlen (*Daniel*, p. 375) remarks: "Chiliasm disappeared *in proportion* as Roman Papal Catholicism advanced. The Papacy took to itself, *as a robbery*, that glory which is an object of hope, and can only be reached by obedience and humility of the cross. When the Church became a harlot, she ceased to be a bride who goes out to meet her bridegroom; and *thus Chiliasm disappeared*. This is the deep truth that lies at the bottom of the Protestant, anti-papistic interpretation of the Apocalypse" (see next Prop.—this allusion is made here, because the principles of interpretation flowing from Gnosticism and Alexandrianism led to such a development and application). Andreas (Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. 5, p. 79) fully admits (A.D. 550-600) the primitive view as still entertained by some, as follows (On Rev.): "Others think that after the completion of 6000 years shall be the first resurrection from the dead, which is to be peculiar to the saints alone; who are to be raised up that they may dwell again on this earth, where they had given proofs of patience and fortitude; and that they may live here a thousand years in honor and plenty, after which will be the general resurrection of good and bad." He says that the Church (his portion of it) does not receive it, holding to a reign in the third heaven, etc., and advocating this interpretation: "By the thousand years we understand the preaching of the Gospel, or the time of the Gospel dispensation."

Obs. 2. The *Ency. Amer.*, Art. "Mill.," briefly states the case: "The *Gnostics*, despising matter, were *adversaries* to the dogma of the Millennium. . . . And ultimately the philosophical school of Alexandria." Mosheim (*Eccles. His.*, Cent. 3d, sec. 12), after declaring: "that the Saviour is to reign a thousand years among men, before the end of the world, had been believed *by many* in the preceding century, without offence to any," adds, "in this century the Millenarian doctrine fell into disrepute, *through the influence especially of Origen*, who strenuously opposed it, because *it contravened* some of his opinions." In his *Com. of the First Three Cen.* (vol. 2, sec. 38), he observes: "Among *the Jewish opinions* to which in this age *philosophy* proved detrimental, *the most distinguished* was that of the reign of Christ a thousand years, with the saints restored to their bodies. This opinion, I believe, was introduced into the church near the commencement of the Christian commonwealth. *And down to the times of Origen*, all the teachers who were so disposed openly professed and taught it, although there were some who either denied it, or at least called it into question.[1] But *Origen assailed it fiercely; for it was repugnant to his philosophy;* and by the system of biblical interpretation which he discovered, he gave *a different turn* to those texts of Scripture on which the patrons of this doctrine most relied." "*It is certain* that in the second century, the opinion that Christ would reign a thousand years on the earth, was diffused *over a great part of Christendom, and that the most eminent doctors favored it; and no controversy with them was moved by those who thought otherwise.* Tertullian speaks of it as *the common doctrine of the whole church.*" "*It is certain*, from Justin Martyr and others, that *very many, and they men of great influence*, thought as he did (i.e. were Millenarians), nor were they on that account taxed with corrupt doctrine." "But in the third century the reputation of this doctrine declined; and first in Egypt, through the influence especially of Origen. . . . And yet it could not be exterminated in a moment; it still had respectable advocates." Mosheim proceeds in various places to show how, by a philosophizing, most violent, system of interpretation, which began "*most wretchedly to pervert and twist every part of those Divine oracles* which opposed itself to their philosophical tenets or notions," the literal interpretation was finally crushed. He thus contrasts the interpretation adopted by the two systems: "He (Origen) wished to have the literal and obvious sense of the words disregarded, and *an arcane sense*, lying concealed in the envelope of the words, to be sought for. But the advocates of an earthly Kingdom of Christ rested their cause solely on *the natural and proper sense* of certain expressions in the Bible."[2]

[1] The student will notice the evident reluctance manifested by the qualifying word "near," and that while some (Gnostics, etc.) may have denied it, it is *utterly impossible* for Mosheim to produce, or quote, a single orthodox writer *who did this* at that period. Such softening expressions are to be found in respectable works, of various writers, but not one has yet *produced his authority* for such assertions; and, therefore, we are forced to conclude that *the wish is father* to the statements. The concessions, partially given in frankness, are all that our position requires, and we feel under obligations to Mosheim, and others, for presenting them, although in direct opposition to their own doctrinal tenets.

[2] Neander follows in the main Mosheim enlarging on many points, and is equally decisive in tracing the gradual overthrow of the once prevailing doctrine to Gnostic and Alexandrian influence. Quotations from him will follow. Kurtz (*Ch. His.*, p. 146) remarks: "Since the time of Papias the expectation of a Millennial reign of glory at the close of the present dispensation had been fondly cherished by the Christians, who, under their continued persecutions, looked for the speedy return of the Lord. *Only the*

spiritualists of Alexandria (Clement, Origen, etc.) opposed these views, and, by allegorical interpretations, explained away the Biblical arguments in favor of them." Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall,* vol. 1, p. 535), with his usual sarcasm, after alluding to the doctrine that "it seems so well adapted to the desires and apprehensions of mankind, that it must have contributed in a very considerable degree to the progress of the Christian faith," remarks: "But when the edifice of the church was almost completed, the temporary support was laid aside. The doctrine of Christ's reign upon earth was at first treated as a profound allegory, was considered by degrees as a doubtful and useless opinion, and was *at length rejected* as the absurd invention of heresy and fanaticism." Beaven (*Account of Irenæus,* p. 255), after reviewing the ground, says: "There is no writer of any importance down to *the time of Origen, who impugned* the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ on earth." Olshausen (favorable to Millenarianism, but somewhat disposed to spiritualize the Kingdom in its application to the church) remarks (*Com.* on Matt. 3 : 2): "Even in the apostolic times sprung up the germs of *the Gnostic idealism,* which, in its doctrine of the Kingdom, denied any future real and outward manifestation of the divine dominion." He also shows how the Alexandrian school developed this ideal feature.

Obs. 3. Gnosticism, with its varied forms and subtle modifications, was early prevailing, and whilst nearly all the doctrines of Christianity suffered, more or less, under its moulding influence, that of the Kingdom *especially* became, under its plastic manipulations, *one widely different* from the Scriptural and early church doctrine. In its dualistic theories, its intermediary existences, its evolutions of the Divine, etc., it struck *a heavy blow* at the promised kingship of *the Son of Man* as David's Son; *it changed* the royal title of "the Messiah," "the Christ" into a mere name equivalent to that of Jesus; *it discarded* as foolish, or received as containing *a hidden* meaning, the prophecies relating to this future Kingdom; and with its peculiar tenets of making man rise to God Himself—a becoming identified with Deity—*it rejected altogether* the notion of such a Kingdom contained in the letter of Holy Writ, and believed in by contemporary Christians. Emanation then, as now in its Pantheistic form, has *no sympathy* for the early Patristic Kingdom. Asceticism, the belief in the inherent corruption of matter, and its kindred brood, *then, just as now,* was antagonistic to it. While Docetism, the outgrowth (so some writers) of one form of Gnosticism, denying as it did the reality of the human body of Jesus, the Christ, *effectually closed* all access to an understanding of the Kingdom, *spiritualizing* not only the body, but everything else relating to Him as Messiah. One party, impelled by their principles, not only ignored Judaism as antagonistic to Christianity, but insisted that the Old Test. contained error and should be rejected as a true exponent of the will of the Supreme God. (The Old Test., while true in itself, was only a history drawn up under the guidance of the Demiurge—hence inferior and liable to deceive;—comp. Neander *Ch. His.,* vol. 1, p. 383). The Chiliasts *maintained the contrary,* largely quoting from the Jewish Scriptures. To reconcile these opposite tendencies, another and succeeding party arose, who assumed that reason occupied the position of umpire, and from the deductions of reason instituted a medium between the two, retaining something from both Gnosticism and Chiliasm, so far as interpretation was concerned, but *also spiritualizing the Kingdom,* applying it to the church, etc. From this arose the rejection of the peculiar and distinguishing characteristics belonging to both Chiliasm and Gnosticism. Hence, it was the relationship that error sustained to Christianity—adopting the phraseology of the latter but with other meanings attached, wearing the garb of friendship and even of piety—that gradually undermined *the formerly received doctrine* of the covenanted Kingdom.

Precisely the same tactics were exhibited in that period, that we find to-day in the writings of Free-Religionists, etc. Gnosticism, in some of its phases and workings, is far from being extinct, as evidenced in a refined Pantheism that finds its advocates even among the professed orthodox.

Obs. 4. It is well to keep in view the direct means employed *to get rid* of the Chiliastic idea of the Kingdom. (1) Caius (or Gaius) and Dionysius first cast doubt upon the genuineness and inspiration of the Apocalypse, it evidently being supposed that the appeals made to it—in view of its correspondence with preceding Jewish ideas—*could not otherwise* be set aside. (2) By rejecting the literal sense, and substituting a figurative or allegorical; this *effectually* modified covenant and prophecy. (3) Such portions of the Old Test. as literally taught the doctrine, had their prophetic inspiration discredited, as in the Clementines (comp. Neander on them). (4) Accepting all the prophetical portions, and what could not be conveniently allegorized and applied to the church, was attributed to heaven for fulfilment (as seen in Origen and his followers). (5) Making promises directly given to the Jewish nation as such, either conditional in their nature or else merely typical of the blessings accruing to Gentiles. These, after what has been written, need no comment.

The student will also observe another cause mentioned by Gibbon, Mosheim, Neander, etc. It appears from the testimony of history that Chiliasts—under the pressure of persecution from which they earnestly sought deliverance, and under the misapprehension that Antichrist was already exhibited in the Roman power, hoped for the speedy Advent of Christ and the coming of the Kingdom. Now, this view of the Roman Empire, and this hope of a speedy anticipated deliverance caused them to feel unwilling to engage in wars of conquest, or even to enter into the civil service of the Empire. This feeling and resultant conduct, based, rightly or wrongly, upon their view of the Empire and its expected destruction under the coming Messiah and Kingdom, was naturally *most offensive* to the Roman Emperors and their adherents, and also to that portion of the clergy who were for *conciliating* the existing temporal power. This became the more so, when the church began to realize the protection of the State preparatory to a union of the two, and the reaction without due discrimination, made Chiliasm itself offensive.

Obs. 5. Another deadly, most effective weapon was *the philosophy* of that period. At first it was only represented as "the wall and the hedge of the vineyard," but it was—notwithstanding apostolic warnings—very soon assiduously cultivated *as part* of the vineyard itself. The first insidious approach was, that this "wall and hedge" was so run as to exclude from the vineyard of truth whatever human reason regarded as objectionable; the second followed as a necessary (through human infirmity and shortsightedness) result, error itself was graciously accepted, diligently planted, cultivated, and grown. The crop was abundant.

It is only necessary, in confirmation, to direct the student to the able histories of Neander, Mosheim, Kurtz, Geissler, etc., for abundant proof in reference to *the fatal* influence of philosophy *as then* taught, "which" (as Mosheim) "struck at the *very vitals* of religion, and tended, in no small degree, *to affect the credit* of those sacred writings on which the entire system of Christian discipline relies for support." It is a sad commentary on human frailty that no important doctrine existed which did not suffer, more or less, from this spirit of Rationalism and Apostatizing. It is only fair to say that the tendencies and teaching of some are far more destructive than that of others; but viewed as a whole, injury to the truth resulted both from the extremists and from those who sought to diminish the extravagances of the former. The same still holds true to-day, for the most determined opponents that we have are those who endeavor to bend religious doctrine to some favorite system of philosophy.

Obs. 6. Eccl. History informs us that Philosophy obtained *the victory* in this struggle between the ancient and later system of interpretation and resultant doctrine of the Kingdom. This mainly arose from two causes: 1. It has been truly observed, in tracing the rise and progress of ideas, that "ideas obtain authority and dominion, not altogether from their intrinsic truth, but rather from their *constant asseveration,* especially when they fall in with the common hopes and fears, the wants and necessities of human nature. The mass of mankind have neither leisure nor ability to examine them; they fatigue and so compel the world to acceptance" (Milman's *Latin Chris.*, vol. 3, p. 437). Thus repetition alone is often the parent of faith, and then of authority, especially if the continued rehearsal is done (*a*) by the learned, whom the vulgar regard with great respect; (*b*) by those in civil or ecclesiastical authority, whom the common people reverence; (*c*) by persons who are in a condition to enforce the same by the extension or withdrawal of patronage and emoluments; (*d*) by individuals and communities in order to accord with popular views and prejudices (which may be seen by contrasting the Alexandrian notion of the Kingdom, heaven, etc., with the heathen ideas of the same) in Eschatology—being thus more in sympathy with preconceived notions, popularly entertained, than with that of the doctrine of the covenanted Kingdom. 2. The Origenistic system of interpretation, being, more or less, under the patronage of the learned and great, the ambitious for civil and ecclesiastical preferments, the flatterers of the Emperors and of the Empire, became intrenched in the church, because of *its adulation* of the church, turning it into the covenanted Kingdom, it paved the way for increased power and riches. With its pliant aid, it was easy to get rid of the prophetical denunciations which seemed *derogatory* to the Emperors and Empire—to remove the belief of a Kingdom to come which involved the supposed *dignity and perpetuation* of the Roman power, to emasculate the prophecies pertaining to the future, which *now* could be applied—even the New Jerusalem state (as by Eusebius)—to *the then* present period. The Alexandrian substitution of the Kingdom, surrounded by talent, wealth, power, influence, and catering to the wishes, hopes, and ambition of humanity, *prospered and extended itself.* As time progressed, it was fostered and cherished by mystical and scholastic tendencies, and finally strengthened and confirmed by various philosophical systems.

Admitting the valuable results that may have flowed from some of these systems thus connected, in resisting Rationalistic influences running to an extreme and in counteracting the subtle arguments of infidelity, yet *so far* as the doctrine of the Kingdom (which is the point constantly aimed at in our argument) has been concerned, their constant aim has been to apologize for, or to ridicule, or to crush, *the apostolic view of the Kingdom.* Their influence in this direction (with but few exceptions, as e.g. in later systems, as Rothe's, etc.) has only been disastrous. In league with the spirit of Alexandrian interpretation, in sympathy with the old monkish notions of the Kingdom, in fraternization with mystical and scholastic ideas, they have endeavored to make out the existence of a Kingdom *in unison* with these; and churchly men, pious and talented, believing that they could be moulded into effective instruments to elevate and defend *the church as the divine Kingdom* of promise, have seized, used, and perpetuated them, not realizing their destructive nature. Human wisdom has been substituted for the divine, and *even dared* to become the measure of, or the standard for, the divine. Philosophy, with its boasted standing, leavened with Origenistic ideas, imbued with a refined Gnosticism, sympathizing with the Ideal or the Pantheistic, *has mistaken* either the Sovereignty of God or the Church *for the covenanted Kingdom;* others, not seeing the blunder, accept of its teachings until, at present, this teaching seems *to be imbedded* in the churches *as a fundamental* truth. This could be the more readily effected seeing that philosophy takes into its

train men of intelligence and deep thinking, of leadership in literature and religion, while the mass of mankind, unaccustomed to laborious thought and relying upon such men for guidance, blindly follow their lead. But the days even of such a fettering philosophy are fast numbered, because there is abroad an independent mode of thinking (alas, too often running into unbelief and the wildest extremes) that receives the declaration of no one without weighing or testing. Two modes of thinking can only now largely affect and control the masses: one is dealing with truth and proving it to be such by the most reliable testimony—either from Scripture (for those who believe in it), or from history (for the student), or from nature (for the naturalist), or from science, art, etc. (for the scientist). The other is to cater in some form to the corrupt nature of man (and this even may be brought into an unnatural alliance with the other), and the more this is done under the garb of order, love, liberty, etc., the better it will be received. The love for the truth and the love for self-indulgence are the two leading motives to be appealed to; and we are assured from Scripture that, so far as this dispensation is concerned, *the latter* will constantly gain the victory as to numbers. We should, therefore, cautiously receive the utterances of man, unless they come to us with the imprint of truth, fortified by *ample scriptural* proof. Especially so when they come to us under the philosopher's cloak, for then if a fallacy exists, it is much more difficult to detect it, being enshrouded in a garb to unclasp which requires skilful hands. What Luther, and many others said respecting the influence of philosophy in the Church can be *truthfully* repeated to-day, at least in reference to the subject of the Kingdom philosophy, whatever its mission may be intellectually and morally, is *not necessary* to an understanding of this Kingdom (Prop. 9). The Kingdom is *founded on covenant and prophecy*, and not on human speculations. We find this Kingdom *only* in the Scriptures and not in human systems (Prop. 10). We do not even require its aid in ascertaining the sense or meaning of Scripture (Prop. 4). Philosophy, if she is (as some claim, and justly too) a handmaiden to Christianity, is a very humble one, that has too often, under the desire to serve, *injured* her mistress. Her true position is not the one assigned to her by many, as a kind of *guardian* (often changing, as seen in successive phases and stages) of the inner shrine, but that of *a mere servitor* sweeping the outer court. She has, through her friends, arrogated to herself *the chief* seat; in a discussion of this kind, when the appeal doctrinally must be to the Scriptures, she, if a true and valuable servitor, must descend from the same, acknowledging *the supremacy* of Holy Writ, and submitting to its authority.

Obs. 7. Another cause which operated largely to diminish the belief in the doctrine of the Kingdom was *the coldness and enmity* which arose between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, when they separated into parties antagonistic to each other. History conclusively shows that the peace formerly maintained between them through the wise, prudent, and conciliating conduct of *the early leaders*, was ultimately removed. Nothing contributed so largely to this as the removal (through Gnostic and Alexandrian influence) of *the distinctive Jewish* idea of the Messiahship and resultant Kingdom, *the bond of faith* that had united Jew and Gentile into fraternal believers. We need not enter into the saddening controversy—a mournful commentary on human frailty and passion—but one of the results arrests attention, viz.: that the Gentile Christians in their animosity to Judaism, which sought to impose its legality and ritualism, finally were carried to such an extreme that, without discriminating between what was abrogated and the things of God that remained in force, everything that savored in their estimation of Judaism *was cast aside*, including of course *the long-entertained* Jewish notion of the Kingdom.

As already intimated, a mystical, transcendant philosophy, a spiritual system of interpretation, aided them in getting rid of *the hated Jewish* forms, traditions, and beliefs. Epithets, a fruitful source from whence moderns still draw an ample supply, were heaped on the doctrine of the Kingdom as once entertained, including such as "gross," "carnal," "material," "degrading," "fleshly," "sensual," "earthly," etc., which still flow so readily from the pens of a certain class—"*heresy-hunters.*"

Obs. 8. Notably, the conversion of Constantine, the deliverance and exaltation of the church, and finally the union of State and church under Imperial supervision and protection, *served* to make Millenarianism *unpalatable.* This has been remarked by numerous writers, and the fact is incontrovertible. We leave others, who have no sympathy for our doctrine, testify. Thus e.g. Smith (*New Test. His.*, p. 723), after stating that "the interval between the apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called the Chiliastic period of Apocalyptic interpretation," proceeds: "Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, *began to lose their vivid expectation* of our Lord's speedy Advent and their spiritual conception of His Kingdom, and to look upon *the temporal supremacy* of Christianity *as a fulfilment* of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman Empire, become Christian, was regarded no longer an object of prophetic denunciation, but as the scene *of a Millennial* development. This view, however, was soon met by *the figurative* interpretation of the Millennium, as the reign of Christ *in the hearts* of all true believers." Kurtz (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, sec. 40, par. 8), after referring to the opposition of Clement, Origen, Dionysius, adds: "But as the aspect of outward affairs changed under the reign of Constantine the Great, these views (Chiliastic) *lose their hold* on men's minds. The church now prepared for a long-continued period of temporal prosperity, and *the State church of that time forgot the Millennial glory of the future.*"

The remodelling of the Church by Constantine, to conform it to the government of the State (compare Mosheim and Neander); the endowment of it with wealth and worldly honors; the constituting it the easy road to preferment, rank, power, and riches for the aspiring; the making it through imperial favor the popular channel of religion, so completely intoxicated men—not apprehending the serious calamities to result from the same—that instead of *looking for the Messianic Kingdom to come*, they now supposed and taught that the prophecies relating *to the Kingdom were fulfilling*—that the Kingdom itself *was already established* under Constantinian splendor, and that some, like Eusebius, dared even to apply the predictions relating to the new heavens and new earth *to this era.* An amazing change took place in the minds of men, when, forsaking *the plain teaching* of the Word and *the early faith*, they permitted themselves *to be blinded* by the outward popularity, the State-union and the imperial friendship conferred upon the Church. The reader will find in Brooks's *El. Proph. Interp.*, Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, and numerous Millenarian works, abundant references to this cause of decline in our doctrine. We can only briefly notice the remarkable change of opinion resulting from the change in the Church's external condition. Before Constantine, the Church, under Chiliastic leading, had always associated the idea of Antichrist with Rome, and that the Roman power would certainly be destroyed at the expected Advent of the Messiah. This was taught down even to Lactantius (*De Instit.*, ch. 15), and was so imbedded in the minds of many that Jerome himself (*Com. on Dan.* 9), giving the testimony of the Fathers on this point, could not contradict it as false. All this was *humiliating* to a professed Christian emperor, to the subservient followers of imperial honors, and to the hierarchical seekers of office, and "the convenient explication was discovered and adopted by many that Antichrist was pagan Rome, and that from the date of Constantine's conversion *the millennium commenced.*" (A view that has been revived by Grotius, Bush, etc., thus *caricaturing* the magnificent prophecies of the Millennium by applying them to a period *disastrous* to the Church, full of bitter discussions and persecutions, pregnant with deceit, violence, and entailed evils.) Shimeall (*Eschatalogy*, p. 49) says: "The policy of Constantine, while it tended to eradicate the last remaining vestiges of the primitive landmarks of Christianity and the Church, contributed also to pander to the ambition of an aspiring clergy after 'the pre-eminence.' Hence the gradual suppression of that (Millenarian) doctrine, which the open hostility of some, and the timid, temporizing policy of others, succeeded to effect. This was brought about by their adoption of the Origenic rule of interpreting the teachings of Isaiah and St. John on the one hand, and the explaining of them in accordance with the theory of Eusebius, which *made Rome the New Jerusalem* of the

Apocalypse on the ground that Constantine turned the heathen temples into Christian churches, etc., on the other." Dr. Schaff (*His. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, pp. 299-301) presents the same testimony as Neander, Mosheim, Kurtz, etc., respecting the extent of Millenarianism in the Prim. Church, saying, for example: "The most striking point in the Eschatology of the ancient Church is *the widely current and very prominent* Chiliasm, or the doctrine of the visible reign of Christ in glory on earth with the risen saints for a thousand years," etc. After referring to the Fathers who taught it, he then remarks: "In the age of Constantine, however, *a radical change* took place in this belief. After Christianity, contrary to all expectation, triumphed in the Roman Empire, and was embraced by the Cæsars themselves, *the Millennial reign, instead of being anxiously waited and prayed for, began to be dated* either from the first appearance of Christ, or from the conversion of Constantine, and *to be regarded as realized in the glory of the dominant imperial State Church.*" Certainly it was not in the selfish nature of "Patriarchs," "Metropolitans or Archbishops," "Bishops," and others, who received *princely endowments, to desire the Coming and Reign of the Christ*—they rather wished their stations, honors, and emoluments to remain in perpetuity.

Obs. 9. Another method, pointed out by Brooks, Mede, etc., which materially aided in removing our doctrine, was *the suppressing* of Millenarian works. Thus e.g. the works of Papias, several from the pen of Irenæus, the Treatise of Nepos against the Allegorizers, Tertullian's on Paradise, and others, were successfully removed. Indeed the writings of some of the Fathers were so totally obliterated that it is only by intimations in the writings of opposers that we know that they were Chiliastic in sentiment. While the ravages and changes of time, the destructiveness incident to age, may account for the removal of some, yet *the extent* of the suppression (together with corruptions, omissions, substitutions of other writings) clearly indicates *the animus* of aversion and hostility.

Then it was also customary to speak of Chiliastic adherents as if they taught *a most gross doctrine*, well knowing that the means of refutation were not at hand. At times, however, they contradict themselves, speaking in one place well of the men whom they in another stigmatize. This is true of Papias and others. We give another illustration referred to by Mede and others. Eusebius says of Nepos that he taught "*a Mill. of sensual luxury on earth.*" But in the same chapter he makes Dionysius, who wrote against Nepos, to say: "*I greatly reverence the man,*" and "*greatly love* Nepos both on account of his faith and industry, and his great study of the Scriptures"—which he scarcely would have said if Nepos was as "sensual" as Eusebius reports. The complacency with which Neander and others relate Eusebius' story of Dionysius converting Coracion and a large number of Chiliastic clergy at a conference held for a disputation at Arsinoe is remarkable—a story which bears on its very face the evidence of being a concocted one, having *no substantial basis*. Observe (1) that Eusebius was exceedingly bitter against the Chiliasts, and untruthful (as Mede and others have shown) in other statements respecting them. (2) Such a unanimous yielding of an entire conference of opponents is a result opposed to human nature and experience. (3) This story was concocted some time after the alleged occurrence took place, and we have none of the marvellous argumentation which produced such a result given. (4) The statement is utterly inconsistent with the principles of interpretation mutually held, and with the Scriptures held by Chiliasts, which are not so readily set aside. (5) The story very flippantly takes it for granted that Millenarians have but little Scriptural foundation for their belief, and that the spiritualistic interpretation is all powerful. (6) We have no statement of Coracion or of any of the alleged converts, of such a result. (7) We know that, notwithstanding the stated conversions, many in Egypt and other places remained Chiliasts. (8) If Dionysius had such extraordinary success and was really so powerful in argument, it is presumable—as Chiliasm was extensive—that this line of reasoning and arguments would have reached beyond Arsinoe. Now absolutely nothing that has reached us from him has any Anti-Chiliastic force, which a tyro could not meet.

Obs. 10. While it may justly be regarded invidious to attempt to lower the character or position of opponents in defence of a doctrine (which has

been largely done against us), yet in self-justification—seeing that many writers (as Jones, Shedd, etc.) *unduly exalt* the first opponents of Chiliasm *to the prejudice* of the Millenarian Fathers—it may be well, briefly, to allow *impartial* (because in no doctrinal sympathy with us) testimony demonstrate *to whom* we are indebted for the decline of our doctrine. Respecting Origen (comp. Luther's view of, *Prop.* 4, Obs. 1, note 1; Michelet's *Life of Luther*, p. 273, and Ap. p. 419, etc.; and Milner's, Mosheim's, Pressense's, *Prop.* 4, Obs. 6), notwithstanding his learning and ability, the ablest writers coincide in saying that *his mode* of handling the Scriptures resulted *most disastrously* to the church. In reference to Clement of Alexandria, Dionysius, and all of the Alexandrian school, it is sufficient to refer the reader to the temperate remarks of Neander, and other historians, on the entire tendency of the Alexandrian school, which was unfavorable to a correct interpretation of Scripture. Regarding Jerome and Eusebius, it will suffice to say, that the same historians, admitting the value of their labors in some directions, also state their unreliability in controversy, their devotion to asceticism (Jerome's), and their gross misinterpretation and misapplication of Scripture.

It is not our desire to detract from the honor due to Origen (as e.g. in his labors on the Hexapla, Treatise against Celsus, etc.), Jerome (as e.g. in his Latin version of the Old Test., etc.), and others. But the tendencies of their Scriptural interpretations and expositions being simple matter of history, and liberally animadverted on by our opponents, form *a legitimate* subject to be thus introduced. (Such animadversions are freely given on our side in Brooks's *El. of Proph. Inter.*, Shimeall's *Eschatology*, Seiss' *Last Times*, etc., and need not be repeated.) When Shedd (*His. Ch. Doc.*) and others shield themselves under the bare statement that our doctrine was crushed under the influence of the Alexandrian school (but carefully avoiding to tell us *the practical and evil tendency* of this school in Biblical interpretation), it is but just to direct the reader's attention to the same (comp. Prop. 4). Prof. Briggs in his series of articles decries all that are admitted to be Chiliasts, and *eulogizes all* that followed the lead of the Alexandrian school. In view of his extravagant praise, we append a few additional testimonies. First, as to Clement of Alexandria, Killen (*The Old. Cath. Ch.*, p. 10) says of him: "His spiritual taste was sadly vitiated by his study of the heathen philosophy, and his tendency to indulge *in allegorical* interpretations renders him *an unsafe guide* as an expositor of the Scriptures." On p. 374 he says of him that he "*allegorized Scripture in a way as dangerous as it was absurd*," and gives some specimens (with which compare those presented by Fairbairn, *Typology*, who gives Luther's and Calvin's opinion on such performances). This estimate of Clement is substantially presented by every Church historian of eminence—some even being more severe in their strictures. And we direct attention to the fact that whatever retention of Chiliastic ideas he maintained, he was the one who introduced this allegorizing system at Alexandria, which proved so fatal not only to Chiliasm but other doctrines. In view, therefore, of his disastrous influence in adopting Philo's method and introducing it into the Church, we present the following estimate of his system of interpretation in the Art. "*Alexandrian Christianity*" (*The North Brit. Rev.*, Aug. 1855): "If we are asked how Clement understood his Bible, we must answer, *pace tanti viri*, very badly indeed. In interpretation he is a mere disciple of Philo; as that writer had dealt with Moses, so he deals with the prophets and the writers of the New Test.; and he applies his principle apparently without any fixed rules at all. He imagined that every passage of Scripture undoubtedly contained *a hidden meaning, or rather any number of hidden meanings:* the same passage might mean this, that, and the other thing, *all at the same time;* and so he set to work at it, as children do at a charade, and expected a discovery of hidden truth from God's blessing upon piously intended guesses." His fame rests not in exegesis; his admirers (Kingsley, etc.) praise him for his philosophy and earnestness. As to Origen, Killen (above, p. 374) says of his using this system and departing from the literal sense: "In this way the divine record may be made to support any crochet which happens to please the fancy of the commentator." The writer in the North Brit. Review (above) remarks: "His (Origen's) principles of Scriptural interpretation are Philo's, reduced to a still completer system; and the most remarkable feature in it is his bold avowal of his belief that the simple literal meaning

is often not only untrue but impossible. On the strength of this expression Strauss claims him as an ally. But the views of the two men are totally different. Origen believed in the complete inspiration of every word of Scripture, and he thought that *the allegorical sense*, which was the most precious, was always strictly true ; but *that God inserted untruths and impossibilities in the literal text* in order that the reader might not be content with it, but look beneath it for the deeper and more precious truth. Indeed, in order to recommend this allegorical theory he even immensely exaggerates the discrepancies of the literal text, and find sdifficulties where no one else would have thought of finding them." (" For example, he pronounces the text, ' If any man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also,' to be very absurd in its literal meaning ; not because, as some have thought, it exaggerates the duty of submissiveness, but because, since a man naturally uses his right hand, he could not possibly strike his adversary on the right but on the left cheek. We wish one of his pupils had been saucy enough to give him a practical proof of the superiority, in such cases, of experiment over theory.") The *Ency. Brit.* says of Origen (*De Princip.*, 211, s. 2) that he described those who refused his views as such, who " refusing the labor of intelligence, followed *the superficial mode* of literal interpretation." Hase (*His. Ch. Church*, p. 94), after having referred to the characteristics of the Alexandrian theology in bringing out " a hidden sense" by means of " allegorical interpretation," which should develop a " signification worthy of God," adds : " It was through his (Origen's) influence *that the expectation which then prevailed* with respect to a near approach of Christ's Second Advent, and a Millennial Kingdom, *began to be regarded as heretical, or at least fanatical.*" Rees' *Cyclop.*, art. "*Mill.*," admits that the ancient belief of the doctrine " touching the new Kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth, after the resurrection, was held for near three centuries *before it was charged* as erroneous, as appears from Eccles. History" (quoting M. Launoy as authority), speaking of it as taught " by several of the greatest men among the Primitive Fathers," and then thus refers to the decline brought about, "*principally through the influence and authority of Origen*, who opposed it with the greatest warmth, because it was incompatible with some of his favorite sentiments." (Comp. arts. on " Origen" in Herzog's *Real Encyclop.*, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, etc.) The disciples of Origen, such as Dionysius, Hieracus, and others, carried out his system, and, of course, assisted in the decline. Among these later on may be especially enumerated Gregory Thaumaturgus, who (*Panegyric in Orig.*, ch. 15, quoted by Neander in *Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 491) most extravagantly eulogizes Origen as specially favored " by communion with the divine Spirit," " so that this man had received from God that greatest of gifts, the call to be to men an interpreter of the words of God ; to understand God's Word *as God speaks it*, and to announce it to men as man can understand it." Men now imitate Gregory, and profess to go into ecstasies over Origen's *astounding* interpretations. Prof. Briggs (*N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879) writes in the highest terms of the Alexandrian school and its followers, simply *because* they are Anti-Chiliastic. To such we commend the rebuke given by a writer (in the *North Brit. Review*, May, 1858, p. 273) to D'Aubigné (in *Christianity in the First Three Cents.*) as follows : " We are sorry to see Dr. Merle D'Aubigné eulogizing Origen as ' the greatest luminary of ecclesiastical antiquity.' Concede to Origen learning, fervor, and a self-sacrificing life ; but *do not canonize* as a luminary one *who did more to darken Scripture and to obscure some of its fundamental truths* than any Father of the first five centuries."

Obs. 11. The opposition to our doctrine, when once inaugurated, was greatly aided by the talent and ability of a few great names. Conspicuously among these is that of Augustine. Probably no work has appeared that had such a powerful influence in overwhelming the more ancient doctrine, as Augustine's leading one, *The City of God.* This was specially designed to teach *the existence of the Kingdom of God in the church* beside or contemporaneous with the earthly or human Kingdom. The *proof* for this is remarkably weak ; the *supposed* fact being largely taken *for granted*, and a superstructure erected upon *a hypothetical* foundation.

Let the student carefully read "The City of God," and he will find that Augustine to make out his theory (vol. 1, p. 436) arbitrarily quotes Ps. 87 : 3 ; 48 : 1, and 46 : 4, which do not apply (as we shall show hereafter) *to the church* in this dispensation ; and (vol. 2, p. 202) in his eagerness he actually has *the marriage* of the Church with Christ *already* consummated, thus violating the order laid down in the Bible. Indeed, the proof alleged

by him is so slightly inferential, and so loosely applied, that it is scarcely worthy of even *a serious* refutation. The book never could have exerted so wide an influence, if it had not accorded so fully with the already favorite Church-Kingdom theory. We give an example of his exegetical proof: thus (b. 18, ch. 31) he adduces Obad. 21, which he renders, "And those who are saved again shall come up out of Mt. Sion that they may defend Esau, and it shall be a kingdom to the Lord." His comment is: that Mt. Sion is Judea where Christ was and is; Mt. Esau is *the church of the Gentiles, and that the latter, being defended, becomes a kingdom.* Similar far-fetched and puerile inferences are scattered over his pages, while (Eusebius-like) the Millennial predictions, the utterances of Habakkuk's prayer, etc., *are all indiscriminately* assigned to the church in this dispensation, and as now existing. Having a Kingdom *on hand* to portray, it must be eulogized at the expense of the Scriptures and stern facts. The truth is, when looking over the writings of Augustine, Origen, Jerome, and others, who so largely contributed to bring our doctrine into disrepute, we are forced to the conclusion that, however valuable they may be in other respects, the line of reasoning (for surely argument it cannot be called) and inferential proof adopted to sustain their own views *of the church being the then constituted Messianic Kingdom of covenant and prophecy,* is entirely and purely of human origin, finding no support in Scripture, but being actually *in open antagonism to the oath-bound covenant of God.* It is a fact, also, that neither Origen or Augustine could *entirely give up* all the characteristics of Chiliasm, but still received some of its features, as will be seen from the quotations, hereafter given, from them. It is in consequence of the retention of some features belonging to Chiliasm, that Bh. Taylor (*Lib. of Proph.*, sec. 5) ranks Origen, notwithstanding his decided opposition, a Millenarian, and this it is supposed (by Brooks) "because Origen lets drop his expectation of the renovation of all things in the seventh millenary of the world." How largely Augustine moulded the Church can be seen in our Church histories, the recent works of Mozley, Dorner, etc., on Augustine.

Obs. 12. The cessation, in almost a total manner, of the conversion of the Jews, also materially aided in extinguishing the doctrine of the Kingdom. Spiritualizing and allegorizing both the covenants and prophecies, changing the significant title of "The Christ" into a mere doctrinal name, heaping upon Gentiles the promises belonging to the Jews, substituting the church for the Messianic Kingdom in its true covenanted Theocratic form, the conversion of Jews was arrested, and, as a result, the advocates (for the Jewish mind posted in the promises of the Old Test.) of Chiliasm were proportionately lessened.

After the Gnostic ideas and the Alexandrian school obtained the ascendency, the preaching of the Kingdom, so widely different from that previously proclaimed by the Fathers, was no longer effective with the Jews, for the simple reason *that it was opposed* to the Kingdom presented in covenant and prophecy. The "Gospel of the Kingdom" as given e.g. by Barnabas, Irenæus, or Justin, *was widely different* from "the Gospel of the Kingdom" as presented e.g. by an Augustine, Jerome, or Eusebius. The former corresponded with the Old Test. delineations; the latter could only be engrafted upon the Old Test. by the most *extravagant spiritualizing and perversion* of Holy Writ—by *a flat denial* of the plain grammatical sense and *the substitution* of a sense which the words do not properly and primarily bear. This, of course, *repelled* the Jewish mind and bore its fruit in a continually diminished number of Jewish conversions until they almost entirely ceased. The great link which united Jewish and Gentile believers in Jesus as "the Messiah" (*which embraced the hope of the same kingdom at the Sec. Advent*) was rudely severed when the Chiliastic doctrine was discarded. So long as the hope was held out to the Jews in "the Gospel of the Kingdom" that Jesus would come again *to fulfil the Abrahamic-Davidic covenant, to rebuild the very tabernacle* of David fallen down and in ruins, *to restore* all things, *to verify* the prophetic promises based on the covenants *just as their obvious sense* conveyed—so long were many of the Jews accessible, and joyfully received Jesus of Nazareth as "the Messiah," and looked for His Coming the second time unto the predicted salvation. But when this hope was taken away and denounced as "carnal"; when it was ridiculed, and, as Baronius informs us, was "*hissed from the stage*" under a pretentious Gnosis; when in place of the restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, a real Theocratic rule on the earth under the Messiah, men palmed off the Church, which in no

respect bore any resemblance to the promised Kingdom, as this predicted Kingdom—*then* the only bond of union and of sympathy, through which the Jews could be easily reached, was also removed. The sad and calamitous results naturally followed, from which the lover of mercy, justice, and humanity sorrowfully turns.

Obs. 13. This enables us to dispose of the historical inaccuracy of those who, overlooking the causes of decline mentioned, tell us that the decrease of Chiliasm is due to the influence of the Pauline Theology superseding the Petrine or Johannine. Learned disquisitions, abounding *with mere assertion*, are given on this point; but to sustain this philosophical conceit, it is requisite to close the eyes to well-known facts that utterly disprove the theory. It is a cleverly contrived plan to throw, if possible, *an apostolic mantle* over a later broached theory of the Kingdom.

This cannot be true, since (as has already been shown) *both* Paul and Peter taught *the same* covenants and promises, the basis of Chiliasm, and confirmed *the same* hope by numerous utterances; since such a position takes it *for granted* (there being no proof) that there is a conflict doctrinally between Paul and Peter, the one bringing forth doctrine more suited to Grecian culture, and the other doctrine more adapted to Jewish; since the Fathers, East and West, taught Chiliasm and were *utterly unaware* of the modern notion of such a conflict or contemplated substitution. Neander, himself too strongly attached to this theory and often pressing it to an extreme to favor his pet development theory, comes nearer to the truth and the facts as they existed, when he traces the causes of this decline to the allegorical spirit of the Alexandrian school, and hostility to Montanism. No writer can do justice either to the early Fathers who were Chiliasts, or to the real causes which affected Millenarian doctrine, who ignores *how* the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants were comprehended and embraced in the faith of the Church, and *by what* means they were eliminated or spiritualized.

Obs. 14. The *abuse* that this doctrine received undoubtedly alienated the minds of some who were not able to discriminate between the true and the false, or who associated doctrine with the personal character of its advocates instead of determining its truthfulness by Holy Writ. Bh. Newton (*On Proph.*, Dis. 25) observes: "This doctrine grew into disrepute for various reasons. Some, both Jewish and Christian, writers have debased it with a mixture of fables; they have described the Kingdom more like a sensual than a spiritual kingdom, and thereby they have not only exposed themselves, but (what is infinitely worse) the doctrine itself to contempt and ridicule. It hath suffered by the misrepresentations of its enemies, as well as by the indiscretion of its friends; many, like Jerome, have charged the Millenarians with absurd and impious opinions which they never held; and rather than they would admit the truth of the doctrine, they have not scrupled to call into question the genuineness of the book of Revelation," etc. There is no doubt but that the fact that Chiliasts also belonged to various already arising, and antagonistic, parties had a decided influence with many in rejecting the doctrine, as e.g. the Montanists, the Apollinarians, etc.

The candid student, however, well knowing both how true doctrine may become allied with error and how men may be charged with error when innocent of the same, will carefully consider such a point in all its bearings before deciding. To do this properly respecting the charge of Montanism, preferred against Tertullian, it would be well not only to notice what enemies have said on the subject but also friends. The excellent remarks of Neander, Lee's *His. of Montanism*, Brooks's statement, and others, are worthy of attention. It must not be forgotten, that if men, under the influence of personal feeling and passion, allied this doctrine with that which is erroneous, others, through whom the orthodox church is properly traced by every Church historian, held to this Kingdom

in its strictly covenanted form, excluding the idea of sensualism or corruption, and teaching the enjoyment of spiritual blessings in it. Dr. Seiss, Ap. Note E., p. 335, etc., of *Last Times* gives an interesting detail of "Millenarian views of the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom," quoting from Irenæus, Justin, Melito, and Tertullian, to show that they did advocate "*spiritual good as a leading characteristic of the Kingdom to come*," and then gives Dr. Greswell's testimony, directing attention also to the spiritually-minded men who have hitherto received it, and concluding by exposing the art which, as Hartley says, some men have of bringing truth into disrepute, as follows: "Among the many arts practised in order to bring any truth into discredit, none is more popular than that of exhibiting it to public view *joined with* the absurd tenets of some that have espoused it, and which is not improperly called *dressing up truth in a fool's coat* on purpose to make it ridiculous; and this often succeeds with the undiscerning vulgar, who judge only by the outward appearance of things." These tactics were practised in old times by Origen, Jerome, Eusebius, and others, and they are repeated in modern times by a Corrodi, Stuart, Sanborn, Seyffarth, Briggs, and a host of others. It has *prejudiced* thousands against us then and now, who failed to see the lack of candor, honesty, and justice in *the unscholarly* procedure. No doctrine, however precious, but can be thus caricatured.

Obs. 15. The prophetical teaching, in explanation of certain prophecies, engrafted upon the apostolic and quite early Chiliasm, had its weight in detaching many from the doctrine, forgetting that the elucidation *of details* or the opinions of fallible men respecting the manner of fulfilment, could not possibly affect *the grand outlines* or the heart of the doctrine, because the former proceed from men liable to mistake, but the latter is fixed, *irrevocably in the oath-bound covenant* and the predictions resulting from the same. Thus, to illustrate: many writers have shown that the Chiliasts, more or less, down to Constantine's conversion thought that Rome would be the seat of the Antichrist and the Roman power would be destroyed. This was widely circulated, and finally became a part of the Chiliastic creed, impressed by persecution and the hope of deliverance, and was so regarded by its opponents. Now the prophecy as believed, instead of being verified, seemed to be utterly vain and idle *when* the Empire became professedly Christian. The result was, that the failure of a portion of the Chiliastic scheme, as *then* entertained, was deemed, without examination, to be *sufficient* proof of the unsoundness of every other part, and the whole was rejected.

Precisely as men do to-day. Because Bengel, Cumming, or Baxter, or some others in the explication of some prophecies, have made prophetic statements which time has proved to be mistaken; because Flemming, Pareus, Wood, and others misapprehended dates and events, the whole doctrine is rejected with ridicule and laughter, *just as if* the doctrine depended upon the interpretation of the precise time of the Advent or the course of certain events, and *not* upon the solemnly covenanted Word given with preciseness and unmistakable distinctness. Good men may indeed be mistaken in details or in the exact order of events, or in the application of prophetical time and announcements, owing to our limited knowledge of the future, and yet all this does not affect *the foundation* of our doctrine, which stands imbedded in "*the everlasting covenant*," "*the sure mercies of David.*"

Obs. 16. The opposition that Chiliasts maintained against various errors and the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, excited hostility against them, and contributed to aid in the suppression of the doctrine.

In this discussion it is important for the student, in order to form a correct estimate of the early Chiliasts, of their doctrine, and of the opposition excited, to notice whom they doctrinally opposed. This has been candidly done by the researches of Neander (who clears them from unjust charges imposed by later enemies) and others, but a succinct statement is still needed. In addition to what has been said, a passing remark on a number may be illustrative of our meaning. The Chiliasts opposed the Ebionists, the

ultra, extreme Jewish sects, mainly on the ground because the latter denied the peculiar, distinctive person of Christ demanded to fulfil the Abrahamic-Davidic Kingdom. They combated all who were tenacious of the observance of the Mosaic ceremonial, abrogated through the founding of the Christian Church. They opposed the Oriental Theosophists because they spiritualized the letter entirely away, thus, among other things, rendering the fulfilment of the covenants, as they read, impracticable. They resisted what is called by some, "The Aristocratic element," as manifested in various Gnostic systems, the incorporation of Platonic and Oriental ideas, the combinations of false reasoning and a subtle philosophy in so far as they denied a literal, grammatical interpretation of Scripture (especially of the covenants), and a divine and supreme authority of Holy Writ. They materially aided in rooting out Cerinthianism, not only on account of its Christology contradicted by the covenants, but by reason of its unbiblical (if correctly reported, being dependent on later and hostile testimony) Chiliasm, seeing that none of the Fathers favored such a sensual system. They contradicted various forms of doctrine, having its advocates as e.g. the denial of the resurrection of the body, the disbelief in the future glorification of the body, the rejection of the final removal of the curse and of evil, the inherent eternal evil of nature, the unbelief in the restitution of all things, etc. They withstood the Basilideans owing to its Christology and to its giving to the ultimate deliverance of man, the race, and creation, a form different from that specified in the prophetical. They resisted the Saturninians with their denial of a real body to Christ, their notions of the Kingdom and way of life. They combated the Marcionites, the Bardesenites, Tatianites, Valentinians, Carpocratians, Origenists, besides others who were regarded as heretics. They resisted, on the one hand, a gross materialism, and, on the other, an encroaching Idealism. It appears, from these contests and the faithful devotion to the essential truths of Christianity, that the Chiliasts were esteemed as strictly orthodox. This honorable feature is given to them *both* by enemies and friends—even their most violent opponents, as Origen, Dionysius, Jerome, and others, *do not deny their orthodoxy*. Indeed, after the declarations of Irenæus and Justin, that those *who were exactly orthodox* held to our doctrine; after *the continuous line* of Fathers through whom the Christian Church is traced, it would be *both* unsafe and unjust to give them any other position. But all this necessarily created opposition against them, and as this resistance finally accorded with the prevailing adopted Alexandrian influence, various parties united in decrying them and in treating their doctrine with contempt. The manner in which the primitive doctrine was gradually crushed reminds us of the parasite in Cuba or India, which enfolds and strangles the life out of the lofty tree. The tiny, silken threads grew into strong compressive cables and trunks encompassing the hapless victim, until he yielded to the long accumulating pressure.

PROPOSITION 77. *The doctrine of the Kingdom, as held by the early church, was finally almost exterminated under the teaching and power of the Papacy.*

This is so plain a historical fact that it needs no special evidence to sustain it. Roman Catholic writers, ecclesiastical historians, and others, have repeatedly recorded the statement, and no denial of it has ever appeared.

Rome, once Chiliastic, became intensely Anti-Chiliastic. Renan, in the Second Lec. of the Four recently delivered in London (at the request of Dean Stanley) on early Church History, declares that the church at Rome was of *Jewish-Christian* foundation, directly sprung from the church at Jerusalem, and *strongly attached to Millenarianism.* The reasons for the change have been already presented in detail. The writer on "*Revelation*" in M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.* (and who cannot be charged with Chiliastic sympathies) thus candidly says: "Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, *began* to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy Advent, and their spiritual conception of His Kingdom, and *to look* upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfilment of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman Empire, become Christian, was regarded no longer as the object of prophetic denunciation, *but as the scene of a Millennial development,*" with which comp. Prof. Bush's "*Mill.*" If there is any propriety and force in the position of the Romish Church, and in the reasoning of Bellarmine, Bossuet, Möhler, and others, that tradition *should be authoritative* with Scripture in deciding doctrine, *then* surely the traditions of the first centuries ought to have made, by their overwhelming weight, the Romish Church Chiliastic. But in this case ambition, pride, conscious power, the possession of honors and wealth, etc., override tradition, as they often have done Scripture (comp. Obs. 4). Chillingworth's reasoning on this remains, and ever will remain, *unanswerable.*

Obs. 1. The Papacy has been ever hostile to our doctrine, owing to the Chiliastic opposition to its pretensions, its provisions looking to futurity, its hierarchical endowments, corruptions, and bold assumptions of being the promised Kingdom. The early Millenarians, without exception, regarded the Roman Empire and the rising Papacy with distrust because of their belief that the Antichrist would in some way or form be identified with one or the other. Before the union of Church and State, the Empire was the object of suspicion; after the union, while the belief was still continued respecting Rome, men began to surmise, as the hierarchical tendencies were more and more developed in the increasing power of the Bishops of Rome, that those Bishops themselves were paving the way for the Roman Antichrist. This opinion was strengthened by the conduct of some of the Popes, so that they were plainly designated either as Antichrists or forerunners of the Antichrist. This view, of course, would be offensive to the heads of the Romish Church, and naturally resulted in their *decrying* Chiliasm and *condemning* it as derogatory to the honor of the church. Pride, dignity, ambition, power, could *not tolerate* a view which, necessarily brought with it, expressed, or even implied, reproach.

Various writers have expressed this as follows: Bh. Newton (On Proph., Dis. 25) remarks: "Wherever the influence and authority of the church of Rome have extended, she hath endeavored *by all means to discredit* this doctrine; and, indeed, not without sufficient reason, this Kingdom of Christ being founded on the ruins of the Kingdom of Antichrist." Dr. Burnett (*Theory of the Earth*, vol. 2, p. 193), after showing how the Romish church discountenanced the doctrine, and that he never met with a Popish doctor who regarded it with favor, concludes: "The Millennium being properly a reward and triumph for those who come out of persecution, such as have lived always in pomp and prosperity can pretend to no share in it or benefit by it. This has made the church of Rome have always *an ill eye upon this doctrine*, because it seemed to have an ill eye upon her. And as she grew in splendor and greatness, she eclipsed and obscured it more and more, so that *it would have been lost out of the world* as an obsolete error, if it had not been revived by some of the Reformation." Cox (*A Millenarian's Answer*, p. 43) says: "*The grand chasm* in the history (of Chiliasm) seems to be those awful centuries *of Rome's supremacy*, when almost every truth was hidden. Indeed, some of the parasites of Constantine, like Ahab's Zedekiah, did not scruple to say that the 21st and 22d chapters of Revelation were fulfilled in his time. Thus did Satan mimic the Kingdom God had promised, and, as one has well observed, constitute the Pope his Melchisedec, his high priest to rule over the nations." Brooks (*El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 51) writes: "When the Christian Bishop of Rome came, in progress of time, to be elevated to the high rank which he attained under the papacy, the inconvenience of explaining Rome to be the capital city of the Antichrist and the 'Babylon' and 'Harlot' of the Apocalypse, was *more sensibly felt* than ever; because it could not be asserted without giving occasion for the very obvious conclusion, that the Bishop of Rome would some day apostatize, together with the church in general over which he was the head. Accordingly, from the time of Justinian, efforts were both openly and clandestinely made to get rid of the doctrine altogether, by removing or corrupting the evidence in its favor, or by affixing to it the stigma of heresy." Seiss (Last Times, p. 246-7) declares: "It is a sad fact, however, that from the fourth century until the sixteenth, this doctrine gradually lost its hold upon the minds and hearts of professed Christians, and went down into almost absolute neglect. But with it went down the great doctrine of justification by faith, and nearly everything that is distinguishing in gospel religion. *It fell only as Popery arose*; and it is only as it rises again that Popery shall shrink and quail. So long as men think they see and hear Christ in the Pope and believe that they are worshipping and honoring Christ by serving and obeying hierarchies regarded as *jure divino*, we need never expect them *to believe* that Christ will ever reign here in person. The two ideas are *fundamentally antagonistic*. If Christ is Himself to reign here in universal empire, He has not given that Empire into the hands of a vicar; and if He has made the Pope the supreme Lord of the world, it is settled that He will never reign here otherwise than by the Pope. Either proposition confutes the other. The two cannot live together. And this puts into our hands *the key* to the true explanation how the church has come to lose sight of the primitive and apostolic faith upon this subject."

Obs. 2. In the very nature of the case, *the Chiliastic Kingdom* of the Abrahamic-Davidic covenant as taught by the Fathers, *the hope* in the constantly expected Advent of Jesus to establish such a Kingdom, *the anticipated struggle* with an Antichrist in ecclesiastical-political power, the view entertained respecting the church as a struggling, tried body awaiting deliverance and triumph *alone* through the personal Advent of the Messiah —*these prevented* aspiring prelates and the ambitious learned from indorsing it. It was an easy matter, by adopting the Origenistic interpretation of several senses, to reject *the covenanted* restored Davidic throne and Kingdom under a personal Messiah, and to substitute in its place *an existing* Kingdom under the rule of appointed hierarchs, and *claim* that in and through them Christ was already reigning in His promised Kingdom. This *caricature* of the Messiah's Kingdom was varnished over by the most laudatory and fulsome language (even applying to it the predictions alone applicable to the mighty Theocratic King) which self-interest and vainglory could suggest. Very soon, too, these declarations were summed up

and declared to be "*the voice of the church*;" the later Fathers superseding those who previously entertained Chiliastic doctrine, now so detractive and humiliating to Popish presumption.

It is noticeable that Romanism pronounces only such "Doctores Ecclesiæ" who have no decided leaning to Millenarianism, leaving Chiliasts like Papias, etc., simply "Scriptores Ecclesiastici" (Ueberweg's *His. Philos.*, vol. 1, p. 275). Those who spiritualized the faith of the Primitive Church were in *the highest odor* of sanctity. Dr. Pise, in the Introd. (p. 7–8) to Rutter's (Rom. Cath.) *Life of Jesus Christ*, exalts the ancient Fathers as in unity with Roman Catholicism (without, however, intimating how *the more ancient* in many points disagree, as abundantly shown by Barrow, Chillingworth, Cumming, etc.), and then, by way of contrast, points out how Luther, Calvin, Melanchthon, Peter Martyr, Beza, Dudith, etc., depreciate them (without noticing that they mainly objected against *the later* who departed the most from the Primitive doctrine, and that they received them when in accord with the Scriptures). It is those very "doctores" that the Reformers found had departed the farthest from the "old paths," so that e.g. taking Jerome, Luther (*Table Talk*, "Of the books of the Fathers," ch. 135) remarks: "Jerome should not be numbered among the teachers of the Church." This reminds us that this Father, so eulogized by some of our opponents because of his one sided Anti-Chiliasm, is thus presented in "The Old and New," Sep., 1871, Art. "*Jerome*," which after acknowledging his merits in several respects, sums up the "Jerome of quarrelsome memory" as follows: "As supporter of the claims of the rising Papacy, as satirist of marriage and of the holiest laws of nature, as compiler of monkish legends and defender of monkish practices, *as defamer of the earliest Christian Protestantism*, and apologist for the martyr worship and paganized ceremonies of the Roman Church, Jerome must be classed with those who have hindered the progress of the race in morals and religion," etc.

Obs. 3. When a church arrogates to itself the great honor of showing forth *within its borders* the predicted millennial glory (as e.g. Eusebius and others, dating its inauguration from Constantine, or Augustine and others, dating the same from the First Advent of Christ); when it enforces the belief by *a wholesale appropriation* of prophecy without the least regard to its connection, covenant basis, prospective attitude, relation to the Jewish nation, union with the Sec. Advent, etc.; when it hedges this around by a confessional barrier, and calls for all its membership to receive it as the truth—*then*, especially when it has the ecclesiastical and civil power under its control *to compel obedience*, it is not strange that the doctrine, *so hostile* to these arrogant assumptions as ours, should be hated and depressed.

The Hierarchy could not, as a matter of mere consistency, receive the notion of a Kingdom (viz.: that of the reign of the Messiah in the covenanted Theocratic-Davidic) which protested against and *condemned* its substitution. Hence Shimeall (*Eschatology*, p. 49) correctly observes: "Then, too, the Popes, in after ages, discountenanced Millenarianism, inasmuch *as it militated* against their anti christian usurpation and dogma, that the Millennium commenced with Romish domination in the church." Dr. West (*His. Pre-Mill. Doc.*) says: "By union of church and state, and perversion of victory, the foundation was laid in the Empire for a carnal and a Satanic *caricature* of the Millennial Kingdom of Christ on earth before the time—a Millennium sunk in the gross materialism and idolatry of a mediæval, political, and military Christianity. By union of Church and State *the martyr doctrine itself was martyred*, no council resisting, and vanished from view with the departing glory and last remnant of a suffering, but pure apostolic church." How the union of Church and State, introducing an antagonism of view utterly irreconcilable with Chiliasm, facilitated the overthrow of Millenarianism, is also briefly noticed by Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, sec. 139. Dr. Fisher, Art. "*Mill.*" M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*, although a Post-Mill., most candidly says: "It (the Mill. doctrine) *was still common*, however, in the time of Jerome, who himself was one of its opponents. But gradually the tenet which had *so widely prevailed* became obnoxious and proscribed. One great reason of this remarkable change of sentiment is to be found in the altered condition and prospects of the Church." The latter, he remarks, led to the idea of bringing the world into subjection to the Church. It is the just view of many that Constantine's conversion and the results were not productive of

good. In addition to writers quoted, see Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, vol. 1, p. 52, Mackinnon's *His. of Civ.*, vol. 1, p. 77, etc.

Obs. 4. Chillingworth (*Works*, Dis. 5)—of whom Prof. Bush declares, "Certainly there are few persons more competent to pronounce on the fact"—makes a strong argument against the Church of Rome, in its refusing to accept of our doctrine when professing to receive by tradition the pure doctrines *of the primitive and apostolic age.* He conclusively proves the generality of the doctrine entertained; that for some time it was uncontradicted; that all the Fathers, East and West, held it; that they professed not only to teach it "*as doctors but as witnesses;*" that it was esteemed as an "*apostolic tradition*" received by persons in personal communication with apostles and elders; that it was regarded *as the faith of orthodox believers;* and then, in the light of all this accumulated evidence, argues that, in this matter at least, the Roman Church "*has grossly falsified the creed of antiquity,* inasmuch as there is *ample evidence* that the doctrine of the Chiliasts *was actually the Catholic faith* of more than one century." Bowers (*His. Popes*), in his life of Damasus, takes the same ground, for, after describing the Millenarian doctrine and its extent, he remarks: "And yet such a doctrine *is now rank heresy* in the Church of Rome. But, by declaring it such, have they not overset their own system, which places tradition upon a level with the canonical books of the Scripture? Can they allege *a more ancient tradition, one more universally received, or equally countenanced by Scripture,* in favor of the many traditional articles of faith which they have obtruded upon the world? Papias declares he received the above-mentioned doctrine of those who had learned it *immediately of the apostles.* If such a tradition be rejected as false, *what other has a right to be admitted as true?*"

Judge Jones (*Essays on the Com. of the Kingdom*, Ess. 5), after declaring "that the system of Popery, morally speaking, could not have been established, except upon the virtual or practical *denial* of this very doctrine," remarks: "Hence it is that while most Romanists have treated the doctrine as a heresy, others feeling their traditions must fail, if Papias, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius, and their contemporaries, should be denounced as heretics, endeavor to escape the dilemma, by making a distinction *between what* these fathers have said in the name of the church, and have delivered as the doctrine of the church, and *what* they choose to consider their personal opinions and conjectures. Some of them trace the doctrine to certain passages in the Apocalypse, which they suppose these fathers misinterpreted; while others affirm that they borrowed it from Plato. The answer given by Chillingworth to this mode of getting over the difficulty *is conclusive.*" It may be here observed (what Jones, Cox, and many others have noticed) that it is not only the church of Rome that is, in view of its organization, ambitious projects, etc., hostile to our doctrine, but this applies to all those religious bodies having "*a High-Church*" tendency, and making *much* of "tradition" (as e.g. Episcopalian High Churchism, Mercersburg Theology, Puseyistic party, ultra Symbolical Lutheranism, etc.), which tells us, with insidious and subtle reasoning, that the Bible is to be interpreted by the past faith of the Church, and yet which, with all its professed churchliness, obstinately and utterly discards *this once generally received faith of the church.* The same is true, in sadness we write it, of all churches that are highly prospered in extension, wealth, and influence (excepting alone individual members, who have faithfully entered their protest), to whom our doctrine is unwelcome for reasons already sufficiently assigned. Ruling in an existing Kingdom, it does not suit the spirit and aims of a multitude to receive a doctrine which necessarily is humbling and derogatory to their pretensions and predictions of the future.

Obs. 5. It may then be briefly stated as a self-evident fact, that the entire spirit and aim of the Papacy is *antagonistic* to the early church view,

being based on coveted ecclesiastical and secular power, on extended jurisdiction lodged in the hands of a Primate. *When* episcopal palaces with their palatial endowments were erected under the fostering care of the Emperors; *when* the rulers of the church enjoyed the rich vestments, emoluments, and honor of office; *when* magnificent churches, with altars and walls adorned and enriched by the costly gifts of its devotees, were built all over the Empire; *when* ambitious men, under the cloak of an established Messianic Kingdom, formed the idea of a universal government; *when* men addicted to pleasures tasted the enjoyments afforded by rich revenues and the servile honor paid to them by the multitude; *when* a system was founded which decided that the reign of the saints had already begun—that the Bishop of Rome ruled on earth in Christ's place; that the deliverance from the curse would only be effected in the third heaven; that in the church, as a Kingdom, there was "an aristocracy" to which unhesitating obedience must be rendered; that the prophetical announcements respecting Messiah's Kingdom were fulfilling in Romish predominance, splendor, and wealth; that the rewarding and elevation of saints was not dependent upon the Sec. Advent, but upon the power lodged in the existing Kingdom, etc., etc.—*then it was that Chiliasm*, so distasteful and obnoxious to these claims and doctrines, *fell beneath* the powerful and world-pervading influence exerted against it.

Judge Jones (*Essays on Com. of Kingdom*) observes: "Ungodly men, allured by ambition, and who desired *nothing less* than the coming of Christ, got influence in the church, and they constructed a system, every part of which speaks in language not to be misunderstood, '*My Lord delayeth his coming.*'" See also in the same connection his remarks, how this is found, more or less, in Protestant churches. It is a sad truth, that our most bitter enemies are those who are *fostered by endowments* looking to a perpetuity of present agencies, etc. It is but just to add, that while Jones is correct in specifying "ungodly men," yet it is also true that many sincere and pious hearts were drawn, by fallacious reasoning and the trust that they were aiding the truth and Christ's glory, in receiving and extending this opposition to Primitive doctrine, position, and usage. For we must not forget that aside from selfishness and personal interest seriously affecting our doctrine, mysticism, in all its forms, with its higher inner light and lowering of written revelation before spiritual contemplation, has ever disastrously—in Romanism and Protestantism—manifested *its scorn* at Chiliasm, owing to the influence of its devotees. A glance at church history is decisive, for such men as Hilary, Maximus, Bernard, John Scotus Erigena, Hildegard, Francis, Eckhart, Tassler, Thomas à Kempis, Molinos, and even such as Fénelon, Pascal, Madame Guyon, Law, and a multitude of others, could not possibly accept our doctrine, seeing that their fundamental principles and their method of interpreting Scripture were utterly opposed to it. Thus a variety of powerful influences (comp. preceding Prop.) were at work, hand in hand.

Obs. 6. The institution of monkery exerted a powerful influence in causing the rapid decline of our doctrine. They formed, owing to their privileges, numbers, sanctity, etc., *the most effective* allies in upholding Papal claims and doctrines, and, of course, in decrying, with the populace, all antagonistic utterances. From the fourth century down, they greatly moulded or impressed the sentiments and views of the church, and, therefore, the student, in estimating the causes leading to a suppression of Chiliasm, must not forget to estimate the leverage exerted by monkery.

It is unnecessary to discuss monkery, as Mosheim, Neander, etc., have presented their *vast* influence in building up the Papacy, etc. Yet it is noticeable that the earlier favorers of monasticism, *like Jerome*, while rejecting our doctrine, were *still unwilling* to brand it as a heresy; this spirit of toleration, with increasing bigotry and ignorance, finally ceased.

Obs. 7. The authority of Councils in the interest of hierarchical tendencies materially aided in obscuring the doctrine of the Kingdom. Indirectly, by exalting and confining the kingship of Christ to His Divine nature, and correspondingly lowering the human, forgetting that *the covenanted kingship* is given to "*the Son of Man*" who is of *the Davidic lineage.* This resulted mainly from the Arian and other controversies respecting the natures of Christ, when one extreme led to its opposite. Directly, by indorsing the polity of the church and state, the ambitious projects aiming at universal power, and the supposed Kingdom as exhibited under the leadership of one Bishop. The decisions of Councils were finally elevated *to an equality* with the Scriptures, and thus aided in crushing the doctrine.

What these Councils were (i.e. of what *fallible* persons composed, what indications of weakness, passion, bitterness, etc.) has been ably and satisfactorily shown by various writers (Mosheim, Neander, Killen, Stanley, Justin, etc., too clearly teach us that the majorities were only too often composed of bigoted, fanatical, and domineering prelates, whose only desire was to compel all men to believe in all things just as they did, to exalt their church by any means, even to the anathematizing of all who would not submit). After the Council of Nice, none gave utterance to anything in sympathy with Chiliasm. In the first General Council of Nice (A.D. 325), being nearly related in time to the preceding Chiliastic Fathers, we have the following: in addition to the definition of the faith and the canons, the Council set forth certain forms of ecclesiastical doctrine. Gelasius Cysicenus (*His. Act. Con. Nic.*) has recorded the latter, and among them is the one on the last clause (viz.: "I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come") of the Nicene Creed. It reads: "the world was made inferior because of foreknowledge; for God foreknew that man would sin. Therefore we expect new heavens and a new earth according to the Holy Scriptures; *the Epiphany and Kingdom of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ then appearing.* And as Dan. says (ch. 7 : 18) *the saints of the most High shall take the Kingdom. And there shall be a pure and holy land, the land of the living and not of the dead:* which David, foreseeing with the eye of faith, exclaims, *I believe to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living—the land of the meek and humble. Blessed, saith Christ* (Matt. 5 : 5) *are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.* And the prophet saith (Isa. 26 : 6), *The feet of the meek and humble shall tread upon it.*" This is quoted by numerous writers, such as Mede, Burnet, Brooks, Seiss, Cox, Hartley, Shimeall, Investigator of Proph., etc. Brooks remarks that Dupin, the Romish historian, calls this into question, while others of the same church contend for its correctness. If it is to be received as genuine (as many contend, seeing that it is to the Romish interest to detract from it), it would appear that many, at least, of the three hundred bishops composing the Council were Millenarian—for this statement is *purely Chiliastic*—and that the influence and teachings of Lactantius (who was then an old man and died about that time) and others were not forgotten. Let us add: that the extract is still valuable in indicating *how anciently* such expressions in the Creed which simply expressed a belief in the resurrection of the dead, were understood, viz.: not necessarily to imply a simultaneous resurrection of all at one and the same time. This again shows, as we shall argue hereafter, that the leading creeds, as the Apostles' and Nicene-Constantinopolitan, as well as the brief formulas of Irenæus and Tertullian (comp. note to Murdoch's Mosheim *His.*, vol. 1, p. 81, Harper's Ed.), were in direct sympathy with Chiliasm (over against Shedd's, Sanborn's, and others' statements to the contrary), seeing that Millenarians *cordially embraced* the same, and even thus tersely expressed a great truth without entering *into details* respecting *the order* of the resurrection. Besides this: while giving this as proof that (aside from Lactantius and others) at this period Millenarian doctrine was not yet extinct, yet, we confess, that we are not great admirers of a Council called and presided over by such a man *as Constantine*, and in which were men (comp. Dunn, Stanley, Killen, etc.) who evinced by their conduct that *they were passionate and frail.* Our doctrine is *not* based on Councils; and we do not quote the latter to give it any authority, but only as a historical fact bearing on *the continuance* of its extent, at a time when abuses came trooping in and the doctrines heretofore held were beginning to fade before the incoming Hierarch. Uhlhorn (*Conflict of Chris. with Heathenism*, p. 352) shows that after the Church introduced hierarchical tendencies and dreams of conquest, *then* "the hope of the speedy Advent, *which shone so brightly in the*

early days, has now become dimmed," and while "the earlier period had no thought of any victory *but that which Christ was to bring at* His Coming," the church now entertained hopes of victory over the Empire and the world. This was largely aided by Councils, aided and supported by imperial patronage and power.

Obs. 8. Theology, under the constant surveillance of a church *jealous* of its delegated kingly authority, in its more systematic arrangements, was entirely controlled so as *to favor the substituted* Kingdom. We find, therefore, in all such works, running down through the scholastic age to the Reformation, a set apologetic defence of the Romish notions of the Kingdom. Starting with the idea—often taken for granted as a settled premise or inferred by far-fetched inferences—that the Romish Church is the predicted Kingdom of the Messiah, everything is made *to bend* to that theory. The utterances of later Fathers, the decrees of Councils, and the self-interested statements of Popes and Prelates, are appealed to with unbounded confidence, just as if, in so fundamental a matter, *the fallible utterances* of man were equal, if not superior, to Scripture itself;—and as many of these thus quoted had been *canonized* by the church they favored, *their saintship corroborated*, in the eyes of many, the claims and doctrines indorsed. To oppose such a swollen stream, guarded by thousands upon thousands of devoted adherents, was simply to risk reputation and life.

We reproduce the language of a valued friend. Dr. Seiss, *Last Times*, p 290, says: "I have proven to you that such (Chiliastic) were substantially the hopes of the church *before* Christ came as the child of Mary; that Jesus and his inspired apostles spoke of these hopes as deeply founded in the purposes and promises of God; that they were entertained, preached, and gloried in by those who received their instructions from apostolic lips, and by the Luthers, and Arndts, and Paleys, and Baxters, and Wesleys, and Halls, and Edwardses, and Chalmerses of the first three hundred years of the Christian Church; that no Christian ever disputed them previous to the time of Origen; and that they are now held and proclaimed by hundreds and thousands among the purest, the most eloquent, the most learned, and the most useful of the children of God on the face of the earth. How the church came to lose sight of these hopes, I have also indicated. It was Popery that obscured them and cast them into darkness. First came Origen's fanciful method of interpreting the Scriptures, casting uncertainty upon the clearest statements, and introducing a way of exposition which all men unite in lamenting and condemning. Then came the desire to render the Christian faith palatable to a Roman Emperor, and then to the papal usurper, leading to a repudiation of a part of the Bible, and the mutilation and interpolation of the writings of the fathers. And thus, as *the joint work* of Origen's vagaries and the sycophantic spirit and corrupt principles of some who came after him, a disposition was made of these great anticipations from which every good man should recoil with horror. It was a stroke of Satan to cheat the Bride of Jesus out of her sublimest dowry. To this day the church is more or less under the influence of that deception. Nor can we do duty to ourselves or to the truth of God, and yet patiently acquiesce in a decision brought about in a way *so unchristian and unwarrantable*. Nay, I feel confident, that when once we have *fairly* examined this whole matter the pure Millenarian doctrine will be held and preached as one of the most glorious articles of our most holy faith." So Dr. Willis Lord (*The Blessed Hope*, p. 79) remarks: "In the Apostolic and Primitive Church *it is certain* that for more than three centuries the Sec. Coming of Christ was expected to take place *before* the Millennium, and that the bliss and glory of that period would flow from His presence and reign. Especially was this so while Paganism still held the seat of power, and the church was despised and persecuted. Most keenly did she *then* feel the sorrows of widowhood, and long for the return of her absent Lord. That return would bring the day of her redemption and joy. When, however, Constantine mounted the throne, and the church with him, her spirit and her faith changed. Favor with men, and increasing flatteries, honors, wealth, and power, made the world seem less barren, and more attractive. Gradually, but surely, the blessed hope *gave way* to the power of present possession and enjoyment; the once desolate widow *became* elated, proud, and self-

sufficient; and she said in her heart, 'I sit as a queen, and shall have no sorrow.' For many generations, it would have been *the dread* of the visible church to have the Lord to come."

Obs. 9. The historical fact that Millenarianism was thus crushed is far from being *dishonorable* to us. Indeed, we rather glory in the occurrence, as indirect proof of *the truthfulness* of our position, seeing that as a defection from the truth was predicted by the apostles to take place, that very form of doctrine departed from—provided once generally held, and contained (even in the literal sense) in the Word—it must be regarded as approaching the nearest to sound doctrine. The warnings *specially* given respecting this doctrine in its leading feature of the Sec. Advent, etc., *unmistakably indicate a foreseen denial* of its characteristics. Hence, we have corroborating evidence in its favor, when we hear the Roman Catholic Baronius telling us: "*The figments of the Millenaries being rejected everywhere, and denied by the learned with hisses and laughter, and being also put under the ban, were entirely extirpated.*"

The reader will observe that if our doctrine had *always remained the generally received* doctrine of the church it would *not* meet the requirements of prediction respecting *the lack* of faith in Christ's coming, the attitude of professed servants who say that *He delayeth His coming*, the abounding of unbelief and apostasy, etc. This same Baronius says (Bowers, *His. Popes*, vol. 1, p. 97) that Damasus *condemned* the Millenarians in the Council of Rome, A.D. 378. But Bowers shows that he is wrong, since *after* that Council "*many eminent men* in the church held it, and Sulpicius Severus among the rest, *without* being deemed heretics on that score." Mede, Brooks, etc., evidently (saying that Damasus condemned the Millenarians, and Mede, *Works*, p. 664, also says that Damasus suppressed the works of Victorinus and Sulpicius) took this either from Baronius, or from Lorinus, the Jesuit (Lorinus in his *Com.* on Acts 1 : 6, refers to "*the heresy of Chiliasm*, which Pope Damasus had condemned in Apollinaris"), and both Baronius and Lorinus were misled by the condemnation of Apollinaris, who with views that the Pope reprobated, *also* entertained Chiliasm in some of its features. After looking over all the testimony available on the subject, it is our decided opinion that *the suppression* of the doctrine *was later* than the time of Damasus, and that Bower *is correct* in his opinion. In confirmation of this, it is only necessary to say that Apollinaris was not condemned *as a Chiliast* but for other alleged error, and that Jerome (with whom Damasus *was intimate*, and who upheld and praised Damasus) himself—opposed to Chiliasm—*dares not condemn* it as heresy (saying that "*many Christians and martyrs* had affirmed the things (Chiliasm) which he denied; and that *a great multitude* of Christians agreed in them in his own day, so that though he could not follow them, *he could not condemn them*"), which he certainly would have done, or intimated, had the Bishop, his personal friend, decreed it. Suppose, on the other hand, that Baronius is correct, that we admit his statement ("the heresy, however, *loquacious before, was silenced then*, and since that time has hardly been heard of"), and that Damasus, with the aid of the Council, suppressed Millenarianism. It certainly cannot be *flattering* to the prevailing view, that this was done by a Pope *with the character* of Damasus, and by a clergy which sustained the reputation given to them at that time.* It must, indeed, be *particularly gratifying* to some of our opponents that the charge of "heresy" preferred against us comes from *such* a source, so that e.g. Dr. Hamilton declares: "Yet this doctrine of the Chiliasts was condemned *by the church*—since that time *all* are accounted *heretics* that maintained it." In our reading, this charge has been found *repeated again and again*

* Comp. e.g. Bowers, *His. Popes*, noticing the statements of Baronius and others. The character of Damasus is very far from being *saintly*, if we are to credit Roman Catholic writers. It is a strange contrast to notice Jerome's time-serving spirit thus brought out: Jerome himself had called Damasus a "virgin doctor of the virgin church," but after his patron was dead and he had left Rome, "*the virgin church*" was suddenly transformed into "*the scarlet whore*," and the clergy, into "*the senate of pharisees*." A tolerable specimen.

by respectable writers, but none of them *dare* to tell us by *what class* of men this was done, for such an exposure would blunt the edge of their weapon and make it recoil upon themselves. The fact is, that Millenarians esteem it *an honor* that their doctrine was first suppressed by prelates possessing *the character*, etc., that history accords to them. The truth is, that while our doctrine was obnoxious to, and detested by, the Bishops, and many of the leading clergy, through partisanship, yet it was not so early authoritatively condemned, seeing that such a condemnation would involve a disastrous controversy respecting the regular perpetuation of the church. The Bishops and Prelates were too shrewd to do this, seeing, as they did, that this would involve so many of the Fathers that it would be difficult and hazardous, yea, impossible, *to trace* the true church unless through "*heretics.*" Hence *the cautious* policy was adopted, not to condemn it in any regular decree, but in establishing as the faith of the church its opposite, and making all submit to the latter as *the truth*. What must we think, however, of the spirit animating Prof. Briggs (*N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879), who, *with evident relish*, approvingly quotes Baronius' declarations, and *eulogizes* the Popish doctors, and *even praises* the long "dark ages" of triumphant Popery, pronouncing them "*the heroic ages*," and then wallows in the old slander of associating Chiliasm with fanatics, outside of "the historic church." The scholarly certainly cannot be influenced by it.

Obs. 10. Baronius and others have asserted that for a long time the doctrine was "entirely extirpated." This is *not strictly* correct. It certainly was brought into such disfavor by a ruling Romish Church that during "the dark ages," down to the Reformation, *it was scarcely known.* Still we have intimations, plain and decided, that *it was held* by individuals (as e.g. Jerome mentions in his day, what Lorinus, the Josuit, says of Tully Crispold, quoted by Brooks, *El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 60; comp. Bernard, etc., quoted by Seiss, p. 26, in *A Question in Eschatology*, etc.), and, at least, in some of its features, by the Vaudois or Waldenses, Albigenses, Lollard, or Wickliffites, and the Bohemian Protestants (comp. the extracts, some of which will hereafter be given, presented in Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, etc.). This testimony could, undoubtedly, be extended, if we only had the opinions of many who fell under Romish condemnation, and of whom it is said that they were detested and rooted out on account of opposition to Romish doctrines. But even if all such intimations were lacking, it would only indicate *how wide-reaching* the apostasy had grown, *how fearfully* prediction on the subject was verified, and *how important* it was for the old truth to be revived.

Prof. Briggs (*N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879) exults in the fact that "the great churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Asia Minor condemned *the heresy*," and that "the consolidation of Christian faith in creed and liturgy, effectually excluded Chiliasm more and more from the church, until it was banished for many centuries." Admit the crushing of our doctrine, and then ask *by whom* was it done, and *how* it was accomplished, and the historical answer certainly *cannot* be flattering to our opponents. The period of time, the many centuries, when it lay depressed, is sufficiently delineated by Romish and Protestant writers to set aside the extravagant eulogies bestowed upon them by Prof. B. in order to sustain his *bitter anti-chiliastic prejudices.* But it does seem strange for *a Protestant*, and *a professed* scholar, to so far forget himself, that, in order to make a doctrine odious, he will exalt those who have been *the most unrelenting persecutors* of the forerunners of principles and a liberty in which the Protestant Church to-day rejoices; and to correspondingly degrade, as unworthy of the least attention, men who advocated those principles and that liberty, because they held to "Chiliastic notions." Those who opposed the encroachments of the Papacy and resisted its abuses, are to be derided, because they said (D'Aubigné's *His. Ref.*, vol. 3, p. 415) in their helplessness: "Let us lift up our heads, looking to the Lord, *who will come and will not tarry.*" Individual members of the Romish Church, as well as protesting communities outside of it, who denounced hierarchical tendencies, resisted usurpations, and expressed a belief in a speedy Advent to remove existing evils and introduce a Sabbatism, are to be judged only *as estimated by their cruel enemies*, because they expressed sentiments too much allied with the Chiliastic. Why not go a step farther, *and include the Reformers themselves*, who

also expressed such views, utterly antagonistic—as we shall show—to modern, Whitbyan theories of the Millennium?

Under the preceding Propositions reference has been made to this continuation, and Jerome's statements respecting many holding it in his day. Later on the traces are rarer, until they cease, unless we regard those testimonies that Döllinger has given in *Prophecies of the Middle Ages*, as favoring Chiliasm in some of their aspects. We pass them by for this reason: although opposed to the Romish, general, view of the Millennium, yet there is such an admixture of error that they cannot properly be regarded as Chiliastic. Let us e.g. take one of the most noted, *the Prophecies* of Joachim, and the *Evangelium æternum* of the Fratricelli, and these were widely removed from the Primitive Chiliasm, losing sight entirely of the specific covenanted Theocratic Kingdom of the Messiah, which was the idea of the early Church. A brief mention of the scheme entertained, is sufficient to demonstrate this fact. These held that we have had a dynasty of the Father extending from Adam to the First Advent; then followed a dynasty of Jesus Christ, lasting 1000 years or more from that Advent; this last, in which they lived, was to be succeeded by the dynasty of the Holy Spirit (golden age), which was indefinite or limited, at the pleasure of the believer. A number of views, hostile to the prevailing Augustinian, may, for aught we know, have arisen from the remains of Chiliastic belief still existing here and there. Some of the former advocates of the Papal doctrine renounced it for Chiliastic views, as Le Père Lambert (a French Roman Catholic, whose "Expositions," favoring a Pre-Mill. Advent, restoration of the Jews, and reign of Christ, was translated into German by Von Mayer), Lacunza (Ben-Ezra, a Spanish Jew, whose work, "The Com. of Messiah in Glory and Majesty," was translated by Edward Irving), John Baptist Pagini (a Roman Cath. Priest, in his work, "The End of the World, or the Sec. Com. of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ). The fact is that some Romanists could not drift so far away from the old landmarks, but what they would revive sentiments and the idea of the Millenaries, more accordant with Chiliastic antecedents than the Popish notion, but these feeble utterances were crushed under the weight of Church authority. Here and there we have intimations of the continued existence of the doctrine even down to the 16th century. Thus e.g. Appleton's *Cyclop.*, Art. *Moise Amyrant*, a French Calvinist theologian, born 1596, who "acting in concert with Richelieu, aimed at a reconciliation between the Protestant and the Catholic Church," wrote a work, "*Against the Millenarists.*" Although knowing nothing of the contents of the work, its title implies that a growing class must have existed, or it would not have been issued. One thing is certain that no union could be effected between Protestants being Millenarians and Romanists.

Obs. 11. Various writers in tracing our doctrine have, through inadvertency or misapprehension of our belief, made *the unscholarly mistake* of attributing a revival of our faith to the extended belief in the Advent of Jesus to judgment about the year A.D. 1000 and succeeding dates, and, with evident relish, endeavor to make our system accountable for the calamitous results (so graphically described by Mosheim). But this belief arose from *the Romish view, and not from Millenarianism.* The proof is *self-evident*, and *the least knowledge* of the facts will make it apparent to every one. The Augustinian theory, so generally adopted by the Popish doctors, commenced the Millennium with the First Advent of Christ, and consequently, in agreement with this view, when the one thousand years, dated from the First Advent, expired, Popery, driven to a conclusion by *its own adopted* Millennial theory, looked for the Coming to Judgment, and, with its doctrine of the end of the world, etc., for a general destruction of all sublunary things. Now this was *the opposite* of Millenarian views, which made the Millennium future, to be introduced by a resurrection, and to be followed by a glorious restoration of all things. The misapplication of the Millenary (making it Pre-Advent) and of the Sec. Advent (making it Post-Millennial) is *purely Romish error*, and, in view of the extent in which it was held and the miseries that it entailed, is decisive proof how largely Millenarianism had been obliterated.

This mistake has been incorporated in several cyclopædias (as Appleton's, Brit., etc.) and also Millerism which lacks the purely Chiliastic features of a future Millennium, the doctrine of the Kingdom, etc. (although the parties sprung from Millerism have in most cases, as the majority of Sec. Adventists, returned to a more pure Chiliastic doctrine). Writers against our belief introduce this *Romish* observation *derived from* Augustinian teaching, most offensively against us, *never* regarding in the least the numerous replies made by us in explanation. In illustration: one of the most unfair and uncharitable performances is Prof. Sanborn's *Essay on Millenarians* (*Bib. Sac.*, July, 1855), in which among other mistakes we are charged with the extravagances of the middle ages (when our doctrine was really buried under a cloud of darkness) introduced by *Post-Millennialists*, and with the errors of men who were *Anti-Millenarians*. Strange that learned men, when our doctrine is *so accessible* and history is *so plain* in describing our views and that of others, cannot discriminate between our *Pre-Millennial* position and that occupied by Post-Millennial and Anti-Millennial advocates. We sometimes are almost led to suspect that the oversight *is intentional*, but, in charity, trust that it results through simple *misapprehension*. As one (Brookes) has well expressed it: "the fanatical crowds that were so alarmed were *not* Pre-Millennialists, *but* Post-Millennialists." Hence it is unjust to burden us with the vagaries that belong, *as all history attests*, to our opponents. As this accusation is constantly repeated, we append several testimonies, which present the truth in the matter. Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, sec. 202, quoting Lücke, etc., shows that the Augustinian view adopted to avoid Millenarianism as formerly entertained, was the cause of the expectation and commotion. Dr. Fisher, Art. "*Mill.*," M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*, justly traces this expectation of Advent to Augustine's views, saying: "As the year of our Lord 1000 approached, it was *a natural corollary* that the judgment and end of the world would then occur." This is true, because the Mill. was then supposed to end, and the Popish ideas of judgment and its results were then to be realized. Compare Faber's *Inquiry into History and Theol. of the Anc. Vallenses and Albigenses*, p. 389, etc., Guizot's *Civ. in Europe*, p. 95, and the Arts. in Herzog and other cyclops.

PROPOSITION 78. *The early church doctrine was revived after the Reformation.*

Several hundred names, including some of the most eminent, learned, and pious in the church, are given in such works, as Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, Brooks's *El. Proph. Interpretation*, Seiss's *Last Times*, Elliott's *Horæ. Apoc.*, Shimeall's *Eschatology*, Cox's *Millenarian's Answer*, Anderson's *Apology*, *Time of the End*, West's *Essay on His. of Doc.*, and various others, embracing many living after the Reformation, who again *revived* the early faith of the church in the Kingdom of Christ still future, and to be set up at the Sec. Advent.

The works alluded to give many interesting extracts confirmatory of the Chiliastic views held at this revival of the doctrine. Bh. Newton (*Dis. On Proph.*, No. 25). after referring to the suppression of the doctrine through the influence of Rome, says : " No wonder, therefore, that this doctrine lay depressed for many ages ; but it sprang up again at the Reformation, and will flourish together with the study of Revelation." Appleton's *Cyclop.*, Art. " *Mill.*," with all its one-sidedness, frankly remarks : " The Reformation of the 16th century gave a new impulse to Millenarian views," that the Anabaptist movement was only a " caricature of the old Christian doctrine," that " it was preached with enthusiasm by many sects and theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries," mentioning Wiegel, Comenius, Jurieu, Mede, Bengal, Oettinger, Hahn, Stilling, Lavater, and also Hass, Rothe, Hoffman, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hebart, Thiersch, Nitzsch, P. Lange, Ebrard, Irving, Cumming, and others, as its advocates during this period and later. Abbott and Conant (*Dic. of Relig. Knowledge*) say : " These views (Chiliastic) may be traced to the earliest history of the church, and were advocated by the fathers up to the 4th century. They then declined, *till the Reformation gave them a new impulse*, since which time they have prevailed through the entire church to a large extent.

Obs. 1. Candor requires of us to state this peculiarity attached to those who were thus Chiliastic. (1) Some held strictly to the Primitive view, as contained in our argument, believing only in *one* Kingdom (while acknowledging the general Divine Sovereignty, etc.), still future, which was *to accord* with the Davidic covenant and related prophecies. The church, exceedingly precious, was regarded as *only provisional and introductory* to this Kingdom. (2) Others, with a cordial faith *in such a future* Kingdom, also upheld a Kingdom as present existing in the church—a kind of *prelude* to the coming one—thus retaining in part the Origenistic or Augustinian idea. (3) Some declare for a present Kingdom in the church, and also for a future one here on earth at the Sec. Advent, but *incorporate* with the latter mystical conceptions or spiritualizing deductions (which detract from the early view), as e.g. making the reign of the Messiah invisible, retaining the Son of Man during this period in the third heaven, etc., *thus violating* the express terms of the covenant and promises. (4) Others, again, with or without a decisive Church-Kingdom theory, have adopted certain salient features of Chiliasm (as e.g. the nearness of the Advent, the restoration of all things, the rise of the Antichrist and his destruction by

the personal coming of Jesus, the first resurrection literal, the Sabbatism, etc.), so directly antagonistic to prevailing views and so much in harmony with our doctrine that they may be classed as, at least, *partly* Chiliastic. The first three, and some of the fourth class, reject the notion that the present dispensation, *in any sense, contained the covenanted, predicted Kingdom of the Messiah;* they all looked, however they may regard the church as provisional and even an introductory reign, *to the Sec. Advent* for the realization of the glorious Kingdom *as promised* by the prophets, *as covenanted* by God, and *as believed* in by the early church. This Kingdom, pre-eminently Messianic, they all believed was introduced *by a personal Advent and a prior resurrection of the saints.*

Hence on the great outlines they are a unit, however they may differ as to details. For they are all *Pre-Millenarian* in view, and look to the Kingdom to be set up here on earth *after* the Sec. Advent for the fulfilment of covenant and prophecy. In a subject so vast and complicated, it is reasonable, owing to human weakness and infirmity, to expect a divergence of view as to details, the order of events, and the meaning of various predictions. A greater divergency and antagonism of view, even pertaining to fundamentals, exist among our opponents, but this is no reason why we should reject their views, seeing that no doctrine of the Bible has escaped such treatment. It is therefore unfair to (as Brown) object to our doctrine because differences of opinion exist as to the fulfilment of details, and conceal the greater differences prevailing on their own side. Besides this, as our argument progresses, it will be shown that these differences largely and almost invariably result from a departure from the oath-bound covenants and the plain grammatical sense of the Word. The truth is, that some Pre-Millenarians are so largely leavened by the prevailing spiritualizing interpretations, that they cannot entirely rid themselves of its influence. It is also true, as the crudeness of the works indicate, that some Pre-Millenarians, without a careful study of the subject, have rushed into print and presented but a meagre and one-sided aspect of the doctrine, utterly failing to observe the force of *the fundamental covenants.*

Obs. 2. While some of the Reformers entertained *partly* Chiliastic views, others expressed themselves in a way *contradictory* to pure Millenarianism. But whatever their sentiments, *not one of them believed in the modern Whitbyan view* of the Millennium. Those who were not Chiliastic, at least supported, as we shall show, *the Chiliastic position* thus far, that they did not adopt *the idea of a Millennium still future,* to be ushered in *before* the Sec. Advent. They were Augustinian in doctrine, and utterly refused the modern prevailing doctrine *as anti-Scriptural and delusive* (comp. e.g. the quotations from them *under Prop.* 175).

In reference to the Reformers we give place to no one in deep respect for them as devoted men of the church, but we have greater esteem for the authority of Scripture (Props. 9 and 10). The Reformers, with all their greatness, were fallible, and differed among themselves. Now it is the distinguishing feature of the Protestant Church in opposition to the Romish that when men differ among themselves the question of such difference is to be decided by an appeal, not to church authority, or to the weight of any man's writings, but to the Scriptures. This was the position of *the Reformers themselves,* and they frequently asserted that they themselves should *only* be followed in so far as their views corresponded with the Scriptures. They themselves acknowledged their liability to error; that many things in the Bible were still obscure to them; and that by study, prayer, continued application, progress would be made in the knowledge of the truth. A pompous amount of quotations might be adduced *from them* to sustain these points, but we think no one will dispute a fact that is so apparent and essential to progress.* For, if we blindly believe and only believe what some great and good men

* Comp. e.g. Mosheim Ch. His., vol. 2, p. 19, and Schlegel's note, Kurtz's Ch. His., vol. 2, sec. 20, D'Aubigné's His. Ref., Schmucker's Lutheran Symbols, and writings of Auberlen, Sprecher, Conrad, and a host of others.

have said, we (*a*) yield the liberty of private judgment given by God ; (*b*) set up an infallibility unrecognized by the Word ; (*c*) render ourselves liable to error; (*d*) dishonor the doctrinal position of Holy Writ ; (*e*) remove advancement in the knowledge of the truth ; (*f*) and place the writer whom we indorse in a false position. Augustine has so happily and delicately expressed this, when he answered a Donatist who had quoted the authority of Cyprian against him, that it may properly be introduced as illustrative of our opinion : "But now seeing that it is *not canonical* which thou recitest, with *that liberty* to which the Lord hath called us, I do not receive the opinion, differing from Scripture, of that man whose praise I cannot reach, to whose great learning I do not compare my writings, whose wit I love, in whose speech I delight, whose charity I admire, whose martyrdom I reverence."

2. It has been asserted by numerous writers that the Eschatology of the Reformers is, more or less, defective. Thus e.g. Auberlen (Div. Rev., p. 224, seq.) says, that "the Eschatology of the elder Protestantism is now generally admitted to be imperfect" (comp. Dorner's *His. Prot. Theol.*, vol. 2, p. 170, etc., also Art. 2, *Evang. Quarterly Review* for Jan., 1875, written either by Dr. Brown or Dr. Valentine, one of the editors, Martenson, *Ch. Dog.*, etc.). Various reasons are assigned for this by different writers, such as, that the defectiveness arose from their recent emergence from Popery (being unable to rid themselves entirely from its influence), from the bias obtained through the teaching of the later Fathers, especially Augustine, from their being trammelled by the popish notion of the church, from their attention being specially diverted to other subjects at that time more the objects of controversy, from their not being placed in a favorable position for the developing of the truth in this direction, etc. However explained, the fact remains, and their language, whatever the reason may be, sometimes implies doubt, sometimes a feeling after the old paths, and sometimes it is contradictory.*

3. After the Reformers occurred what they themselves were directly opposed to, viz.: their writings and confessions (especially the latter) were elevated to an authority equal to that of the Scriptures. All historians sadly testify to this unfortunate procedure. The impartial student must acknowledge that there is justice in the strictures of certain writers respecting the course taken by some of the followers of the Reformers. Thus e.g. Hallam (*Introd. Lit. of Europe*, vol. 2, p. 200) alludes to the right of Private Judgment, as an essential principle of Protestantism, but which was afterward *constantly violated* by the stringent imposition of Confessions, in the understanding of which Confessions *no liberty* was allowed, even in non-essentials. This gave force to one of the reproaches cast upon the Reformation by the adherents of Rome (and reproduced by Free Religionists, etc., of the present day), viz. : that *after* according liberty of judgment to reject the authority of the Romish church and form others, it *then* withdraws that liberty and devotes all who dissent from them to obloquy, heresy, and even to bonds and death. Hallam remarks : "these reproaches, it may be a shame for us to own, can be uttered and cannot be refuted" (comp. Milner's *His. Literature*, etc.). Hence it has been said (vol. 1, p. 370) that the Reformation "was but a change of masters"; and if we are to credit certain rigid symbolists of our country and Europe, these old confessions (*with a mass of superadded matter*) are still to be our masters, to be received *unqualifiedly*, placed on a Romish footing of equality with the Scriptures. This spirit necessarily excluded proper development and true advancement ; fettered by *a bigoted* confessional of standard by which everything drawn from the Scriptures is to

---

* Compare also on this defectiveness Dr. Lange, in his Introd. to Rev., and p. 401 ; also the Art. "*Antichrist*," in Herzog's Encyclop., the remarks of the Com. in Lange's Com., 1 Thess., p. 24, and Dr. Lillie's note, etc. Dr. Kling, Art. "Eschatology," in Herzog's Encyclop., declares that the Reformers while resisting, on the one hand, the fanatical Anabaptist view, and, on the other, Popish errors, still held to a defective Eschatology, the original doctrine not being correctly held, but which was restored as the church advanced in her prophetical studies. The best proof of such a defective Eschatology is found in the fact that the most ultra-symbolists, who specially pride themselves on a strict adherence to Reformation doctrine, do *not hold* the Eschatology as given by the Reformers, as e.g. the time of the Millennium, the nearness of the Advent, the non-conversion of the world, and the Antichrist. Such, while opposing us, are very careful *to conceal* their *own defection* from the Reformer's teaching. Accusing us of a departure —as if it were fatal—they themselves are open to the same accusation, if it has any force.

be measured, the Confessions *became the measurer* of Scripture. But this is only part of the truth; for however extended this spirit, yet good and true men, followers of the Reformers, endeavored to restrain this spirit, so fatal to advance in knowledge. German, English, French, and other theologians of eminence have *protested* against this *extreme* confessional observance, and have shown that, owing to this proscription and the virulent controversies engendered by it, a fruitful source of continued ignorance upon various points, and a shutting of the door to advance in the truth, have been entailed. Hallam and others overlook this protest, because in the earlier period it unfortunately proved itself a small minority, which by degrees, however, has swelled to a large number. It is somewhat remarkable, illustrative of human prejudice and passion, that while, on the one hand, it was acknowledged that such confessions were fallible—the *then* expressed understanding of the Scriptures by their authors—they still were, on the other hand, held as certain, from which there could be *no dissent* without meriting censure and punishment. From all this (comp. Prop. 10) we learn, that while it is a duty and pleasure to honor the Reformers and their utterances (in so far as they accord with truth), we cannot, without detracting from our Christian manhood, and from the honor due alone to the Scriptures, elevate these men and their works to the position of the inspired prophets and apostles. If God had intended the Scriptures to be circumscribed by such assigned limits, provision undoubtedly would have been made to secure to us a confession not evidencing in its very construction the marks of human workmanship.

4. Simply as a reminder to our opponents (as e.g. Seiffarth) who urge the Reformers as if they were infallible, we illustrate the fact that, with all their greatness and valuable labors, they may also be in error in their interpretation of Scripture. Thus e.g. both Luther (*Table Talk*) and Melanchthon (*Initia Doctrinæ Physica*), as shown by White (*The Warfare of Science;* and see his references to Bretschneider, Lange, and Prowe), opposed the Copernican system by appeals to Scripture, Joshua, the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, etc., proving that the earth is the centre of the universe. In their conscientiousness Luther calls Copernicus "an upstart astrologer" and "fool," while Melanchthon pronounces him guilty of "a want of honesty and decency to assert such notions publicly." This teaches us that good and great men may misjudge and misinterpret, under the impression that they are doing God's service.

Obs. 3. The subject requires that we should more particularly allude to the views of the Reformers, and those after them, who were not directly Chiliastic in doctrine.[1] They (as e.g. Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox) occupied the Augustinian or Popish position (see works giving extracts from their writings, such as Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, etc.), viz.: that the church, in some sense, was the Kingdom of God (preparatory to a higher stage), and that the Millennial period (one thousand years) included *this* dispensation or gospel period (some of the Millennial descriptions being applicable only to a future period either in heaven or the renewed earth), and hence was nearing its close. But each of these recorded their belief, in the duty of every believer to be *constantly looking for the Advent*, in *a speedy* Advent, in there being no future Millennial glory *before the coming of Jesus*, in the church remaining *a mixed state* to the end, in *the design* of the present dispensation, in *the principle of interpretation* adopted, in unbelief again extending and widening *before* the Advent, in *the renewal* of this earth, etc.—doctrines *in unison with Chiliasm*. The simple truth in reference to them is this: that they were not Chiliasts, although teaching several points *that materially aid* in sustaining Chiliasm (as e.g. in those enumerated), and in some, as Luther and Melanchthon, holding that at the end of the 6th Chiliad—the close of six thousand years—Christ would appear and introduce a glorious Sabbatism (Prop. 143). They were thus *really Anti-Millenarian* in the sense of expressing faith in a proper Millennium yet to come, or in that of believing in a Millennium already past, and this *can be abundantly proven* from their writings, in their declarations of the future anticipated condition of the

world, in their hopes of an Advent drawing nigh, and in their emphatic denial of a conversion of the world prior to the expected Advent. Therefore it is that neither Millenarians (*excepting* in the features stated) nor Whitbyans (i.e. believers in a future Millennium brought about without the Advent through present agencies) can wholly claim them.[2]

[1] Because Millenarians quote Luther, etc., to sustain certain features of our doctrine, we are sometimes unjustly charged as if we referred to them *as express* Chiliasts; and this too notwithstanding the explicit statements given by us respecting their doctrinal position. Many Millenarian works (as Elliott's, Brooks', Cox's, Seiss', Taylor's, and others) allow in full their *Augustinian* position, but only refer to them (1) to show that nowhere do they endorse the modern Whitbyan doctrine; (2) that they *pointedly condemn* the present prevailing view; (3) and that, in important points, they *fully and unreservedly coincide with our Millenarian attitude.* Our opponents of the Whitbyan school cannot claim them, seeing that their position is *directly hostile* to that of the Reformers. In the course of extended reading, we have yet to find a single sentence in the Reformer's writings, that our opponents can *directly* quote in their behalf as being in sympathy with the Whitbyan hypothesis. Our ability to do this in behalf of some of our views seems to be a tender matter with Whitbyan folowers.

Our opponents very artfully quote from the Reformers such matter as they suppose is Antichiliastic, but are *very careful to avoid* two kinds of utterances given by the same men: (1) those that are *in cordial sympathy* with Chiliastic doctrine; (2) those that are *in direct conflict* with the modern, Whitbyan notion. Prof. Briggs, in the *N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879 (republished in the *Lutheran Quarterly*), endeavors, by *a concealment* of the actual facts, to leave the impression that the Reformers were in accord with the prevailing modern view. Articles like these—and they are numerous—are insidiously constructed, and well calculated to prejudice *the ignorant or unwary.* Our opponents, when driven to the wall, fully acknowledge that the Reformers were wrong in their Eschatology relating to the Millennium. Scarcely any theologian adopts their view to-day, it having been discarded for the futurity of the Mill., is a question no longer debated. Consequently the Reformers are *immensely more in agreement* with us than with our opposers, as we show by our quotations from them. No one denies that the Reformers held to a present spiritual Kingdom preparatory to a future one (as many Millenarians also do), or that they rejected a proper Mill. age in the future (which is *just as hostile* to our Post-Mill. friends as it is to us), for the simple fact, which colored their Eschatology, is that they, more or less, adopted the Augustinian notion of a past, present, or existing Mill. age, identifying it with *this* dispensation. That the Reformers were opposed to the carnal, fanatical Anabaptist movement is what every Chiliast does, on the ground of locating the Mill. age *after* the Advent and *after* the res. and translation of the saints. Whitbyans, certainly, ought not to seek the shelter and authority of the Reformers in this indirect method (which is both unscholarly and dishonest, because it seeks by *the suppression of their real views* to make them seem favorably disposed), when, in the most fundamental things pertaining to their theory, they were directly in antagonism (comp. quotations from them e.g. under Prop. 175). It is strange that men have not the acuteness to see that when they endeavor to array others against us who have *less sympathy* with their own theory than with ours, *they are only heaping up material condemnatory of their own views.* What service is gained, or what proof is obtained in behalf of the Whitbyan "hypothesis," by showing that certain persons were not favorable to Chiliasm proper (although they adopted and taught *certain prominent* Chiliastic doctrines), when the same persons plainly reject the Whitbyan theory *as unscriptural and misleading? What weight* should be given to such testimony, which forms the staple of numerous essays against us? Compare for the Reformer's views Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, and Arts. in Herzog, M'Clintock & Strong, etc. Lange, Introd. to Rev., p. 67, etc., refers to Luther's view as that "the thousand years extend from the time of the Apocalyptist to Gregory VII.," and this is stated in numerous Pre-Millenarian works.

[2] The same is true of many theologians who followed the Reformers, for while opposed to the direct ancient Chiliasm of the Primitive Church they, adopting the views of the Reformers, held to no future Millennium before the Advent of Christ. Thus to illustrate: for example, Quenstedt (Theolog. Didactico-polemica, 4, p. 649), Hunnius (Epit. Credendorum, pp. 266, sex. 291), Hutter (Compend., p. 171), and others given by Dr. Seiss (*A Question in Eschatology*), with which compare Schmid's *Dogmatics*, etc. The intelligent and careful student will also notice (what happens frequently in late commentaries, etc.) that some theologians of this class while stating succinctly their belief in no

future Millennium before the Advent of Christ, in other places drop expressions which either make their utterances contradictory or leave the impression that they were in doubt respecting their own position. The fact, however, as stated by us is this: that such a view is held by but few at present. The Protestant position has (as noticed by Hengstenberg, *Apoc.*, vol. 2, p. 334, Stuart, *Apoc.*, vol. 2, p. 463), in view of its Apocalyptic application to the Papacy, approached a Chiliastic one, and locates the 1000 years' reign in the future, after the overthrow and destruction of the Antichrist. It is unnecessary, because of the almost universal rejection of their Millennial theory, to enter into a detailed statement. Under other Props. will be shown (e.g. Prop. 158, etc.), the Scriptural and historical reasons which lead, inevitably, to its abandonment. The advocates of this view are mentioned e.g. by Lange, *Introd. to Rev.*, and the denouncement of these "servile adherents to orthodoxy," etc., is given p. 401, etc.

Obs. 4. In noticing the history of Chiliasm, it is very important for the student to discriminate between *the various beliefs* in antagonism to it. By overlooking this some writers have made serious mistakes, (1) in calling those Millenarians who, *before the personal Advent and the resurrection of the saints* (both cardinal doctrines in our system) look for a Millennium (as e.g. Anabaptists, Shakers, Swedenborgians, etc.); (2) in making out those favorable to the Whitbyan theory (*a*) who oppose us and are really *Anti-Millenarian*, or (*b*) who decry Chiliasm, but are themselves *Post-Millenarian*, or (*c*) in producing those who are Millenarians *as if opposed* to it, as e.g. in quoting from their writings, as in the case of Bunyan and others, the belief in the conversion of the world, without knowing that when they come specifically *to explain the manner* of its accomplishment it is purely in the Chiliastic order. Hence the careful writer on the subject will distinguish between the various theories: (1) Pure Chiliasm as entertained by the early church, which held as distinguishing characteristics that the church was *not* the Kingdom, but that the Kingdom was dependent on a *Pre-Millennial personal Advent, a Pre-Millennial resurrection* of the saints, etc., when, after such an Advent and resurrection, *the personal reign of Christ* and the saints would be introduced; (2) mixed Chiliasm, (*a*) holding to the early view as stated, with the exception of making also the church a preliminary Kingdom, and (*b*) receiving all of the second, including the personal Advent and resurrection, but making the reign one in heaven, or invisibly; (3) the Augustinian or Popish view, which makes the church in this dispensation the Kingdom, and does not look for one to come in a still future Millennial period; (4) another Popish view, indorsed also by a few Protestants (Grotius, Prideaux, Bush, Vint, etc.), that the church is the Kingdom, and that the Millennial era is to be dated from Constantine's conversion; (5) the Anti-Millenarian theory, which, without any Millennial doctrine (or else making the Millennial descriptions apply to heaven), regards the church as a Kingdom, and denies that there will be any Millennium in the future; (6) the Post-Millennial view (which adopts either 3 or 4), but extends the church already (as Swedenborgians) into a New Jerusalem state; (7) the view of those who regard the church a Kingdom, but (as Shakers, etc.) have it in Millennial glory in their own organization; (8) the doctrine of such, who, without any Chiliastic Kingdom—also making the church a Kingdom—simply teach the nearness of the Advent and the destruction of the world (as Millerites, etc.); (9) the singular opinion of some (as Seventh-Day Adventists), who, also teaching that the church is a Kingdom, declare the nearness of the Advent, but consign the reign of the Messiah and of the saints during the one thousand years to the third heaven, to be followed by a renewal, etc.;

(10) the Whitbyan hypothesis, which makes the church a Kingdom, and looks for a higher stage of it in the future Millennial age, merging ultimately into the heavenly Kingdom ; (11) the opinion of a few, that the church is no Kingdom, but will ultimately be incorporated into one in the third heaven ; (12) the development theory, which teaches that, while an invisible Kingdom exists in the church, the church will still more and more develop itself into the outward form of a Kingdom, without noting any particular era for the same ; (13) the Rationalistic view, that the church is no Kingdom, and none, in any proper sense, is to be expected ; (14) and the notion of some (as Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men), that *prior to* the Advent and resurrection they could, through violence, etc., introduce the Kingdom of Christ in its Millennial greatness.

The reader will observe that nearly all in this list are based on the Alexandrian interpretation, and are the offshoots of the Origenistic system, discarding *a grammatical interpretation* of covenant and prophecy. Hence their direct antagonism to the Davidic covenant, and the promises founded on the same, and which is sought to be reconciled *by special* spiritualizing to suit the theory.

Obs. 5. A number of writers have sought to bring discredit on our doctrine by declaring that it never was embraced in any public and acknowledged confession of the church, either before or after the Reformation. A few remarks, indicative of the facts, may be in place, in order that the reader may decide for himself *what weight* is in the objection.

1. Even if this were true, two things are worthy of attention : (1) That Creeds and Confessions *do not circumscribe* the Word of God, or *prevent a deeper and more Scriptural insight* in Divine things, seeing that they are simply the expression of the understanding that certain persons or bodies have of the truth *at a particular period.* The fallibility of these Confessions is apparent, in that *no two* of them *coincide* in all particulars, and that one is antagonistic to another. (See Props. 9 and 10.) (2) Our opponents who present this objection weaken their own cause by urging it, because *some of these Confessions* contain Chiliastic features, or are *in greater sympathy* with our doctrine than with their own, and *none* of the leading ones *indorse the Whitbyan theory.* The objection would have force if the Confessions *directly taught* their own Millennium doctrine, but as this is *not* the case, it can only prejudice the ignorant or unreflecting.[1]

2. If we take the quite early creeds, the Apostolic and the Nicene, we find them *held equally* by Chiliasts and Anti-Chiliasts, for they contain *nothing* respecting the Kingdom or Millennium. If we are to take Gelasius' (Prop. 77, Obs. 7, note 1) explanation of the Nicene, *then* they were regarded as embracing Chiliastic views. Writers of ability have traced the Apostles' Creed *to express Chiliasts,* as e.g. to Irenæus and Tertullian. One thing, at least, is very evident to the student, that the brief allusions to Eschatology are of such a nature *that both parties can heartily* adopt them, since they only embrace some salient features without attempting *to explain how, or in what order,* they are to be realized.[2]

3. Coming to later confessions, we find them, the leading ones, to express Eschatology in such a form (as e.g. the fact of a resurrection, of an Advent, of a judgment, etc.) that Millenarians, Post- and Anti-Millenarians can *cordially subscribe* to them. It is, however, alleged that some have been specifically hostile to Chiliasm, and two, with evident relish, are

brought forward as evidence, viz.: the Augsburg Confession and the English Confession of Edward VI.

(1) *The Augsburg Confession.* Knapp, Schmid, Shedd, and a number of writers assert that the Augsburg Confession *positively condemns* Chiliasm. On the other hand, Semisch, Auberlen, Floerke, Delitzsch, Spener, Bengel, Crusius, and others *affirm the contrary.* The intelligent reader will, in such a discussion, be influenced by the statements of eminent men who disinterestedly, and after mature consideration of the subject, declare that the Confession does not reprove and reprobate ancient Chiliasm as held by the Fathers, but *only* the form of doctrine *as advocated by the Anabaptists.* We refer in illustration to the paper drawn up by members of the Faculty of the University of Dorpat in reply to questions proposed by the Lutheran Synod of Iowa. It is signed by Drs. Havernach, Kurtz, Von Oetengen, Von Engelhart, and Volck, and fully answers the question, whether Chiliasm is in conflict with the Confession and the Lutheran Church, *in the most decisive negative.*[3]

(2) *The Confession of Edward VI.,* brought forward by Shedd and others, can only be fairly and scholarly treated by considering: (*a*) That the Art., adopted in 1553, to which they refer, was *only nine years afterward withdrawn* (which fact *they are very careful* to keep from their readers), thus indicating that any censure intended was *fully revoked.* (*b*) That in the later revisions it continued to be omitted, thus showing that a condemnatory spirit was *not indorsed.* (*c*) That in *immediate connection* with the Confession was published "The Catechism of Edward VI.," drawn up by his Prelates (said to be Cranmer, Burnet's *His.*, vol. 3, B. 4; or Neale, *His. Puritans,* vol. 1, p. 63, Poynet, afterward Bh. of Winchester), which contains, on the questions respecting "Thy Kingdom come," *the strongest Chiliastic views* (see them given e.g. by Brooks, Cox, Taylor, etc.). (*d*) And that prominent Prelates (as Bh. Latimer, Arch. Cranmer, Bradford, etc.) who received the Confession *entertained* Millenarian doctrine.[4] (3) Coming to other Confessions, we find upholders of our doctrine and opposers of it, *both* holding to the same. Thus e.g. the Westminster Assembly. In proof of our position we refer to the fact stated by an Anti-Millenarian (hence disinterested), Dr. Baillie, that "the most of the chief Divines here" (meaning the Assembly) "not only Independents but others, such as Twiss, Marshall, Palmer, and many more, *are express Chiliasts.*"[5] Again, if we refer to the Belgic Confession, produced by Shedd, Millenarians can most cordially subscribe to the Art. respecting the time of the Advent and the completion of the number of the elect. The same is true of many others, and it appears as if the language was purposely guarded to allow *a common confessional union,* which could only be done by avoiding direct Chiliasm or its opposite.

4. Several Confessions (confined to small bodies of believers) have Chiliastic Articles. One of the most noticeable of these is that drawn up by the Baptists (for since they form a large organization, the same is discarded, or held only by individuals, or small portions of the Baptists) in A.D. 1660, and presented to Charles II., signed by John Bunyan and others (said to have represented "more than twenty thousand Baptists"), in which *the purest early Patristic Millenarian doctrine* is contained, discriminating the order of resurrection, making a literal first resurrection to occur at the Sec. Advent, having a glorious Messianic Kingdom then established, etc.[6]

[1] That they are *directly opposed* to the Whitbyan doctrine, looking for the righteous to predominate in government, etc., is evident by looking at e.g. Augsburg Confession, Art. 17, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, and Articles of Smalcald (Müller's *Symb. Buch.*, p. 245, 298). The Latter Confession of Helvitia (Niemeyer's *Col. Conf.*, p 485-6), and the Confession of the Westminster Assembly, and others as given by Seiss in *A Question in Eschatology*, pp. 33–40, with extracts. (Comp. Prop. 175.) The reasoning therefore of Prof. Briggs, and others, is *totally irrelevant*, and if it has *any force* whatever, *must be decisive against themselves*. For, while there is no creed or confession which directly and positively teaches the Whitbyan theory, we have some creeds (which we shall quote hereafter) that *directly teach* Chiliasm, and we have all the great leading ones to *directly present prominent* Chiliastic doctrines held by us, and such as are *utterly irreconcilable* with the modern "hypothesis."

[2] Comp. King's *His. Apos. Creed*, Bh. Pearson *On the Creed*, Mosheim's *Eccl. His.*, vol. 1, p. 79, and Murdock's note, etc., and notice the reference to Irenæus and Tertullian. Observe also that in the enlargement of the Creed, as now used, by the Romish Church the same features are retained so that both partie could still receive it. The eschatology of the Athanasian Creed follows the others, with more of a leaning toward Romanism. See the Creeds as given by Dr. Schaff in *Creeds of Christendom*. The Scriptural statements (using the exact phraseology), or the general expressions (without any attempt to explain order, etc.), were of such a nature as to allow both parties to adopt them as true; the difference and antagonism only appeared when the manner of fulfilment or realization was expounded. Thus e.g. to believe in a res. of the dead is the faith of all, but when the order and manner of the res. is afterward discussed (aside from the creeds) differences appear, etc.

[3] The reply is so admirable in spirit that we append a few extracts. It has been published in German as a Tract, and in English in the *Evang. Quarterly Review* and *The Lutheran*. Giving reasons drawn from Melanchthon, Luther, and others, for the declaration: "There is no doubt that our Confession here (art. XVII.), *has not in view the Old Catholic Chiliasm* in its various forms, but that of the Münzer Anabaptists, and the fanatical errorists akin to them," the writers proceed as follows: "The fact, therefore, is *incontrovertibly* this, that the Augsburg Confession *has only to do* with the Anabaptist errors and efforts of those times. It places affirmatively the chief eschatological facts, in their principal features, over against the rejected error, without, for example, any special explanation as to how we are to understand the Coming of Christ, or the Last Day, what the Scriptures teach concerning the resurrection of the dead, and how the passage in Rev. 20 : 1–6, in connection with the entire Scripture, is to be explained. Especially has it not at all yet expressed itself concerning the precise substance of the last question, namely: whether this prophecy must be looked upon as one already fulfilled, or as one, the fulfilment of which is yet future. Each one may answer these for himself, in such way as he may deem defensible by the Word of God and the *concensus* of church doctrine. We look upon these questions, neither as finally determined, nor as allowing, in attempts to solve them, a departure from the prophetic and apostolic word; further, that the attention which this subject commands is a characteristic feature, and one worthy of notice of the Church and theology of the present day. They are, in fact, yet open exegetical questions, every solution of which cannot be assented to; nor, on the other hand, is every Christian and theological conviction, resting upon an earnest and churchly-minded Scriptural investigation, which does not agree with old dogmatists, to be at once rejected with fanatical Chiliasm, or even to be suspected as Chiliastic." After showing that church fellowship cannot Confessionally be denied to any one "on account of differences in the doctrine of the Chiliastic Kingdom, concerning which *our confession has not at all yet expressed itself*," the writers continue: "We are indeed not able to see, under what churchly confessional claim it can be forbidden to the individual, and especially to the theologian, in the Lutheran Church, *to search* the prophetical Scriptures in the manner designated, and upon their basis *to form* a Christian and theological faith—conviction concerning the final acts of redemption; nor with what churchly right, inasmuch as our Church recognizes *no exegetical* tribunal, we can refuse to regard similar questions of doctrine, so long as the expressed saving faith remains, as anything else than they really are, namely: open questions." They add: "It is our conviction, that it is an error to suppose that there is *nothing more* given for faith and the Church to search after and to learn; or that it lies in the power of the Church, especially *the more* she nears her final goal, to go out of the way of these questions."

That the reader can see for himself that it does not, and cannot, condemn the Chiliasm of the Apostolic and later Fathers, we reproduce that portion of art. XVII. which is alleged as condemnatory: "they condemn those who spread abroad Jewish opinions,

that *before the resurrection of the dead*, the pious will engross the government of the world and the wicked be everywhere oppressed,"--(the German : " they condemn those who circulate the Judaizing notion, *that prior* to the resurrection of the dead, the godly will establish a world-dominion and all the wicked will be exterminated ").* Now every one can see that the form of doctrine here condemned *is not the one entertained* by the ancient Chiliasts, for *not one* of them locates this Kingdom *prior to*, or *before*, the resurrection, and *not one* of them teaches that this can be effected by the pious but *only* by the Sec. Advent and the power of the Messiah. The error thus reprobated belongs to the Anabaptists, and all that class (*including also the Whitbyans*) who teach that *before* the resurrection, and consequently *before* the Advent, and *before* the end of this dispensation, the Church will so advance, etc., that " the pious will engross the government of the world," institute a " world-dominion," and suppress the wicked. The Millenarian view, having for cardinal doctrines *a prior Advent and resurrection*, is not chargeable with *so gross* an error ; and those who urge this Confessional objection are *not sufficiently candid* to acknowledge that it is condemnatory—if it has *any logical* force whatever—of *the present prevailing Whitbyan* theory of the Millennium.

The reader is referred to an art. on the question, " *Does the Augsburg Confession condemn Chiliasm ?*" by Dr. Seiss in the Append. (Note D.) to *The Last Times*. He makes at length the following points : (1) By name Chiliasm is not condemned. (2) The description of the opinions condemned does *not* describe Millenarianism, for it is *no doctrine* of ours " that the pious are to have a separate Kingdom to themselves *before* the resurrection of the dead." We look for a Kingdom only *after* the resurrection, and the authorities in behalf of our doctrine are given. (3) Reference is made in the Confession to the Anabaptists, and it is decisively shown from historical authorities that the doctrine of the Anabaptists *widely differed* from the Millenarian. (4) The declarations of Luther, Melanchthon, and others, are produced to indicate the same. (5) Millenarians of eminence and ability are adduced, who subscribed to the Confession, such as Spener, Bengel, and others. (6) That the Confessors did not sit in judgment over, and condemn the Apostolic and Primitive Fathers, who were Chiliastic, for whom in other places they profess esteem.

It is unfortunate and misleading, that even in Cyclopædias, His. of Doctrines, etc., efforts are made to link ancient and modern Chiliasm with the vagaries of Anabaptists and the Fifth Monarchy men, and *hastily to infer* that when these are confessionally or otherwise condemned by the Reformers and others, that *this also* is condemnatory of Chiliasm in all its phases. Such a line of procedure if applied to other doctrine, would leave but little for us to receive. The vagaries of Anabaptists, such as, that *before* the Advent and resurrection the promised Kingdom is to be established, that it is to be set up *by human means and instrumentalities*, that Christ will *then reign through self-appointed* prophets, vicars, kings, etc.—which Chiliasm *pointedly repudiates*, are fully described by Mosheim, Ranke, Hardwick, Miller, Walch, etc., so that a student *cannot* plead ignorance when indorsing such an error. So also with the Fifth Monarchy men ; history (Burnet, Wilson, etc.), attests, that the Fifth Monarchy of Daniel, they expected (with perhaps few exceptions, as Tillinghast and others) to raise up through *their own agency before* the Coming of Christ, and contended, therefore, that all power, civil and spiritual, should be already given to them. Hence they entered into open rebellion against the existing powers, etc., a principle *utterly at variance* with ancient and modern Chiliasm.

Numerous testimonies expressive of the intended meaning of the art. could be given. And as our opponents persistently urge it as an objection, a few more are appended. Dr. Lange in several places (e.g. Rev. p. 351, Amer. Ed.) refers to this misinterpretation of the Confession, e.g. saying : " The elder Lutheran theology continues most involved in the toils of mediæval tradition. The slavish theology of the letter has found a support in the view of John Gerhard in particular. The Apocalypse, Gerhard declares, is a deutero-canonical book—the Kingdom of Christ will never on earth, not even at the end

---

* We refer the critical student to the incorrect usage of " Jewish opinion" and " Judaizing notion" in the art. For, as we have abundantly proven, in former Props., in quotations from our opponents, Jewish authorities, and recent works on the Doc. of the New Test., it is not even correct to associate the Anabaptist error with Jewish views, because the Jews associated a res. of the godly with the Advent of the Messiah and His reign, etc. It is only true, when taken in a limited sense, expressed e.g. by Jews who permitted themselves to be imposed on by false Messiahs. Here even it is proper to discriminate, so that injustice is not done to the Jewish expressed faith. The Jews, as a class, took no part in this movement.

of the days, be one of external sovereignty (a sentiment dictated, doubtless by *a misunderstanding* of art. XVII. of the Augsburg Confession)—all the dead are to arise in *one* day—there is to be but *one* general resurrection of the dead at the Parousia of the Lord. Accordingly, it is further stated, the beginning of the Mill. Kingdom probably falls in the time of Constantine—Gog and Magog are to be regarded as significant of the Turks. A partiality for this *prejudiced* tradition can in general be regarded only as the *sad fruit of partyism.*" (Comp. p. 401.) In Richter's *Erklarte Haus Bibel*, Tom. 6, 1134, in advocacy of our views, it is said: "The doctrine of the one thousand years' Kingdom, or Flower and Golden Time of the Church upon this present earth—which the prophets have so amply pictured—is thoroughly in accordance with the Evangelical Church doctrine, for in the 17th art. of the Augsburg Confession there is not a syllable (steht kein wort) about the one thousand years, nor about the one thousand years' Kingdom," etc. So the *Berlenberg Bibel*, Tom. 6, pp. 397–399, advocates Chiliasm, and declares that the art. is not in conflict with it, but that "a mere carnal, world-kingdom is justly rejected." Thus others might be quoted, as Olshausen, Bengel, Steir, Auberlen, Delitzsch, Koppe, Piscator, Spener, Ebrard, Lisco, Roos, Kohler, Bauer Fr., and many others. Mallery (*Prop. Times*, vol. 5, p. 97) justly, in reply to Shedd, observes: "What the Augsburg Confession *does* condemn, is the now prevalent notion of a Millennium of righteousness and good government *before* the Lord's coming. It condemns the notion of the conversion of the world under the present dispensation, the idea now regarded as orthodox, but one which Luther constantly condemned." The student, too, will observe the force of the word "*prior*" or "*before*" used designedly, for, as we shall hereafter show by numerous quotations, the Reformers did believe that *after* the resurrection and *after* the Sec. Advent this earth renewed, etc., *would be given to the pious* and that they would gloriously reign—thus incorporating into their faith doctrines in sympathy with Chiliastic views. As illustrative of view, we quote Koch (*Das Tausendjährige Reich*), who says: "Here, first of all, the false Chiliasm advocated in the time of the Reformation by the fanatical Anabaptists, is to be mentioned. They taught a future glorious Kingdom of Christ on earth, but imagined that *the immediate erection* of this Kingdom was a matter of the first importance to the Christian Church. *By her own might, sword in hand*, it must be established, just as it was attempted by Thomas Munzer to overthrow the Christ-opposed powers of this world (even as Israel overthrew the Canaanites formerly), in order to proclaim the Kingdom of Christ as the Fifth Monarchy, which was to succeed the four universal monarchies described by Daniel. Against this conception of the 1000 years' Kingdom—*and only against this*—was the 17th art. of the Augsburg Confession directed, which rejected the Jewish opinion that believers should enjoy on earth, *before the resurrection, a worldly kingdom, after a general crushing out of the wicked.* But not merely by the Augustana, but also by the Scriptures, is this false Chiliasm condemned, because, as already shown, the erection of the Millennial Kingdom, according to the prophets' words, is *not* the result of *any such* Church action, *but comes only by means of the returning Lord*, an event which the Church awaits with patience, and which at last it *can only realize*, not by works, but by suffering. Kindred with this false Chiliasm, is a conception of *modern* theology, according to which the Kingdom of Christ is to be realized *by means of Church action*, not, indeed, violently, but gradually and in a peaceful way. The sanctifying influence of Christianity is to evermore powerfully extend itself, in ever-widening circles, the power of sin evermore retreating before it, until, finally at the close of its historical development, all humanity shall be glorified into a Kingdom of God. Even *this finer form of Chiliasm*" (as e.g. given by Whitby, Edwards, Brown, Glasgow, etc.), "*like the coarse form* advocated by the Anabaptists, is *condemned* by the Apoc. of John. According to this, wickedness does not decline in the course of history, but rather ascends to its most fearful antichristian height, while on the other hand, also, the Church is purified by means of her tribulation, in the last time. Not the preaching of the Gospel, the moral influence of Christianity, puts an end to antichristianity, *but the judgment of the returning Lord*, with which the glorious Kingdom of God on earth makes an entrance." (Compare Starke, Steffann and Ebrard, p. 440, Lange's *Com.* Rev.)

[4] Brooks' *El. Proph. Interp.*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, Cox's *Millenarian's Answer*, *The Time of the End* by a Congregationalist, Shimeall's *Eschatology*, and other works give the evidence respecting this Confession, and copious extracts from the Catechism and from the Prelates indorsing it, *unmistakably proving* that many who were Chiliastic received it; and that, therefore, the withdrawal of the article was intentional "either" (so Brooks) "from the increase of Millenarian principles at this time; or at least from the conviction that they were not to be confounded with the extravagances of Cerinthus or of Munzer." Bickersteth (*Prom. Glory*, p. 93, note) refers to the opinion of the Reformers (Tyndale, Bradford, Latimer, Becon) and of Edward VI.'s Catechism, and then to

the speedy withdrawal of this art., adding: "The idea of a carnal Mill. of worldly pleasures is justly denounced by all thoughtful Christians. The common idea of the Reformers, derived from Rome and continued for some time after the Reformation, was, that the Mill. was past, an opinion generally now abandoned. The 41st art. was wholly withdrawn from the authorized Articles of 1562. The prevailing opinion of the Reformers was, that the judgment to come was to be *expected speedily*, without any intervening Mill., and that our Saviour would soon return in His glory; and hence the services have nothing that interferes with our looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; and have also many expressions of confidence in His return, and the Kingdom then to be inherited by the saints."

[5] Brooks, *El. Proph. Interp.*, p. 72, quotes the letter from Baillie (Let. No. 117, presented also in Anderson's *Letter to the Author of Millenarianism Indefensible*," and quoted in various works), and gives among the "*many more*" known to have been Millenarian, Ash, Bridge, Burroughs, Caryll, Goodwin, Gouge, Langley, and Sterry, *all members of the Assembly*. To these as expressing Chiliastic views to some extent, Shimeall (*Eschatology*, p. 89) adds: Selden, Ainsworth, Gataker, and Featly. No wonder that Baillie writes that this "*error so famous in antiquity*" is "*so troublesome among us.*" Prof. Briggs in his bitterness against Chiliasm affirms, *most unjustly*, that the Westminster Conf. rejects Pre-Mill. as *error and heresy* (Dr. Macdill follows him closely in the same *unhistorical* charge); now Dr. Craven in his reply to the grave charge (*N. Y. Evangelist*, Jan. and Feb. 1879), makes the following points, which serve as *a most ample refutation*. (1) The majority of the committee (viz.: Goodwin, Bridge, Caryll, and Greenhill—who had been members of the Westminster Assembly), who framed the Savoy Confession, were *express* Pre-Millenarians. (2) Pre-Millenarians *prominently* took part in framing the Confession, and evidently—as a compromise—to preserve unity and harmony, so worded the same, giving general and Scriptural statements (without any intimation *of order or manner*) that all could accept of it. (3) As a diversity of opinion existed relating to the events preceding and connected with the Sec. Advent, the only basis of union was to avoid *a discussion* of the order and manner of fulfilment, which was done. (4) The use of the phrases "day of judgment," "Kingdom," etc., as well as the adoption of Scripture on controverted subjects *without explanation*, did not forbid Pre-Mills. or Post-Mills. to accept of the same. (5) That the admission of Prof. Briggs that Pre-Mills. (as Sterry, Burroughs, and Goodwin) were in the Westminster Assembly, and *utterly unconscious* of being denounced and condemned, is sufficient evidence in our favor. (6) That these and other Pre-Mills. labored with Post-Mills. in the same Church, and were *never* tried and disciplined for their doctrinal views, is conclusive proof how the same were regarded. (7) That Homes' intensely Pre-Mill. work "*The Res. Revealed*," *was indorsed by a committee* (Caryll and Sterry) *of the Assembly*, is decisive that *no condemnatory* idea was ever entertained. (8) That the testimony of Baillie (*Letters*, vol. 2, p. 414-15), and of Masson (*Life of Milton*, vol. 2, p. 146), both opponents, as to *the extent* of the belief, and *the eminence* of its believers, is irresistible to any unprejudiced mind. (9) That Twisse, "a thoroughgoing Pre-Millenarian, *should have been selected for the position of Moderator*," is evidence either of the esteem in which Chiliasts were held, or of the number of Chiliastic adherents in the Assembly, or of both. (10) Caryll, as one of the committee to whom Homes' Chiliastic work was given, not only pronounces the book "very useful for the saints and worthy of public view," but states that its doctrines have "*gained ground in the hearts and judgments of very many, both grave and godly men*, who have left us divers essays and discourses on the subject." We leave the *candid* reader to say whether, in view of *such facts*, there is the slightest foundation for Prof. B.'s *uncharitable* deductions; and whether the latter do not spring more from the heart than from the mind. The feeling and opinion even later is illustrated e.g. in the *Life of Ed. Irving* (by Mrs. Oliphant, p. 335); it being stated that the authorities of the Church tacitly admitted, by non-interference, attendance, etc., that the doctrine of the Millennium was "open to a diversity of view." We shall have occasion to quote this Confession under another Prop., as in sympathy with some Chiliastic views, viz.: the looking for the Advent enforced as a duty without an intervening Millennial age, and the nonconversion of the world.

[6] The student is referred to Crosby's *His. of the Baptists*, vol. 2, App. 85. We give a few extracts to illustrate. The Confession declares the unalterable faith of the signers, saying, "for which we are not only resolved to suffer persecution to the loss of our goods, but also life itself, rather than decline from the same;" and this enforces the Chiliasm as a deliberate conviction. It then plainly announces: "We *believe* that there will be *an order* in the resurrection; Christ is the first-fruits, and then next, or after, *they that are Christ's at His Coming*; then, or afterward, cometh the end. Concerning the Kingdom and reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, as we do believe that He is now in heaven

at His Father's right hand, so *we do believe* that, at the time appointed by the Father, He shall come again in power and great glory; and that at or after His coming the second time, He will not only raise the dead, and judge and restore the world, but *will also take to Himself His Kingdom*, and will, according to the Scriptures, *reign on the throne of His father David, on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, forever.*" "We *believe* that the Kingdom of our Lord will be *an universal* Kingdom, and that in this Kingdom the Lord Jesus Christ Himself *will be alone, visible, supreme God and King of the whole earth.* We *believe* that as this Kingdom will be universal, so it will be also *an everlasting* Kingdom, that shall have no end, nor cannot be shaken; *in which* Kingdom the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus *shall receive the end of their faith*, even the salvation of their souls; where the Lord is they shall be also. We *believe* that the New Jerusalem that shall come down from God out of heaven, when the tabernacle of God shall be with them, and He will dwell among them, *will be the Metropolitan City of the Kingdom, and will be the glorious place of residence of both Christ and His saints forever*, and will be so situated as that the Kingly palace will be *on Mount Zion, the holy hill of David, where His throne was.*" The Confession insists on a personal Advent, upon Christ's obtaining the government of the world, the saints reigning on the earth with Him, applying Dan. 7 : 27; Rev. 19 : 16; Ps. 22 : 28; Zech. 14 : 9, etc., to this period. The contrast in the present and future condition of saints is thus drawn: "'For unto the saints *shall be given* the Kingdom, and the greatness of the Kingdom, under (mark that) the whole heaven' (Dan. 7 : 27). Though (alas!) now many men be scarce content that the saints should have so much as a being among them; but *when* Christ shall appear, *then* shall be their day, *then* shall be given unto them power over the nations, to rule them with a rod of iron (Rev. 2 : 26, 27). *Then* shall they receive a crown of life, which no man shall take from them, nor they by any means turned or overturned from it, for the oppressor shall be broken in pieces (Ps. 72 : 4), and their vain rejoicings turned into mourning and bitter lamentations, as it is written (Job 22 : 5-7)."

As to other Confessions, a number, indicative of *the extent* of belief, may thus be specified. The "Free Chris. Church of Italy," in Genl. Assembly at Milan, June, 1870, adopted the following Chiliastic doctrine: "Art. VIII. The Lord Jesus Christ will come from heaven and transform our body of humiliation into a glorious body. In that day the dead in Christ shall rise first, and the living who are found faithful shall be transformed, and thus together shall we be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, to be forever with the Lord; and, after His Kingdom, all the rest shall rise to be judged in judgment." The "Second Adventists," in their public expression of Faith (Taylor's *Voice of the Church*), declare their belief in the speedy Advent, the first and second resurrections separated by an interval of a 1000 years, the reign of Christ and the saints on the earth, etc. They are far more Chiliastic than the Millerites—the latter being chiefly distinguished for belief in an immediate coming and fixing the time for the same. "The Catholic Apostolic Church" (a succession of the Irvingites) presents in its Confession of Faith a strong Chiliastic belief, for which they are noted. Its leading doctrine is a belief in the speedy Coming of Jesus, and expresses it "as the only hope of deliverance to the sin-burdened and weary creation." (Comp. art. on, in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* It has extended itself in England, Scotland, Ireland, Switzerland, France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Austria, Germany, America, etc.) The "Seventh-Day Adventists," entertain several of the Chiliastic tenets. "The Brethren," or "Dunkards," as represented by Nead, in Nead's *Theolog. Writings* (see ch. 20, on "The Sec. Advent"), hold to the personal return and reign of Jesus, to a previous fearful lack of faith and persecution, to a restoration of the Jews, to a glorious Mill., to a first res. preceding, and to a second res. at the end of the 1000 years, to a great battle between Christ and His enemies, to the perpetuity of the race after the Advent, and to the removal of the curse and the Sabbatism. Thus many of the essential points of Primitive and Scriptural Chiliasm are incorporated. What number or particular body are thus presented the writer does not know. A few copies of *The Brethren at Work*, a Brethren or Dunkard periodical published at Lanark, Ill., fell into my hands, and they contained the advocacy of the Mill. and the personal reign of Christ (as e.g. March 21st, 1878), by James Wirt. "The Church of God" (see art. by Winebrenner, in Rupp's *Orig. His. of Relig. Denom.*) gives as an art. of Faith: "She believes in the personal coming and reign of Jesus Christ, Matt. 24 : 42-44; Acts 1 : 11; Phil. 3 : 20, 21; 1 Thess. 4 : 16, 17; 1 John 3 : 2; Rev. 1 : 17." "She believes in the resurrection 'both of the just and the unjust;' that the res. of the just will precede the res. of the unjust." (In 1867, the Church numbered 11 elderships, 400 churches, 350 ministers, and over 25,000 members.) In conversing with ministers and members of this Church, they exhibited an intelligent Chiliastic belief, in marked contrast with many others. The "Plymouth Brethren," or Darby-

ites, entertain a prominent Chiliastic belief, being one of their chief characteristics, as any reference to their expressed faith will abundantly show. The "Harmony Society," or the Rappists (followers of Rapp, settled at Economy, Pa.), hold Pre-Mill. views. The nearness of the Millennium, introduced by the Sec. Advent, is a cardinal doctrine with them. The "Mennonites" (art. in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* says) "in the 16th cent., held, in common with the Anabaptists, the belief in Christ's personal reign during the Millennium." Buck's *Theol. Dic.*, art. "Mennonites," remarks, that Menno discarded the extravagant views of certain Anabaptists, but retained the doctrine of "the Millennium, or 1000 years' reign of Christ upon earth." How largely this doctrine continued among them, the writer is unable to say, for they now number altogether, it is supposed, about 200,000, divided into several branches. The "Apostoolians" (*Ency. Relig. Knowl.*), one of the branches, is decidedly Millennarian. The "Christadelphians" have largely incorporated Chiliasm, and make it essential to their system. It is most prominently presented in their published "Principles," and other works. Various offshoots of the "Pietistic movement" were largely affected by Chiliasm, as for e.g. the "Society of Korn" (art. on, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*), which was under "the Millenarian influence of Jung Stilling and Michael Hahn." (The followers of Hahn in 1817 "numbered 18,000.") The "Moravians" favored Chiliastic views, however perverted by ideal and mystical conceptions. Writers professing to give the faith of the "Unitas Fratrum," present the Millenarian view, as e.g. Bish. Spangenberg in his last ch. of *Exposition of Ch. Doctrine.* Various parties, imbibing Spener's pietism and Oetinger's theosophy, incorporated Chiliasm, as e.g. the "Michaleans" (and in contrast with them the "Pregizerians"), of whom Kurtz (*Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 291) says: "They had a common ground in their Chiliasm, and in the doctrine of restoration." Chiliastic views are dominant in small parties, as in the "One-faith people," in the adherents of Barbour, of Rochester, N. Y., and in the followers of Russell, of Pittsburg, Pa., as well as in others whose location has escaped the writer's recollection. The same is true of some German Millenarians near Tiflis, the capital of Georgia (Henderson's *Bib. Researches in Russia*, pp. 524-529, and Pinkerton's *Russia*, pp. 143-151). The first attempt to form a Universalist sect embraced distinctive features of Chiliasm allied with Universalism, as seen in the "Rellyanites or Rellyan Universalists" (Art. on, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*), whose theory of Restitution is in the main allied with Chiliastic views, revived by Barbour, Russell, etc., in the *Three Worlds* and their respective newspapers. As this fact is not generally known, we quote the following from James Relly's (at one time connected with Whitefield) and his followers' belief: "In general they appear to believe that there will be a resurrection to life and a res. to condemnation; that believers only will be among the former, who, as firstfruits, and kings and priests, will have part in the first resurrection, and shall reign with Christ in His Kingdom of the Millennium; that unbelievers who are after raised must wait the manifestation of the Saviour of the world under that condemnation of conscience which a mind in darkness and wrath must necessarily feel; that believers, called kings and priests, will be made the medium of communicating to their condemned brethren, who, like Joseph to his brethren, though he spoke roughly to them, in reality overflowed with affection and tenderness; that ultimately every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength, and thus every enemy shall be subdued to the Kingdom and glory of the great Mediator." (Those who have recently revived this Restitution scheme, change some features, as e.g. the obstinate and recalcitrant are given over to "the second death," etc.) Even the Mormons, together with much that the Church receives in general, incorporate Chiliastic features. Jos. Smith in his *His. of the Latter Day Saints* (Rupp's *Orig. His. of Relig. Denoms.*) says: "We believe in the literal gathering of Israel, and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes;" "That Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisaical glory." But (Art. "Mormons," M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) teach a gross future, illustrated by the future marriage, etc. (The influence that the association of Chiliasm with singular or fanatical views has upon many—who overlook the fact that the most precious and fundamental Christian doctrines are similarly treated--will be treated under Prop. 179)

Obs. 6. The Chiliastic doctrine is not confined to any one branch of the Protestant Church. Its advocates are to be found *in all denominations*, more or less, and embrace men eminent for piety, abundant labors, and ability. The lists that are given in various works include Reformers, Martyrs, English Church Divines, Lutherans, Reformed, Westminster

Assembly Divines, English Dissenters, New England Divines, Baptists, Presbyterians, American Episcopal Divines, Congregationalists, Missionaries, etc., forming a noble band of adherents to the early faith.

The student is referred to the lists given in Brooks's *El. Proph. Interp.*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church, The Time of the End* by a Congregationalist, Seiss's *Last Times*, Shimeall's *Eschatology*, Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, McCaul's *The Old Paths*, Wood's *Believer's Guide, The Investigator*, 4th vol., Manford's *Apology for Millenarianism*, Drummond's *Dialogues on Prophecy*, and *Defence of the Students of Prophecy*, Bryant's *Millenarian Views*, West's *His. Pre-Mill. Doc.*, etc. Macaulay (*Essays on the Jews*, 1831) referred to this feature: "Many Christians believe that the Messiah will shortly establish a Kingdom on the earth and reign visibly over all its inhabitants. Whether this doctrine be orthodox or not, we shall not inquire. The number of people who hold it *is very much greater* than the number of Jews residing in England. Many of those who hold it *are distinguished* by rank, wealth, and ability; it is preached from pulpits both of the Scottish and of the English Church. Noblemen and members of Parliament have written in defence of it, who expect "that before this generation shall pass away, all the kingdoms of the earth will be swallowed up in one Divine Empire." While many of the names that we give are verified by a personal perusal of their works or extracts from them, many are presented on the authority of others, and we may thus inadvertently place some of those who are more thoroughly Millenarian with those who are less so, and the reverse. A complete list of writers, classified as to their exact views, is still a *desideratum*, and until this is done, injustice may unintentionally be done to authors.

Obs. 7. After the Reformation, however, the Reformers and others indorsed certain distinctive features belonging, as parts of the system, to Millenarian doctrine, we are chiefly indebted to a few leading minds for bringing forth a return to the old Patristic faith in all its essential forms. Prominently among these are the following: the profound Biblical scholar Joseph Mede (born 1586, died 1638), in his still celebrated *Clavis Apocalyptica* (translated into English) and *Exposition on Peter;* Th. Brightman (1644), *Expositions of Daniel and Apoc.;* J. A. Bengel (a learned divine, born 1687, died 1752), *Exposition of the Apocalypse* and *Addresses* on the same; also the writings of Th. Goodwin (1679); Ch. Daubuz (1730); Piscator (1646); M. F. Roos (1770); Alstedius (1643 and earlier); Cressener (1689); Farmer (1660); Fleming (1708); Hartley (1764); J. J. Hess (1774); Homes (1654); Jurieu (1686); Maton (1642); Peterson (1692); Sherwin (1665); and others (such as Conrade, Gallus, Brahe, Kett, Broughton, Marten, Sir I. Newton, Whiston, etc.), materially aided in directing attention to the Millenarian doctrine and to influence persons to Biblical study on the subject. When these were followed by men eminent for learning and marked ability (some have been mentioned, others will follow); when the leading poets and commentaries gave an additional impulse to Millenarian doctrine by their forcible portrayals and exegetical comments; when persons of the highest and lowest position, in all ranks and professions, of undoubted piety and usefulness, thus united in expressing Chiliastic views, the doctrine of the early church received correspondingly *a revival and renewed strength* in the hearts and hopes of believers.

The student is aware that when the revival of Pietism (a movement against a cold Philosophical and Symbolistic tendency) took place under Spener, Francke, and others, there was also *a return* to the Chiliastic faith. Admitting that in some cases it might have been allied with fanaticism, as Mosheim (vol. 3, p. 381) intimates, yet Mosheim (himself Anti-Millenarian) is *uncandid* when he says that they "also recalled upon the stage opinions long since condemned; asserted that the reign of a thousand years, mentioned by John, was at hand." The unfairness consists in this: (1) He seems *to sanction the condemnation* of the doctrine by the Romish Church; (2) he links this doctrine with extravagances, *as if* inseparable; (3) he forgets, having *highly praised* Spener, *that Spener*

himself defended the Millenarian view as Scriptural, and not opposed by the Augsburg Confession ; (4) that works, specially written to set forth what were the real views of the Pietists (as e.g. Klettwich's), were suppressed, and that their doctrine, in the bitter controversies that ensued, was caricatured, etc. ; (5) Mosheim permits his spirit of hatred to the doctrine (as e.g. in the case of Peterson, etc.) to appear on several occasions, and hence is to be received with caution ; (6) the best devotional hymns and books, as well as practical works on religion, have sprung from that movement. It would be well, if the detractors of the Pietists possessed their piety, sincerity, usefulness, and ability.

Dr. Fisher in Art. "*Mill.*" (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) remarks : "The Mill. doctrine, in its essential characteristics, has had adherents among some of the most sober-minded theologians of the Lutheran Church in later times. Of these, one of the most distinguished is John Albert Bengel, the author of *The Gnomon*, who defended his opinion in his *Com. on the Apoc.*, published in 1740. He has been followed by other divines of repute ; and the doctrine has not been without prominent supporters among the Lutherans down to the present time. One of the latest of their number who has discussed this question is the Rev. A. Koch (*Das Tausendjährige Reich*, Basle, 1872). This writer endeavors in particular to refute the arguments adduced against the doctrine of a Millennium by the German commentators Hengstenberg, Keil, and Kleifoth." (Comp. Lange's estimate of Hengstenberg, etc., in his *Introd. to Rev.*) The Dr. also says : "In all the other various orthodox Protestant bodies, *there are many* who believe in the personal Advent of Christ for the purpose of establishing a Millennial Kingdom."

Obs. 8. There is a class of able men whose sentiments were favorable to Millenarians—who either express these in their writings, or speak approvingly of Chiliastic works—and yet by many, at the present day, are supposed to be the contrary. In illustration of this, a number may appropriately be mentioned. John Wesley has often been claimed as Chiliastic (and is so given by Taylor, Shimeall, and others), because of his chiefly *adopting Bengel's views* in Revelation, and of the views presented in some of his sermons. This has been denied, and utterances *seemingly* contradictory presented in proof. But this has *finally been settled* by a Methodist historian, Tyerman, in his *Life of John Wesley*, vol. 2, p. 523, etc. After giving very candidly Hartley's Mill. views from "*Paradise Restored*" (affirming the Pre-Mill. Advent, and the Mill. reign of Jesus, etc., which Wesley *indorsed*, see *Works*, vol. 6, p. 743), Tyerman then gives the fact that John Wesley read and approved of the same, writing (*Meth. Mag.*, 1783, p. 498) to the author : "Your book on the Millennium was lately put into my hands. I cannot but thank you for your *strong and seasonable confirmation of that comfortable doctrine, of which I cannot entertain the least doubt, as long as I believe the Bible.*" Tyerman most frankly and honestly (worthy of special notice) adds : "With *such* a statement, in reference to *such* a book, there can be *no doubt that Wesley*, like his father before him, *was a Millenarian, a believer* in the Sec. Advent of Christ to reign on earth, visibly and gloriously, for a thousand years. This is a matter which *none* of Wesley's biographers have noticed ; and yet the above is not the only evidence in support of it." He then refers us to a letter to Dr. Middleton (published 1749), in which Wesley indorses Justin Martyr's Mill. views, saying : "To say that they" (i.e. the Fathers of the second and third cents.) "believed this, was neither more nor less *than to say they believed the Bible.*" Reference is also made to an article, "The Renovation of All Things," in Wesley's *Arminian Mag.*, 1784, p. 154, etc. The adoption of the Millenarian Bengel's notes for the Apoc., in his Com. on the New Test., his expressed views on the Judgment Day (which we quote, Prop. 133), the deliverance of creation (which we quote, Prop. 146), and related subjects, is ample testimony.[1]

Some few have denied that Dr. Chalmers was Pre-Millenarian, against the express sentiments quoted by us of a Pre-Mill. Sec. Advent, a non-conversion of the world preceding that Advent (see Prop. 175), the renovation of the earth (Prop. 146). However he may have been influenced by some of the vagaries of Irvingism not to give great prominency to his views on the subject, yet, in behalf of the truth, his utterances are decided, as can be seen e.g. by comparing his *Sabbath Readings*, vol. 1, pp. 311 and 108 (comp. *Proph. Times*, vol. 4, p. 110, etc., for detailed statement). So also some have tried to claim Spener as Post-Millenarian, against the testimony of history and his own writings. It is well known to students that Spener *defended Chiliasm*, and showed that the Augsburg Confession was *not* opposed to a Scriptural doctrine. The enemies of Spener made *his Chiliastic views* one of their points of attack, and Pietism (comp. Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, Neander, Mosheim, etc.) was always, more or less, allied with Millenarianism. Some, attracted by his name, attempt to make out a very mild form of Chiliasm, but Dr. Kling, Art. *Eschatology* in Herzog's *Encyclop.*, pronounces Spener *a most decided Chiliast*, inclined even to the fanatical. (?) Prof. Stuart, and many others of our opponents, concede him to us. Dr. Brown of Gettysburg, in an Art. published in the *Luth. Observer*, even attempted to take John Bunyan from us, but the *Confession of Faith* (with which compare him on the "First Chapters of Genesis") quoted under Obs. 4, is a complete and overwhelming answer. As to Bish. Butler, it is sufficient to refer to his *Analogy*, Part 2, ch. 7, and to his *Memoirs*, p. 298 (quoted by Taylor, and others), where occur sentiments *only* in accordance with pure Chiliasm. In reference to Rev. Hall, the celebrated Baptist, it is evident that in his early life he was opposed to Chiliasm, as is seen in the production "Chris. Consistent with Love of Freedom," where occurs the phrase "the long-exploded tradition of Papias respecting the personal reign," but in the closing years of his life he materially modified his views, coming nearer to Bunyan's *Confession*. For (Duffield *On Proph.*, p. 259) Mr. Thorp, of Bristol, England, conversed with him on the subject a few days before his decease, and he "regretted that he had not preached the Millenarian views he entertained." (May not others be found in this category; for the writer personally knows men who *privately* entertain Chiliasm, but *never* present it publicly).[1]

[1] Tyerman unhesitatingly classes among Millenarians, Charles Wesley (as various hymns evidence), Fletcher (as a letter to John Wesley positively asserts, written A.D. 1755, Fletcher's *Works*, vol. 16), Piers, and others. John and Charles Wesley's testimony is the more disinterested and valuable, since on the one hand they had to resist the indifference of others, and on the other, the fanaticism of Bell and others, who (so Tyerman) predicted the speedy end of the world. Rev. Dr. Nast (himself a leading Methodist) says (Art. "Christ's Mill. reign," in the *West. Ch. Advocate*, July 23d, 1879), after referring to the able Pre-Mill. advocates in the various denominations: "I admit that the Methodist Church is not so largely represented, and that *at present* Pre-Mill. views are unpopular among us, *but it was not always so*. Both John and Charles Wesley, Dr. Coke, as well as Fletcher and Whitefield, occupied Pre-Mill. ground, and also, as I am credibly informed, in our day, the late revered Secretary of our Miss. Soc., Dr. J. P. Durbin." Now *in contrast* we present the following: Prof. Worman, in his extended Art. "Methodism" (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*), says: "The Sermons of Jno. Wesley, and his Notes on the New Test., are recognized by his followers in Great Britain and America as *the standard* of Methodism, and as *the basis* of their theological creed." If so, *then* there has been *a wide departure* on Eschatology. To indicate the same by way of illustration, we copy this notice, without comment, from the *Luth. Observer*, March 1st, 1878: "The Rev. Arthur P. Adams, Beverly, Mass., so *Zion's Herald* states, has been suspended from the Methodist ministry for holding and teaching doctrines *at variance* with those of the

Methodist Episcopal Church. He held that Christ's Sec. Coming is *near* at hand, and that *not until after* the resurrection occurs can the redemption scheme of Christ be complete" (i.e. in results). It is proper to add, as Tyerman remarks, that Wesley was guarded, so as not to give place to extravagances; as e.g. on fixing the date of the Advent, Wesley (*Meth. Mag.*, 1827, p. 392) says: "I have no opinion at all upon when the Mill. reign of Christ will begin; I can determine nothing at all about it; these calculations are far above, out of my sight." Tyerman then repeats: "Still, Wesley *was a believer* in the certainty of such a reign, and so was Fletcher, as we have already seen, and so was Wesley's friend, the Vicar of Bexley, Mr. Piers, and so seem to have been the writers of some of the hymns in the Meth. Hymn Book" (quoting several hymns with Pre-Mill. sentiments). Charles Wesley's Pre-Mill. hymns are quoted in detail in *Proph. Times*, 1866, p. 111, etc., Taylor's *Voice of the Church, Time of the End*, etc., and they are so decided in sentiment that it is a matter of surprise that any one should fail to appreciate them.

[3] Others, who entertained distinctive Chiliastic features and located the predicted Kingdom of Dan. 2 and 7 after the Second Advent, might be mentioned, as Archb. Cranmer (see the *Catechism* authorized by Edward VI., and written by him, on the phrase "Thy Kingdom come"), Archb. Newcome (see Bickersteth's *Diss. on Proph.*, p. 106), Dr. Benson (see *Notes on* Ps. 76 : 10-13, and 98 : 4-9), Rudd (see *Time of the End*, p. 325), Toplady (see *Sermons*, Lib. 3, p. 470), etc. (Comp. Taylor's *Voice of the Church* and Seiss's Ap. to the *Last Times*, from whom a large number might be added.)

Obs. 9. It would be interesting to trace the rise of Millenarianism in this country. That it was *early* incorporated into the belief of *many* of the first preachers of this country is evident from the testimony of Cotton Mather, who himself *heartily* indorsed it. Thus e.g. in the *Magnalia* he testifies of Rev. John Davenport (died in Boston 1668), that he apprehended "the true notion of the Chiliad," and "preached and wrote" about the "coming of the Lord, the calling of the Jews, and the first and second resurrection of the dead, which do now of late years *get more ground* against the opposition of the otherwise minded, and find *a kinder entertainment* among them that 'search the Scriptures;' and that" he asserted "a personal, visible, powerful, and glorious coming of the Lord Jesus Christ unto judgment, long before the end of the world." He calls Rev. Thomas Walley (died 1679), "our pious Chiliast, Walley," who was like Mede, Davenport, Hook, and who understood "the First Resurrection to be corporeal," just as "some of the first and eminent teachers in the church believed." Reference is made to Rev. John Eliot (died 1690), as constantly pressing "the Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ;" the same intimations are given respecting Whiting, Samuel Mather, Increase Mather (Pres. Harvard College), himself, and others.

We append additional testimony. In the Preface to *The Magnalia*, Mather says: "The *first and famous* pastors in the New England churches did, in their public ministry, frequently insist on the doctrine of Christ's glorious Kingdom on earth which will take place after the conversion of the Jews, and when the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in. It is a pity that this doctrine is no more inculcated by the present ministry, which has induced me the rather to preach and now by the press to publish, what is emitted herewith." And now that this must be understood in *a purely Chiliastic* sense, is evident from both what Cotton Mather and his father, Increase Mather, have taught on the subject. Thus e.g. Increase Mather, in his *Discourse on Faith* (A.D. 1710), and *The Mystery of Israel's Salvation*, teaches: "He (Christ) will *then* (*at Coming*) remove His throne from heaven to this visible world. *Then will His visible Kingdom* appear in the greatest glory; when also there will be *a personal reign and residence* of Christ in this lower world." "When they that corrupt the earth are destroyed, a new earth will succeed, in which shall dwell righteousness. *Then* will the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdoms of Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever," etc. But Cotton Mather is more plain: "It is well known, that in the earliest of the primitive times the faithful did, in a literal sense, believe the 'second coming' of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the

rising and the reigning of the saints with Him, a thousand years *before*, the rest of the dead live again,' a doctrine which, however, some of later years have counted heretical; yet in the days of Irenæus, *were questioned by none but such as were counted heretics.* It is evident from Justin Martyr that the doctrine of the Chiliad was in his days embraced *among all orthodox* Christians; nor did this Kingdom of our Lord begin to be doubted *until* the Kingdom of Antichrist began to advance into a considerable figure, and *then* it fell chiefly under the reproaches *of such men* as were fain to deny the divine authority of the Book of Revelation, and of the Second Epistle of Peter. He is *a stranger* to antiquity who does not find and own the ancients generally of the persuasion. Nevertheless, at last men came, not only to lay aside the modesty expressed by one of the first Anti-Millenarians, namely, Jerome, but also with violence to persecute the Millenary truth as an heretical pravity. So the mystery of our Lord's 'appearing in His Kingdom' *lay buried* in Popish darkness, till the light thereof had a fresh dawn. Since the Antichrist entered into the last half-time of the period allotted for him, and now within the last sevens of years, as things grow nearer to accomplishment, *learned and pious men, in great numbers*, everywhere come to receive, explain, and maintain, *the old faith* about it." In the *Student and Preacher*, Mather is equally decisive: "The Son of God, about to descend, will inflict vengeance on them who know not God and obey not His Gospel; but He will manifest *His Kingdom of the saints in the earth*, which is to be possessed by our second and heavenly Adam; and this, we confess, is ascertained to us by promise, but in another state, as being *after* the resurrection." "They indulge themselves in *a vain* dream, not to say *insane*, who think, pray, and hope, *contrary to the whole sacred Scripture and sound reason*, that the promised happiness of the Church on earth *will be before* the Lord Jesus shall appear in His Kingdom." "*Without doubt* the kingdom of this world will not become the Kingdom of God and His Christ, *before* the preordained time of the dead, in which the reward shall be given to the servants of God and to those that fear His name." "The *rest* of the saints, and the promised *Sabbath*, and *the Kingdom* of God, in which His will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven, and those great things of which God hath spoken by the mouths of His prophets, all prophesying as with one voice; all shall be confirmed by their fulfilment in the new earth, not in our defiled and accursed earth." Rev. Joshua Spalding (*Lectures*, pp. 221-2, etc.) speaks of "*many Christians*, who were looking, *not* for the modern Millennium, *but* for the Sec. Coming of Christ," etc., and adds: "I have had the testimony of elderly Christian people, in several parts of New England, that within their remembrance this doctrine was first advanced in the places where they lived, and have heard them name the ministers who first preached it in their churches. No doctrine can be more *indisputably proved* to have been the doctrine of the Primitive Church than those we call Millenarian; and, *beyond all dispute*, the same were *favorite* doctrines with the fathers of New England; with the words of one of whom, writing upon this subject, we shall conclude our observations upon their antiquity: 'They are *not new, but old;* they may be new to some men, but I cannot say *it is to their honor.*'" In another place (p. 191) he says: "The doctrine of the Millennium *is truth;* and the *prevailing* expectation, that it is fast approaching, and is now very near, is doubtless rational," etc. The same is true doctrinally of Thomas Prince (A.D. 1728 to 1758), pastor at Boston (so Spaulding's Lectures), of Dr. B. Gale (see Barber's *His. Collections of Connecticut*, p. 531, who also says: "This (Millenarianism) appears to have been the belief of pious persons at the time of the first settlement of New England," etc.).

The same early Chiliasm is traceable in other denominations. Thus e.g. in the early Lutheran and Reformed Churches quite a number of ministers entertained it. The writer was informed by his grandparents and parents that they conversed with such and heard them occasionally present Millenarianism. The brief biographical sketches remaining give us no idea of the form in which they held it, but a clue is obtained by the fact that the works of Bengel, Stilling, and others like them, were favorites and largely circulated. Books of German and English Chiliasts were held in esteem, and the writer has often been surprised to find among old people a detailed and correct knowledge of the doctrine, and on inquiry the reception of the same was generally attributed to the instruction of some old pastor or the reading of such works. In conversation with others, they recalled similar reminiscences.

Obs. 10. The progress of Chiliastic doctrine in this country, while immensely in the minority, has been highly respectable, as admitted even by our opponents. It embraces many of the ablest, most devoted and scholarly men that the church has produced.

The *Luth. Observer* (always, more or less, an opponent), in a notice (Oct. 25th, 1878) of a Pre-Mill. pamphlet, "Jesus is Coming," by W. E. B., says that our doctrine "has had eminent supporters in the Church. Such men as Sir I. Newton, Dr. Chalmers, Dean Alford, and Dr. Breckenridge have been among its advocates. And among the signatures to a call for a series of public meetings to be held in New York, in the month of October, are the names of *learned and pious men representing all the denominations of Protestantism.*" Prof. Briggs, and a few others, evidently angry at the increase of Chiliasm in the Presbyterian Church, suggested discipline on the charge of "heresy," to which Rev. Dr. Mutchmore (quoted *Messiah's Herald*, Jan. 15th, 1879), of the same Church, replies: "It is best to allow our pastors to use their own judgment in preaching on the matter. What are we to do? Some *of our most eminent men* are Pre-Millenarians, and we have no article which is against the idea of Christ's personal reign on earth. It is all a question of interpretation, on which our highest bodies have never made any deliverance, and, in my opinion, they never should." Rev. Dr. Mackay, in his address at the Milday Conference (1879), speaking in reference to Chiliastic advocates as observed in his recent visit to the U. S. and Canada, said: "I thank God that *in every city* that I visited, in New York, Chicago, and elsewhere, *the most spiritual men* are rousing up to inquire and look into these things." Many such declarations might be given, but the reader can soon satisfy himself by glancing over the names following. We append a list—imperfect at best—of American and Canadian Chiliasts, according to their Church relationship as far as known.

Prot. Episcopal Church: Dr. S. H. Tyng, sen., Dr. Tyng, jr., Dr. R. Newton, H. Dana Ward, Rev. J. S. Alwell, Rev. E. T. Perkins, Rev. Th. W. Haskins, Rev. Rob. C. Booth, Rev. L. W. Bancroft, Felix R. Brunot, Dr. Julius E. Grammer, Bh. T. H. Vail, Rev. T. W. Hastings, Bh. W. W. Niles, Canon Baldwin, Canon W. Bond, Bh. Southgate, Dr. F. Vinton, Rev. Morell, Bh. McIlvaine, Bh. Henshaw, Rev. E. Winthrop, Rev. Morgan, Rev. Johnson, Rev. Farrer, Rev. Dobbs, Rev. Smith, Rev. Trenwith, Rev. Newton (Gambier), Bh. Bedell, Bh. Hopkins, Bh. Williams, Bh. Huntingdon, Bh. Odenheimer, D. N. Lord.

Reformed Episcopal: Bh. W. R. Nicholson, Rev. G. A. Reddles, Rev. W. V. Feltwell, Rev. B. B. Leacock, Rev. M. B. Smith.

Presbyterian: Dr. C. K. Imbrie, Dr. S. H. Kellogg, Dr. E. R. Craven, Dr. J. H. Brookes, Rev. W. J. Gillespie, Rev. H. M. Parsons, Dr. N. West, Rev. W. J. Erdman, William Reynolds, John Wannamaker, Rev. F. W. Flint, Rev. E. P. Adams, Rev. J. S. Stewart, Rev. D. E. Bierce, Rev. C. C. Foote, Rev. L. C. Baker, Rev. W. B. Lee, Rev. E. R. Davis, Dr. S. R. Wilson, B. Dubois Wyckoff, Rev. B. F. Sample, Rev. H. M. Bacon, Rev. D. Mack, Rev. E. P. Marvin, Dr. R. Patterson, Rev. R. C. Mathews, Rev. A. Erdman, Rev. J. R. Berry, Prof. J. T. Duffield, Saml. Ashhurst, Rev. Prof. R. D. Morris, Rev. D. R. Eddy, Rev. Wm. P. Paxon, Dr. Willis Lord, Dr. J. G. Reaser, Dr. Marshall, Dr. Felix Johnson, Dr. Kalb, Dr. F. E. Brown, Dr. Stanton, Dr. McCartee, Dr. Geo. Duffield, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, Dr. Krebs, Dr. J. Lillie, Rev. R. C. Shimeall, Dr. Poor, Dr. Van Doren, Rev. Blauvelt, Rev. Dinwiddie, Rev. Laird, Matthews, Marquis, Congdon, Rev. Adair, Rev. Prof. McGill, Rev. J. C. Randolph, Rev. W. Hogarth.

United Presbyterian: Dr. J. T. Cooper, Dr. W. Y. Moorehead, Rev. J. P. Sankey, Rev. W. J. Gillespie, Rev. R. W. French, Rev. S. B. Reed, Rev. R. A. McAycal, Rev. D. A. Wallace, Rev. J. G. Galloway, Rev. J. S. McCulloch, Rev. W. W. Barr, Rev. G. Hayser.

Baptists: Dr. A. J. Gordon, Rev. J. D. Herr, Rev. J. Hyatt Smith, Dr. J. W. Bancroft, Rev. H. M. Saunders, Rev. J. P. Farrer, Rev. Alf. Harris, Rev. Jos. Evans, Rev. J. M. Stiffler, Rev. G. M. Peters, Rev. F. E. Tower, Dr. J. E. Jones, Rev. J. T. Beckley, Rev. J. J. Miller, Ed. S. White, B. F. Jacobs, Rev. C. Perrin, Rev. F. L. Chappell, Rev. Rob. Cameron, Rev. H. F. Titus, Rev. H. A. Cordo, Rev. G. M. Stone, Dr. S. H. Ford, Rev. A. J. Frost, Rev. J. C. Wilmarth, Prof. Dr. Weston, Rev. Barralle, Rev. Brown, Rev. Colgrove, Rev. Wm. Knapp, Rev. H. Knapp, Rev. J. C. Waller, Rev. Taylor.

Congregationalist: Dr. E. P. Goodwin, Rev. W. W. Clarke, Dr. H. D. Kitchell, Dr. J. Wild, Rev. W. R. Joyslin, Rev. G. C. Miln, Rev. E. C. Hood, Rev. W. W. Syle, Rev. Myron Adams, Rev. G. R. Milton, Abner Kingman, Rev. Burton, Rev. Francis Russell, C. M. Whittlesey, Rev. Lorimer, Rev. Morton, Rev. Bancroft, Rev. Andrews, Rev. Cunningham.

Reformed Church: Dr. Rufus W. Clarke, Rev. C. Parker, Rev. J. B. Thompson, Rev. W. H. Clarke, Dr. W. R. Gordon, Dr. J. T. Demarest, Dr. G. S. Bishop, Rev. R. F. Clarke, Rev. Merritt, Rev. Ballagh, Rev. Brown, Rev. Dr. Forsyth, Dr. S. H. Giesy.

Methodists: Prof. H. Lummis, Rev. Jno. Parker, Dr. H. Foster, Rev. Jesse M. Gilbert, Geo. Hall, T. W. Harney, Rev. W. E. Blackstone, W. E. Grim, Dr. Geo. W. Brown, Geo. A. Hall, Dr. Marshall, Excell, Dr. J. P. Durbin, Rev. Dr. Nast.

Lutheran: Dr. J. A. Seiss, Rev. Laird, Rev. Dr. Oswald, Rev. A. R. Brown, Dr. J. G. Schmucker (and Drs. Helmuth, Lachman, and D. Kurtz, who recommended his Chiliastic work).

Moravian: Rev. E. Reineke, J. G. Zipple.

Chiliastic writers belonging to various bodies, such as *Second Adventists*, or branches: Hastings, Taylor, Andrews, Crozier, Bliss, Himes, Litch, Hale, Thomas, Wilson, Campbell, Reed, Coghill, Lyon, Chown, Cook, Woodruff, Catlin, Allen, Ramsey, Fancher, Parry, Chase, Coombe, Niles, Jacobs, Seymour, Champlin, Lumbard, Carpenter, Batchelor, Wellcome, Grant, Smith, Burnham, Libby, Brewer, Pratt, Shepherd, Flagg, Sutherland, White, Couch, Higgins, Burbank, Piper, Simpson, Cole, Hancock, Bellows, Austin, York, Teeple, Morgan, Preble, Chittenden, Cotton, Moore, Pearson, Miller, C. Palmer, E. K. Barnhill, S. A. Chaplin, etc.

Among other organizations are writers of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," "Plymouth Brethren," "Christadelphians" (Dr. J. Thomas and followers), and others.

Miscellaneous. Names that have fallen under observation as Chiliasts, but whose exact Church relationship is unknown to the writer, such as Storrs, Beegle, Wendell, Ramsey, Woodworth, Bh. Ives, Dr. Broadhead, Dr. McCarty, Lindsey, Forsyth, Rev. Geo. C. Lorimer, R. C. Matlack, Geo. R. Cramer, Rev. L. Osler, J. M. Orrick, L. B. Rogers, Geo. W. Tew, Rev. C. M. Morton, Rich. Aorton, Rev. Almond Barrelle, Prof. T. W. Bancroft (Brown Univ.), Wm. Reynolds, Rev. C. Cunningham, S. J. Andrews, Rev. F. W. Dobbs, Dr. A. W. Pilzer, J. M. Haldeman, D. C. H. Marquis, Rev. Dr. Watson, Rev. Dr. Miller, Dr. J. R. Davenport, Dr. W. Lloyd, Rev. A. J. Patton, Rev. J. P. Newman, Dr. R. Jeffrey, M. Baldwin, Rev. Dr. Simpson (Louisville), Rev. Dr. Shaw (Rochester), Rev. Graves, Rev. Brookman, Dr. Williamson, Dr. Robinson, Geo. Reynolds (the last four in Canada), Rev. R. Campbell, Rev. W. Cadman, Thomas (of Canada), Rev. J. M. Weaver, Walter, John H. Graff, Rev. B. Philpot, Rev. S. Bonhomme, J. Harper, Anna Siliman, Dr. J. W. Hatherell, Darby, Thomas, Harkness, Bryant, Davis, Holgate, James Inglis, Dr. J. J. Janeway, Rob. Kirkwood, Rev. W. Newton, J. P. Labagh, Seth Lewis, Granville Penn, Dr. Wm. Ramsey, Hollis Read, Hugh White, Rev. John G. Wilson (Ed. *Proph. Times*), Jno. F. Graff ("Greybeard"), Woodbury Davis, D. M. Lord, Dr. Ramsey, Dr. Halsey, Dr. Harkness, A. D. Jones, B. S. Dwiggens, C. T. Russell, N. H. Barbour, J. M. Stevenson, J. P. Wheethee, Wiley Jones, J. H. Patton, W. J. Mann, B. Wilson, J. A. Simonds, B. W. Keith, G. M. Myers, A. B. Magruder, H. V. Reed, L. A. Allen, W. Laing, E. Hoyt, J. Pierce, T. Wilson.

Obs. 11. The advocates of Chiliasm in England, Germany, France, and other European countries form a band that contains names highly honored by the church, both as to attainments and usefulness in the service of Jesus.

We present the following without reference to their Church relationship.

England, Scotland, and Ireland: Dr. A. R. Fausset, Dr. W. P. Mackay, Bh. Newton, Sir I. Newton, Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Candlish, Horne, Bh. Trench, Bh. Ellicott, Twisse, Marshall, Elliott, Maitland, Birks, the Drs. Bonars, Bickersteth, Auriol, Fremantle, Ryle, Palmer, Ash, Noel, Canon Hoare, Rainsford, Wood, E. Garbett, Bridge, Burroughs, Kelly, Cox, Caryll, Goodwin, Gouge, Wilson, Brock, Smith, Trotter, Langley, Sterry, Selden, Ainsworth, Gataker, Fealty, Greenhill, Stevenson, Shepherd, Dean Alford, Brooks, Pym, Dalton, Greswell, Burgh, Todd, Irving, Hewitson, Dr. M'Caul, Anderson, Begg, McCheyne, Burns, Gilfillan, Hamilton, Cumming, Adolph Saphir, Frazer, Jamieson, Cochrane, Cunningham, Sabine, Hugh Miller, the Duke of Manchester, Lord, Jones, Habershon, Alexander, Tycho Brahe, Lord Napier, Leut.-Gen. Goodwyn, Haldane, Stewart, Rob. Montgomery, Preb. Auriol, Rev. M. Rainsford, Dean Fremantle, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Bell, Pruden, Baxter, Lord Radstock, Earl Russell, Rev. C. Skrine, Rev. E. Nangle, Rev. R. Chester, Capt. J. E. Dutton, Th. W. Greenwell, Rev. S. V. Edwards, J. Denham Smith, Capt. Moreton, Dr. C. B. Egan, Bh. Wordsworth, Rev. Gordon Calthrop, Rev. J. Gosset-Tanner, Rev. C. H. Hamilton, Rev. Grattan Guinness, Rev. S. Gravatt, Mr. Soltau, F. G. Bellett, Mr. Hyslop, Mr. Jenour, Dr. A. Saphir, Rev. E. Wilkes, Rev. C. H. Hamilton, Lord Carlizle, T. R. Andrews, Col. Sandwith, Preb. Cadman, Col. Rowlandson, Rev. E. H. Brooke, Rev. T. Flavel Cook, Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe, Preb. Dalton, Rev. C. J. Goodheart, Rev. J. Wilkinson, Rev. H. E. Fox, Rev. F. A. C. Lillington, Canon Garbett, Rev. Rev. Frank White, E. J. Hytche, Rev. G. A. Sparks, R. J. Mahoney, Cheyne Brady, Bh. Horsley, Tillotson (a Westm. divine), Mede, Burnet,

F. E. Hastings, Chas. Maude, Rev. W. Frith, Durant, Farmer, the Bishop of Cashel, the Bishop of Ripon, Admiral Vernon Harcourt, Hon. A. Kinnaird, Capt. John Trotter, Rev. Capel Moleneux, Rev. James Cochrane, Rev. Walter Wood, Geo. Ogilvie, Hon. S. R. Maxwell, Rev. James Kelly, Rev. Dr. Wilson, Rev. W. Brock, Rev. W. Trotter, Rev. B. Wills Newton, Rev. Dr. Stevenson, Rev. W. Niven, Wattson, Waples, Roach, Pirie, Mansford, Mandeville, McCausland, Gregory, Bellamy, Rev. S. E. Pierce, Keach, Tait, Sirr, Wells, Coke, the Wesleys, Fletcher, Piers, Skeen, Brightman, Frere, Pitcairn, Carleton, Waple, Archer, Dallas, Brightman, Woodhouse, Wickes, Bayford, Villiers, J. Biencho, Beverly, Grimshawe, Woodroofe, Barker, Marsh, Dibdin, Fisk, Fremantle, Wilson, Reichart, Harrison, Holland, Wigram, Nolan, Burgh, Bh. Clayton, Cooper, Drummond, Eyre, Farmer, Ed. King, A. Jukes, Flemming, jr., W. Vint, Keith, R. Hort, Dr. J. Knight, P. Lancaster, Flemming, Ferer, Th. Loader, Frey, Gregg, Girdlestone, Habershon, Hallet, Maitland, Hartly, the Duke of Manchester, Manford, Hawtrey, Homes, Dr. W. Marsh, Rob. Maton, J. Hooper, Rev. Hugh McNeile, Hon. and Rev. G. T. Noel, Dr. F. Nolan, J. Hussey, W. Perry, Rev. A. Pirie, Rev. A. R. Purdon, J. Purnes, Forster, Nath. Ranew, R. Roach, B. W. Saville, James Scott, Dr. Sayer Rudd, F. Sergent, Wm. Sherman, Peter Sterry, J. G. Zipple, H. W. Woodward, J. H. Stewart, Tillinghast, Th. L. Strange, Wm. Thorpe, Wm. Whiston, Jos. Tyso, Jos. Tyson, El. Winchester, Jer. White, Leut.-G. H. Wood, Walter Wood, Wm. Witherby, H. W. Woodward, T. Whowell, Benson, Ambrose, Rev. Ch. Brown, Spurgeon, Burnet, Burk, Pope, Sherwood, Dr. G. Sharpe, Dr. S. Charnock, Wm. Cowper, Spalding, R. Clarke, Wm. Clayton, Bh. Cranmer, Charlotte Elizabeth, Gilfillan, J. Glass, Dr. R. Hurd, Wm. Wogan, Dr. I. Watts, Bh. Heber, Gen. J. Harlan, Rev. S. Johnson, Jno. Keble, Jno. Milton, A. M. Toplady, M. F. Tupper, Dr. Jno. Thompson, J. L. Towers, Rev. L. Way, Cressener, Jno. Fox, Dr. Margolionth, Denham, Niven, Nangle, Harker, Dr. Wilson, Dr. Stephenson, French, Dr. Leask, Gillson, Berks, J. Verner, Foskett, Scott, Phillips, Dr. T. J. Bell, W. S. Ross, Purdon, Harris, Code, Rob. Howard, Hon. W. Wellesley, Rob. Baxter, Henry Drummond, Dr. Rob. Anderson, Rev. Wm. Maude, Rev. N. Starkey, M. Redman, Esq., Rev. S. Garrett, E. Phair, Rev. J. Sabine Knight, Rev. J. Cochrane, Hon. S. R. Maxwell, Reads, Wood, Moleneux, H. Smith, J. Kelly, Brack, W. Trotter, Wills Newton, Niven, H. Shepheard, Dr. J. Wilson, Dr. Stevenson, Geo. Ogilvie, B. Wills Newton, Rev. T. J. Malyon, Rev. E. J. Hytche, H. Weymott, Rev. G. H. Pember, Rev. N. S. Godfrey.

Germany: Bengel, Jung Stilling, P. J. Spener, M. F. Roos, P. M. Hahn, J. M. Hahn, Peterson, Rothe, Auberlen, Martensen, Dorner, Christlieb, Luthardt, Delitzsch, Lange, Olshausen, Ebrard, Meyer, Baumgarten, T. C. K. Von Hofmann, Lechler, Riggenbach, Floerke, Schlegel, Krummacher, Steir, Kurtz, Christiani, Rinck, Pfleiderer, Koch, Schmid, Steffan, Düsterdieck, F. Semler, Typke, Gerken, Opitz, Leutwein, Rühle, von Lilienstern, Sander, Oetinger, Lavater, Crusius, Cocceius, Breithaupt, Piscator, Passavant, Lisco, Kohler, C. F. P. Leutwein, Dr. V. U. Maywahlen, Huss, Clöter, Michael, Hebart, Schneider, Gotlob Schultze, Jno. Dav. Schaeffer, Daubuz, Koppe, Fr. Bauer, Freiderick Kletwick, Dr. J. Lange, Jno. G. Schoner, Dr. F. V. Reinhard, C. R. Reichel, Osiander, J. Nissen, Kling, Thomasius, H. Wilh. J. Thiersch, Alb. Köppen.

France and Switzerland: Prof. Godet of Lausanne, Gaussen, Dr. J. Abbadie, Père Amelote, E. Guers, P. Jurieu, Lambert, Pierre Poiret, Lavater.

Holland: Van Oosterzee, Da Costa, Capadose.

Miscellaneous: F. W. Stuckert, Rev. D. G. Mallery, Rev. Paul, Roorda, Hebert, Gneis, Madam De Gasparin, Rev. R. Hamilton (Melbourne, Australia), Comenius, Jurien, Seranius, Altingius, Alsted, Riemann, Worthington, Seitz, Dreissenius, Jarchi, Kimchi, Abrabanel, Alabaster, Durant, Chas. Jerram, Mejanel, Coleman, Ben Ezra, Crool, S. A. Blackwood, J. G. Bellett, H. W. Soltau, Wm. Lincoln. H. Snell, Bh. Spangenberg (Moravian), H. Meynott, Esq. (Australia).

Obs. 12. The number of able commentators favoring, indorsing, and teaching Chiliastic doctrine is not only creditable, but extremely satisfactory to the faithful believer, showing that men who specially devote themselves to the study and explanation of the Scriptures find Millenarianism clearly taught therein.

We instance the following: Bengel's *Gnomon of the N. T.*, a work still in the highest esteem; Olshausen's *Com. on the New. Test.*, a work repeatedly republished; Gill's *Expos. of the Old and New Tests.*; Steir's *Words of the Lord Jesus*, still republished; Alford's *Greek Test. with Proleg. and Com.*, a standard work; Lange's *Com. of the Old and New*

Tests., especially the Amer. Edition, and particularly 1 and 2 Thess., Ed. by Dr. Lillie; Meyer's *Com. on New Test.*, recently republished; Cocceius' *Commentaries* in "*Opera Omnia*"—was charged by his enemies with Chiliasm, Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 213; *Die Berlenburger Bibel*, 1726, 4 vols. large fol.; Richter's *Erklärte Haus Bibel*; Starke's *Synopsis of the New Test.*; Piscator's *Com. on Old and New Test.*; Coke's *Com. on Old and New Test.*; Jamieson, Brown, and Fausset's *Com. on the Old and New Tests.*, a recent one, and Pre-Mill. in the parts edited by Fausset; Judge Jones's *Notes on Scripture* (in the republication this title was changed); Dr. Nast's *Com. on New Test.*, only a part published.

Commentaries and Expositions on detached portions of the Scriptures. Greswell (*Parables*), Keach (*Parables*), Bonar (*Lev. and Psalms*), Tait (*Hebrews*), Ryle (*Exp. Thoughts, Gospels*), Seiss (*Lev. and Hebrews*), Cumming (*Parables, Rev., etc.*), Lillie (*Thess.*), Schmucker (*Rev.*), Daubuz (*Rev.*), Koppe (*Thess.*), Fry (*Rom. and Psalms*), Sirr (*Notes on Luke*), C. H. M. (*Notes on Gen.*, etc.), Wells (*Dan. and Rev.*), Demarest (*Peter*), Delitzsch (*Gen.*), Sir I. Newton (*Dan. and Rev.*), Ebrard (*Rev.*), Skeen (*Rev.*), Haldane (*Rom.*), Mede (*Apoc. and Peter*), Brightman (*Dan. and Rev.*), Bengel (*Apoc.*), Goodwin (*Rev.*), I. Lange (*Apoc.*), Auberlen (*Dan. and Rev.*), Elliott (*Apoc.*), Lord (*Apoc.*), Buck (*Matth.* 24,) Frere (*Dan., Esd., and Rev.*), Pitcairn (*Ps.* 2,) Carleton (*Matt.* 24), Waple (*Apoc.*), Woodhouse (*Apoc.*), Wickes (*Apoc.*), Bliss (*Apoc.*), Roos (*Dan. and Rev.*), Sander (*Rev.*), Kohler (*Hag.*), Birks (*Dan.*), Cressener (*Apoc.*), Hooper (*Apoc.*), Knight (*Peter*), W. Newton (*Dan.*), Pewn (*Ezek.*), Thompson (*Matt.* 25), Tyso (*Ezek.* etc.), Gaussen (*Dan.*), Cunninghame (*Apoc.*), Darby (*Dan.*), Holmes (*Apoc. and Dan.*), Tregelles (*Dan.*), Brown (*Apoc.*), Irving (*Apoc.*), Ward (*Rev.*), Wickes, (*Rev.*), Mandeville (*Heb.*), Waples (*Apoc.*), and others. Commentaries and Expositions that present some of the Chiliastic features. Clarke's *Com. on the Old and New Test.*; Jarchi's *Com. Hebraicus*; Kimchi's *Com. on Prophets*; Abrabanel's *Com. on Prophets*; Stuart's *Com. Apoc.* (gives the doctrine of a literal first resurrection); Altingius' *Com. Jeremiah*; Piscator's *Com. on Old and New Tests.*; Caryll's *Exp. on Job*; Gouge's *Com. Hebrews*; Passavant's *Phil. and Eph.*; Lisco's *New Test.*; Deprez *On Daniel*; and others.

We append a few statements respecting Pre-Mill. commentators. Alford (*N. T.*, vol. 2, p. 350), speaking of the Apocalyptic interpreters since the French Revolution, says: "The majority, *both in number, learning, and research*, adopt the Pre-Millennial Advent, following the plain and undeniable sense of the sacred text." Dr. Ed. Beecher in *The Independent* (Aug. 24th, 1871), laments over the "*increase*" of Millenarian "*power*" as exhibited *in recent* commentators, saying: "This is true of Alford, Ellicott, Lange, and his co-laborers, especially Drs. Lillie, Auberlen, and Riggenbach. To these we must add the writings of English and American Millenarians, the older and the more recent. And there is at present *no adequate* counterpoise *to the weight of authority* of the commentators whom we have mentioned." This feature, thus frankly acknowledged by an opponent, is a source of gratification to us, and of thankfulness to God in raising up such advocates.

Obs. 13. Numerous writers, who, in their occasional works, give expression to Chiliastic belief, without entering largely in details.

Such as e.g. Milton, the various Pre-Mill. Commentators, Chalmers, Charnock, Wogan, Dorner, Mather, Nissen, Spurgeon, Talmage (somewhat contradictory), Gilfillan, Moody, Burroughs, Clayton, Coleman, Fox, and many others.

Obs. 14. Authors, who prominently set forth one or more essential features of our system, either in elucidation or defence of the same.

Such e.g. Woodward, *Essays on Mill.*: Thorp, *Destinies of the Brit. Emp.*; Crool, *Rest of Israel*; Frey, *Judah and Israel*; Winthrop, *Premium Essay on Symbols*; Abdiel, *Essays*; Begg, *Argument for the Coming of the Lord*; Nathan Lord, *The Millennium*; W. Newton, *Lec. on the first two visions of Dan.*; and the writings of White, Thompson, Burgh, Tyso, Strange, Stewart, Beverly, Eyre, Flemming, Sirr, Labaugh, and many others.

Obs. 15. Writers who give a very fair exhibit of the system of doctrine, showing the relationship that one part sustains to the other, are also quite numerous.

Thus e.g. Seiss' *Last Times;* Brooke's *Maranatha ;* Demarest and Gordon's *Christocracy ;* Bickersteth's *Practical Guide ;* Brooks' *El. of Proph. Interpretation;* D. N. Lord's *Coming and Reign of Christ ;* Dr. McCaul's *Old Paths,* etc. ; McNeile's *Sermons on the Sec. Advent. ;* Noel's *Prospects of the Church of Christ;* Duffield's *Diss. on the Prophecies ;* and the writings of the Bonars, Pym, Shimeall, Molyneux, Lord, Birks, Bryant, Ramsey, and many others.

Obs. 16. The controversial writers who have directly written in defence of Millenarianism against the attacks of opponents are worthy of notice.

Works specially designed to defend Chiliasm against objections are numerous. The following may be designated : Duffield's *Mill. Defended,* and *Reply to Stuart;* Shimeall's *Reply to Shedd ; The Theol. and Lit. Journal,* Ed. by D. N. Lord, contains a large number of such articles ; Dr. Craven's Reply to Prof. Briggs (*N. Y. Evangelist,* 1879) ; Dr. Moorehead's series of arts. in reply to Dr. Macgill (Chicago *Instructor,* 1879) ; Randolph's series of arts. (Danville *Tribune,* 1879) ; *The Prophetic Times* in its entire old and new series ; Lillie's *Notes on the Mill. Controversy* (in his " Perpetuity of the Earth") ; Anderson's *Apology for the Mill. Doc. : Christocracy,* by Drs. Demarest and Gordon ; Bayford's *Reply to Jones ;* Tyson's *Defence of the Personal Reign ;* Drummond's *Defence of the Students of Prophecy ; The Literalist* (5 vols.) contains some able articles ; Manford's *Apology;* Spence's *Defence of the Hope of Better Times ;* Sirr's *First Res. ;* Prudon's *Last Vials ;* Bryant's *Mill. Views ;* Pym's *Thoughts on Mill. ;* Maton's *Israel's Redemption Redeemed ;* Ogilvie's *Popular Objections ;* Cox's *Millenarian's Answer ;* and, in brief, the writings of Seiss, Brookes, Bonar, Bickersteth, Cunninghame, and many others (for nearly all Chiliastic works devote some space to the consideration of objections), besides the quarterlies, monthlies, and papers specially devoted to the advocacy of Pre-Mill. The work of Dr. Brown (*Sec. Coming*) was answered by Lord (*Lit. and Theol. Journal*), Bonar (*The Com. and Kingd. of the Lord Jesus Christ*), the Duke of Manchester (Ap. to *the Finished Mystery*), Wood (*Tract*), Scott, and others.

Obs. 17. Various writers in our religious papers, periodicals, simply either give their initials or conceal their identity by a *nom de plume,* while presenting articles of a Chiliastic tenor, are not to be overlooked in considering the number of advocates.

Hence it is difficult to form anything like a correct estimate of numbers. In my own denomination (Evang. Lutheran) quite a number of persons are only known to me by occasional articles signed in this way. This is true of many others. Rev. Ebaugh in his brief *His. of Mill.* in Rupp's *Orig. His.* of Relig. Denom's, says : " The number of Christians who hold substantially the foregoing views of the Millennium [Chiliastic], cannot be computed with any degree of certainty, but from the writings of distinguished divines, both in the European and American churches, we are warranted in estimating their number at many thousands already." We have also quite a number of Chiliastic works given anonymously, such e.g. *Time of the End, Spes Fidelium, or The Believer's Hope, Theopolis, The Sec. Com. of the Lord, Review of Scripture, Reign of Christ on Earth, Millennial Church, A Tenet of Millennium, Multum in Parvo ; or the Jubilee of Jubilees, The First Resurrection, Enoch, An Inquiry into the Sec. Coming, Das Tausendjährige Reich, Christ's Speedy Return in Glory, Abdiel's Essays, Second Advent,* and others.

Obs. 18. Writers who are utterly opposed to the prevailing Whitbyan theory, and declare the nearness of the Advent, the non-conversion of the world before the Advent ; the renewal of the earth, etc., are also to be considered, because on some salient points, *essentially connected* with our system, they manifest a decided leaning favorable to Chiliasm.

We instance e.g. Richard Baxter, Bh. Bale, Th. Watson, Th. Vincent, Jno. Durant, A. Grosse, Arch. Usher, Arch. Cranmer, Bh. Davenant, Bh. Ridley, Matthew Henry, Sayer Rudd, Geo. Benson, Jno. Howe, Bh. Latimer, Archd. Woodhouse, Romaine, Bh. Russell, Hammond, Alberus, Nicolai, Ringwald, Grotius, Prideaux, Bh. Taylor, Paul Gerhard, Lee, Quenstadt, Hutter, Jno. Knox, Hunninus, the Reformers (as quoted), Jos. Alleine, Aretius, Bradford, Toplady, Tholuck, Dr. Scott, Pareus, Archb. Newcome,

Knapp, Dr. E. Hitchcock, Dr. Hales, Bh. Davenant, Flacius, Chytræus, Sandys, Keith, Gale, Dodwell, King, and many others.

Obs. 19. The controversial works, essays, and articles against us fully indicate the extent in which our doctrine is held.

Works that are directly written against Chiliasm may also be noticed, both as indicative of the extent of Millenarianism, and that the student may compare them with our line of argument. The controversial works of importance on the other side are the following: Brown's *Second Coming;* Gipp's *On the First Res.;* Hall's *Reply to Homes;* Hamilton *On the Mill.;* Jefferson *On the Mill.;* an anon. work, *The Kingdom of Grace;* Morrison *Christ's Personal Reign;* Waldegrave's *Bamp. Lectures*, 1854, Williamson's *Letters to a Millenarian;* Stuart's *Strictures on Dr. Duffield;* Vint's *New Illustrations of Prophecy;* Bogue's *Dis. on Mill.;* Bush *On the Mill.;* Pro. Brigg's arts. in *N. Y. Evangelist*, 1879, and repub. in *Luth. Quarterly;* numerous arts. in the reviews, quarterlies, relig. weeklies, etc., reiterate the statements of the above works; the brief statements found in works such as Barnes' *Notes on Rev.*, Shedd's *His. of Ch. Doc.*, Hodge's *Sys. Div.*, etc. In our argument we freely present these and other opposing works, give their objections (overlooking none), and meet them in detail. We really are desirous for the reader to know, Scripturally and historically, the arguments *on both sides, so that he may intelligently compare them*, and decide for himself. We feel assured that in a candid comparison, our doctrine will lose nothing by it. Hence we commend the preceding for perusal, as well as the following: Carson's *Personal Reign of Christ during the Millennium proved to be impossible;* Hopkins' and Boyd's *Second Adventism in the light of Jewish History;* Warren's *Parousia;* Merrill's *Sec. Coming of Christ;* Clemens' *Spiritual Reign*, and the writings of Berg, Hengstenberg, Davidson, and many others.

Obs. 20. The greatest and most decided opposition to Chiliasm is that which springs from the adoption of the Whitbyan theory—a view that is incorporated in systems of theology, sermons, etc., and is the prevailing one.

Prof. Briggs, in his series of articles (in the *N. Y. Evangelist*, 1878), states that he Dr. Hatfield, and others, hold "that the Millennium began in the past, and corresponds with the period of the church, or the Kingdom of God, on earth, in whole or in part." (See this view adverted to under Prop. 158.) This he pronounces "the church view," and the Editor of *the Evangelist* (Oct. 10th), flatly contradicts him, saying that "*the common doctrine* of the church" is the one that Whitby introduced, viz.: that the Mill. is still future and that it shall be ushered in by the preaching of the Gospel, etc. Now while *neither* are taught in the leading confessions of the church (but are contradicted by the statements in reference to the condition of the church itself, the nearness of the Advent, etc.), the editor is correct when he makes the Whitbyan theory the present prevailing one. Prof. Briggs' view is held by *an exceeding small minority* of Protestants, however popular it has been *with the Papacy* as "the church view." A few remarks, indicative of *the modern origin*—so recent as to be amazing, when its progress is considered—of *the Whitbyan theory* is in place. The His. of Doctrines informs us that when the Augustinean view was introduced it became, as opposed to Chiliasm, the popular doctrine of the Roman Church; and that it was, more or less, entertained by the Reformers. This continued until the appearance of *Daniel Whitby* (comp. Prop. 175, Obs. 4, and Prop. 127, Obs. on Rev. 20), an English commentator (b. A.D. 1638 and d. 1726), who in explaining Rev. 20: 1–6, advocated what he calls a "*New Hypothesis*," viz.: a spiritual Millennium *still future* to be introduced by existing Gospel instrumentalities. This *appropriation by Whitby* of a new, unheard-of application has been unquestioned by able scholars, such as Bh. Russell, Archd. Woodhouse, Prof. Bush, and others. Indeed it materially differs from the Popish and Jesuitical dreams of a subjugation and conversion of the world under Papal supremacy; because such dreams of conquest were allied with the Augustinean theory, and regarded as the result of *an already existing* Mill. period—the latter being regarded as equivalent to the existing dispensation, while Whitby located his as future and distinctive in time and results. The nearest ancient approach, although differing from it, to Whitby's theory are the prophecies of Joachim (comp. arts. on in *Cyclops.* and Von Döllinger's *Proph. of the Middle Ages*, VII.), or the declarations of Roger Bacon, Dolcino, and men of that stamp. So the fanatical Anabaptist movement

materially differs in the instrumentality used, but only sympathizes with it (Prop. 156, Obs. 4) in the effort to secure a world-wide dominion without the personal Advent preceding, and before the res. of the saints. Hence Pre-Millenarians, unwilling to associate the Whitbyan theory with such Popish and Anabaptist vagaries and dreams of conquest, assert (as Bh. Henshaw, Bickersteth, Dr. Lillie, Dr. Duffield, Dr. Seiss, Dr. Brookes, and others) that Whitby is *the first writer* who systematically presented the opinion, now so prevailing, that the Mill. age (1000 years) is future and will be introduced, without any Advent of Christ, by the preaching of the Gospel.* This theory denies the Pre-Mill. Advent of Jesus, the prior res. of the saints, the personal reign of Jesus and the saints on earth, and holds simply to a conversion of the nations then living, and to a spiritual reign of the then existing church. It has thousands of talented advocates, and is held by multitudes of pious and devoted Christians, being found entrenched in Sys. Divinities, religious works of all kinds, books of worship, hymnals, periodicals, etc. It is a matter of surprise that a theory of such "*recent origin*" (so Dr. John Lillie, who adds, "it is very questionable whether even so late as two hundred years ago, it had yet been heard of among good men,"—quoted by Brookes, *Maranatha*, p. 321-2) should have such an extended reception, and be so perseveringly upheld, when bringing the church into the predicted position of unbelief (comp. Prop. 177). Bh. Henshaw (*An Inquiry concerning the Sec. Advent*) pronounces it "*a novel doctrine*, unknown to the Church for the space of 1600 years. So far as we have been able to investigate its history, it was first advanced by Rev. Dr. Whitby, the commentator." (Comp. Dr. Seiss' *Question in Eschatology*, p. 47–50.) Some have questioned these statements, but no one has been able to produce a single writer of ability preceding Dan. Whitby. Historically, the modern view has no foundation whatever; it is "*a novelty.*"

Obs. 21. Many, without having a definite Mill. doctrine (their notions of Mill. prophecies being vague), are influenced by the general deductions of the Whitbyan theory, and reject our doctrine chiefly on the ground of a still future conversion of the world under present instrumentalities, which is supposed to bring about an ample fulfilment of predictions relating to the Messianic Kingdom. (Comp. Props. 175 and 176, where this matter is discussed in detail.)

We have men, who will in eccles. bodies oppose our views, and yet at the same time confess (e.g. The Mass. Gen. Conference on the Mill., *Proph. Times*, vol. 4, No. 12), that they have not given the subject "that critical study which it demanded," and that "with all the objections to Mill. views, it is still difficult to see how many passages of Scriptures can be otherwise explained." And, without such study, and with such a confession of weakness, they are content with their Modern Whitbyan theory. Indeed, many of this class cannot be induced to study the subject. The *Examiner* (N. Y.), commenting on the late "Proph. Conference," after speaking favorably of the men conducting it, says: "But the great facts of Christ's personal Sec. Coming, that it may occur at any time, that there will be a first res. of the righteous dead, and a second res. of the wicked dead, and that the final general judgment will then come, do not belong to the shadowy and fanciful imaginings of mere theorists."

Obs. 22. However respectable the number of adherents to our doctrine in whole or in part, yet they form but *a small* minority in comparison with *the immense* body that rejects the belief once so prevailing in the church.

---

* Dr. Craven in Lange's *Com.* Rev. p. 346, Amer. Ed., introduces the following footnote: "Elliott writes: 'Vitringa, however, who alludes to Whitby's as a work just published, makes brief citations from two earlier writers, Conrad of Mantua, and Carolus Gallus, as expressive of the same general view." Hence, as these writers had but little influence in moulding the sentiment of the Church (for they are almost unknown, and our opponents, so hard pressed for authorities, failed to find them for *no one* quotes them (Dr. Craven in his "Excursus" says: "This theory (Post-Millennial), which is the one most generally adopted by English-speaking Protestant theologians, *was first fully* developed by Whitby."

The retention of the Augustinian theory or Constantinian view by some; the general adoption of a spiritualizing interpretation to sustain a Church-Kingdom view; the reception of the Whitbyan hypothesis; the issuing of works in which our doctrine is caricatured, misrepresented, and ridiculed; the linking of our doctrine with the vagaries and fanaticism of certain parties to make it odious; the incorporation of some parts of our system by smaller organizations that exerted but little influence; the parading of mistakes made by some rash writers both as to time and details; the influence of leading societies in their publications, their endowments, commentaries for popular use, periodicals, etc.; in brief, the unfriendliness of worldliness, sect, indifference, unbelief, prejudice, etc., has been exerted to overpower *this ancient faith.* Numerous instances will be cited as we proceed. The fact that great and good men—men eminent for piety and ability in the church—have aided in decrying the doctrine has had a powerful influence upon the minds of many (comp. Props. 177–180). Doctrinal belief is not, however, *decided by numbers* (Matt. 8 : 13, 14, and 22 : 14; 1 Cor. 1 : 26, 27, etc.).

Obs. 23. Writers that are evidently unacquainted with the literature and history of our doctrine dismiss it with some contemptuous allusion to "the ignorance and fanaticism" of its upholders. Certainly the eminent and venerable names presented *are sufficient* to redeem it from such charges. We are not concerned in eulogizing its advocates; this is done by our opponents and others.

As indicative of the treatment received, we present several illustrations. Dr. Mosheim (*Ch. His.*, vol. 3, p. 393), notwithstanding the important concessions given by him, exhibits his animosity to the doctrine as follows: "The expectation of the Millennial Kingdom, which seldom exists *in well informed minds*, and which generally produces extravagant opinions." The editor of the *N. Y. Evangelist* eulogizes Prof. Briggs's *one-sided* articles, and then says (*Editorial*, Jan. 9, 1879) of Chiliasm, that it is "*a delusion exploded many times*," having a "*a sporadic existence*"; and even designates "*the blessed hope*" *sneeringly*, "the blessed appearance, *as they call it.*" The slightest acquaintance with the history of Chiliasm, and the long line of revered advocates, should undoubtedly *prevent* the use of such language, unless the parties employing it desire the same to be attributed *to improper* motives. Consequently we find scholarly men, who desire to act honorably and justly, express themselves, although opposing our doctrine, as reverencing the pious and eminent Chiliastic advocates; they *know enough* concerning their honored lives, their labors of love, their sufferings for Christ, that, supposing them even to be in error on this point, they find *sufficient* redeeming qualities to secure a high respect and cordial esteem. Prof. Bush, whose enlogy on Millenarians we quote in the Preface, is an example followed by others. The *Princeton Review*, Ap., 1851, p. 187, concedes, as it well may, that we have in our ranks "minds too of devotedly pious men, who are also highly reputable scholars." Even Harris, in his *Great Commission*, where (pp. 115–117) he grossly misrepresents our doctrine and its advocates (comp. for a reply, Prop. 175), is still forced in candor to acknowledge: "We are aware, indeed, that among those who, for the sake of distinction, are called Millenarians, there are to be found divines *of considerable reputation*, and Christians *of the greatest sanctity.*"

We leave a recent writer, an opponent (the author of *God is Love*—3 vols.—a work specially devoted against our doctrine), to testify *both* respecting its adherents and extent. He says (Pref., vol. 1) that he is personally acquainted with "*a very large number* of my most revered private friends, both among the clergy and laity, (who) are firm believers in the doctrine of a personal reign of Christ on earth." "They are alike *eminent* for the greatness of their talents, for their deep and sustained spirituality of mind, for their habitually close walk with God, for their exemplary conduct in the society and sight of their fellow men, and for their devotedness to the cause of Christ and of souls." He refers "to the fact that *so many* of my greatest Christian friends, equally *remarkable* for their gifts and graces, believe in the personal reign as the

great central doctrine," etc. He refers to "*the great extent* to which that class of views are now adopted," especially in "in the Church of England," "among the Independents, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians," and largely advocated by "the Plymouth Brethren." He adds: "Millenarianism is spreading rapidly in nearly all parts of the country at the time at which I write." He remarks that *all* converted Jews are Millenarian, and referring to the efforts of "The Prophecy Investigating Society" in propagating the doctrine, says: "The clerical members of this society are, in the majority of cases, *men of eminence* in the religious world; while the laymen are, in every instance, men of *acknowledged* piety and high social position." He remarks, "Among the vice-presidents are the Bish. of Cashel, the Bish. of Ripon, Admiral Vernon Harcourt, the Hon. A. Kinnaird, M.P., and Captain John Trotter." He speaks of the preachers, whose sermons are published on the subject, as "most of them men of eminence;" refers to the ability of its advocates in Ireland, and then gives a list of publications, interspersed with high eulogies of various writers, who hold to what he is pleased to call "the Millennial delusion." He declares that "Millenarianism is making such rapid progress among all Evangelical denominations," so that he advocates the "adopting measures to arrest its progress" (his book being one based on the rejecting from Scripture, as interpolations, all teaching that favors our views!). This confirms Moody's (the Evangelist) statement in a sermon on the Sec. Advent: "*Many* spiritual men in the pulpits of Great Britain are firm in the faith. Spurgeon preaches it. I have heard Newman Hall say that he knew no reason why Christ might not come before he got through with his sermon." Dr. Fisher, Art. *Mill.* (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) says that an anon. work, *The End of All Things* (which is opposed to us), frankly declares that "more than half of the evangelical clergy of the Church of England are at this moment Millenarians." Dr. Moore writes from Wartburg, Ger., to the *Central Presbyterian* (1867), and after delineating the religious condition, says: "I find among the Evangelicals a great deal of Millenarianism; and the Sec. Coming of Christ is the great feature of the Gospel that swallows up all others with them." This agrees with Nast's (Com. Matt., 6:10) declaration, who speaks of "many Evangelical divines of Germany," and of "the most learned theologians of England and America" as Millenarian. Such testimony from opponents and sympathizers should certainly have sufficient weight to prevent that spirit of detraction so prevalent with some.

Obs. 24. Ignorance or malice, alone, can produce the charge of "heresy," so often, with evident relish, urged against Pre-Millenarians.

We give a few illustrations out of many such charges. Prof. Briggs, in the *N. Y. Evangelist*, Sept. 12th, 1878, pronounces Pre-Millenarianism a "*heresy*," and "the basis of a most pernicious series of doctrines, *ever rejected by the Church* as fanatical, visionary, and dangerous." (This certainly comes with good grace from one who professes to believe that the Church has been in the past, and now is, enjoying the predicted Millennium.) Dr. Berg in "*The Sec. Advent of Jesus Christ, not Pre-Millennial*," follows the same tenor, pronouncing "the doctrine of the Pre-Mill. Advent, and the so-called Personal Reign of Christ" to be not only "erroneous" but "pernicious," "yoked to the car of fanaticism," "the motive power of the wildest vagaries." characterized by "eccentric variations"; being "the favorite hobby upon which wild delusion has careered with whip and spur to perdition," "changing sincere fanatics into shameless impostors," etc. (This reads remarkable well from the man who strives to make the stone of Dan. 2 to represent *the American Republic!*) If the doctrine produces all this, it is exceedingly unfortunate for the wisdom of the Bible, that it contains *so much* in its plain, grammatical sense, in its structure and analogy, as to induce multitudes in the Primitive Church, and since, to believe and adopt it. If the doctrine has this tendency, and produces such persons, *then it follows*, that the Church has honored, and now reverences, men for their piety, usefulness, learning, etc., who are only "heretics." If the doctrine is so bad, demoralizing, and destructive, it is especially unfortunate for the Ch. Church, that through the first centuries of its existence, *it can only trace* its progress through such successful martyr, but hated "heretics." Our decided impression is, when we look at the men thus defamed—men who sealed their love for Jesus and His truth by abundant labors, toils, sufferings, and even death—that the time will come—if it be at the throne of Jesus Himself—when such *wholesale, unchristian and most unjust charges* will be deeply, if not bitterly, regretted by the persons urging them. The persons who bring this charge ought to have some consideration of their own accountability. Dr. West (*Essay* before the Proph. Conference *on the His. of the Doc.*)

remarks: "And equally powerless is the attempt to stigmatize the holders of this hope as aiders and abettors of 'heresy.' That is a weapon that cuts fearfully in the opposite direction. Never has there existed a persecutor of God's saints on earth, since the dawn of Christianity, *who was not an Anti-Chiliast.* The Apostate Church of Rome, idolatrous corrupter of every truth of God, and red with the blood of God's saints, was built and nurtured on an Anti-Chiliastic creed. The first perversion of this hope was by a heretic, Cerinthus or Montanus. The first assault upon it was by the rationalizing Origen, who became a Universalist. The next was by Dionysius, who denied the Apoc. of John. The first official condemnation of it was by a Roman Pope. The early misrepresentator of it was Eusebius, an Arian, and let him who can, defend Whitby from the charge of becoming a Socinian. I dismiss the imputation with the remark, that if, in days to come, a personal Antichrist, more God-defying and blaspheming than he who sits in Rome, shall rise, one of the marks that will signalize him as the concentration of satanic energy and hate, will be that he is *a pronounced Anti-Chiliast.* And just in proportion as such time shall approach, will this glorious martyr-truth revive, as all history shows, and to suffering saints will it be given again to witness for that same hope under which the first confessors of Jesus, comforted, supported and strengthened, sank singing to their tombs." The absurdity, the injustice, and the sinfulness of thus designating the founders, martyrs, confessors, missionaries, and ablest divines of the Church, is self-evident, but it is something that we are led to anticipate, *Isa.* 66 : 5. It is the old charge reproduced: Spener (Dorner's "*His. Prot. Theol.*," vol. 2, p. 211) was opposed on account of his Millenarianism, and those who received his views were denounced as heretics—his name lives in freshness of honor, while the opponents are almost forgotten. So Auberlen (Dis. Rev. p. 315) quotes Delitzsch as saying in reference to the wide-spread influence of Bengel: "To whom do we owe it, that the orthodox church of the present day, no longer brands the Chiliastic view of the last times, as all books of systematic doctrine do, as heterodoxy, but has woven it *into her own inmost life so deeply,* that *hardly* a believing Christian can be found who does not hold it." (Thus indicating its hold in the Evangelical portion of believers.)

Obs. 25. Pre-Millenarianism is frequently, either through lack of knowledge or animosity, represented as indorsing the belief of bodies (e.g. the fanatical Anabaptists. Fifth Monarchy men, etc.) whose faith is directly opposite to it.

For Anabaptists, etc., see Props. 175, 179, etc., where their views are given in detail. We, however, present another illustration of our meaning. The Editor of the *N. Y. Observer,* (Sept. 1866) makes out "that Shakerism is composed of Millenarianism and Spiritualism." And as the result of his visit to the Shakers in Columbia Co., N. Y., says: "The Shakers believe He (Jesus) *is now present in them,* and that it *is high noon* of the millennium all around here." The truth is, that there is not *a particle of affinity* between Shakerism and Millenarianism. Their doctrine of the Second Coming of Jesus in the person of Ann Lee and of a present resulting Millennium is *utterly opposed* by our fundamental principles. No Chiliast *ever advocated* such a delusion. Their doctrine *best suits* the Whitbyan spiritual reign theory, being *the result of the spiritual,* mystical system of interpretation repudiated by us. As to the Doctrine of a present Millennium, that *accords best* with Prof. Briggs' theory of a present existing Millennium. The fundamental position which distinguishes Millenarians from all others, is this: No Millennium without the personal coming and intervention of the same identical Jesus who ascended to heaven. To accommodate all this covenant and prophesies, to Ann Lee, is *a complete perversion* of the truth,—a sad prostitution of the promises pertaining to the Christship and the Messianic kingdom.

Obs. 26. Pre-Millenarianism is unjustly held accountable for the extravagances of its votaries, and even of its opposers.

We have referred to this, and give instances of both. It is only necessary to say, that no doctrine of the Bible has ever yet escaped being allied with error and fanaticism (but on that account ought not to be discarded), so this doctrine has not escaped the usual lot. We find it allied with error and extravagance from the days of Montanus down to the present day, but this should not deter any one from the reception of Biblical truth (which is not responsible for the affiliated error and fanaticism), especially when so many able and pious men have received it without incorporating those extravagancies, etc. (Compare Prop. 179.)

Obs. 27. Pre-Millenarianism, being chiefly related to Eschatology, is adopted by persons in all (or nearly all) denominations, but our opponents, overlooking this fact and its historical status, eagerly hold it up as related to some sect or sects, who incorporate it with other doctrines that are objectionable (compare Prop. 179).

Obs. 28. The newspapers and periodicals, partly or wholly devoted to an exhibit of Chiliastic doctrine, also evidence its extent.

The Theol. and Lit. Journal, Ed. by D. N. Lord, a Quarterly Review, only 13 vols., 8vo, published in New York; *The Jewish Repository*, changed to *Expositor and Friend of Israel*, London; *The Investigator of Prophecy*, London; *The Bloomsbury Lent Lectures*, 10 vols., London; *The Literalist*, 5 vols., Philad.; Purdon's *Last Vials*, London; *The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, Ed. by Dr. Bonar, London; *The Presbyterian Review* (Organ of the Scotch church, a no. of articles); *The Prophetic Times*, Philad.,—the old series edited by Dr. Seiss, the new by Rev. Wilson; *The Israelite Indeed*, or *Nathaniel*, New York, edited by Lederer; Way-Marks in the Wilderness, New York, edited by James Inglis; *The Truth*, St. Louis, edited by Rev. Dr. Brookes; *The Rainbow*, London, Ed. by Dr. Leask; *Old Truths* (Eng.), Ed. by Rev. Cox; *The Watchman of Ephraim*, England. Also such papers as "The Christian Herald" (London and New York), "The Christian Observer," "Revivalist," etc., contain Chiliastic articles. Besides these are the periodicals published by the Second Adventists, Christadelphians, Seventh-day Adventists, and various other bodies, which, more or less, largely teach Chiliastic doctrine, such as "The World's Crisis" (Boston), "The Gospel Banner and Mill. Advocate" (Geneva, Ill.), "The Proph. Watchman" (Harvard, Ill.) "The Herald of Life and of the Coming Kingdom" (New York), "The True Herald" (Plano, Ill.), "Herald of the Kingdom" (Birmingham, Eng.), "The Proph. Key" (Versailles, Ky.), and others.

Obs. 29. The survival of Chiliasm, amidst the opposition, ridicule, persecution, etc., of the past centuries, is worthy of notice. Dr. West (*His. of the Doc.*) has some forcible remarks on this point, showing "that only because it is *an imperishable truth of God* has it been able to survive the ordeal which it has passed." Considering the reproach attending it—the debasements and admixtures to which it has been subject; how offensive it was to Gentile rulers, to Gnostic and Alexandrian teachers, to Papal claims; the persecutions to which it was exposed; the obloquy heaped on it as heresy to crush it; the misrepresentations, abuse, hostility, etc., heaped upon it, as found in thousands of works; and considering the pious and eminent men who clung to it, taught it, and urged it upon others, it must be—as Chiliasts affirm—a truth found in the Divine Record, planted there *by God Himself* to inspire faith and hope.

Obs. 30. The number of missionaries holding our doctrine, who have gone to foreign lands and among the heathen, is not only gratifying, but evidences how widespread must be Chiliastic teaching.

Compare our remarks on the missionaries and missionary spirit, given more in detail, under Props. 175-178. In this connection we only say that a long list of missionaries, extending from the Apostolic church down to the present, who are Chiliastic might be given. Dr. West ("His. of the Doc.") says of its advocates: "that devoted missionaries like Duff the opener of India, Gutlaff the opener of China, Bettleheim the opener of Japan, Heber, Bertram, Wolff, Herschel, Poor, Lowry, and many more, were Pre-Millenarians, and are followed, if recent information is correct, by a majority of missionaries now in the foreign field, of the same faith." (Comp. Brookes, *Maranatha*, Seiss, *Last Times*, etc., for similar statements.)

Obs. 31. The Evangelists and Revivalists who are Chiliastic is conclusive evidence of two facts, viz.: that Chiliasm is not opposed (as some

allege) to personal effort to bring men to Jesus, and that Chiliasm is taught by men who have access to large numbers of hearers.

The Evangelists, well known, who present our hope, are the following: D. L. Moody, Rev. G. F. Pentecost, G. C. Needham, T. W. Bonham, Halsey W. Knapp, Maj. D. W. Whittle, B. F. Jacobs, Rev. H. W. Brown, F. M. Rockwell, H. P. Welton, — Harry, — Moorehouse, P. P. Bliss, (see testimony of chairman of the Proph. Conf. held at N. York, 1878, *Trib. Sup.*, p. 18), — Sankey, John G. Vassar.

Obs. 32. One remarkable feature connected with the history of Chiliasm must not be overlooked. It has been held by believers of all classes and the most opposite tendencies—men of the strongest Confessional tendency and men the most unconfessional; men hierarchical in teaching and men the most determined against it; persons who prided themselves in their orthodoxy and persons who rejoiced in their heterodoxy; persons highly Calvinistic and persons low Arminian—in brief, *nearly all classes* are represented. This arises from the fact that the doctrine is mainly confined to Eschatology (having, however, as we show, an important bearing on many related subjects), and could readily be incorporated in the various systems. Scarcely any other doctrine is found more widely diffused.

Simply to illustrate how parties the most diverse in view entertain it we point to organizations of believers who hold to it as a prominent article of faith. The "Holy Apostolic Church" is exceedingly high-church and ritualistic; on the other hand "The Plymouth Brethren" are the direct opposite. On the one hand the "Michaelians" (following Spener's pietism and Oetinger's theosophy); on the other the "Pregizerians" (Kurtz, Ch. His. Vol. 2, p. 290-1) who laid the greatest stress on ordinances. The names that we give of its Primitive and succeeding advocates, down to the present day, clearly evidences this feature. This fact evidently indorses the idea that the doctrine must be distinctively taught in the Scriptures, seeing that so many, who are *not united* on other doctrine, find here a common scriptural basis,—some indeed more distinctively and systematically than others.

Obs. 33. The Conferences held at London, Milday, New York, and other places, in which the most eminent ministers and laymen of the various Protestant denominations participated, evidence *the extent* of the doctrine and its *practical* realization.

These Conferences, in view of the eminence, ability, etc., of their supporters, the various denominations so largely represented by leading divines and laymen, have directed public attention to the doctrine and its extent. It has alarmed Post- and Ante-Millenarians, so that Prof. Briggs and others protest, under the threat of Eccles. action, against their continuance, and call for a disbandonment. Such menaces are *a good sign*, both of felt weakness in support of their own theories and of the strength manifested by Pre-Millenarians.

Obs. 34. The poets who have presented Chiliastic views are both numerous and eminent.

The following may be instanced: Milton (*Paradise Lost*), Alex. Pope (*The Messiah*), Jno. Keble (*The Christian Year*), Charles Wesley (*Hymns*), Bh. R. Heber (*Hymns*), M. F. Tupper (*Poems*), Isaac Watts (*Hymns and Psalms*), Wm. Cowper (*Task*), Ed. Bickersteth (*Yesterday, To-day and Forever*), H. Bonar, (*Hymns of Faith and Hope*), Rev. L. Way (*Palingenesia*), Jno. G. Wilson (*Psalms*), S. B. Monsell (*Hymns*), Gerard Moultrie (*Hymns*), M. Habershaw (*Hymns*), and many others. Hundreds of hymns and psalms in the older Christian Psalmody are so opposed to the Whitbyan and Augustinian theories, so full of longing for the Sec. Coming as the "the Blessed Hope," so utterly faithless of the world's progress without the Christ, etc., that they strongly express Chiliastic views.

Obs. 35. The design that God has, in thus greatly reviving the doctrine, is worthy of attention. He does not leave His truth without testimony.

Dr. West (His. of Doc.), pertinently, after referring to "the galaxy of illustrious names by which it is adorned, by what piety it is commended, by what unquestioned orthodoxy and scholarship supported, and how the Church seems to be rallying around it, as in the martyr age," says: "What an All-Wise Providence means to intimate, it is well to consider." (Comp. Prop. 174.)

Obs. 36. In conclusion, a brief résumé of our historical argument, to show its connection, is in place. The evidence in support of each step is *ample and conclusive.* Indeed, no other doctrine has *a more clear and decisive proof* in its behalf drawn from historical ground than this one. 1. We have shown that the Jews, before and at the First Advent, held to it, professing to derive it from covenant and prophecy. (Compare e.g. Props. 20, 21, 40, 44, 72, 74.) 2. Then we prove that John the Baptist and the disciples both entertained and preached the doctrine. (Compare Props. 38, 39, 43.) 3. Next, that the doctrine was still held after the death of Jesus. (Compare Props. 69, 70.) 4. Extended evidence is given that the apostles, after the ascension and after the day of Pentecost, still adhered to it. (Compare Props. 71, 72 with Props. 66–68.) 5. It is proven that our doctrine was generally, if not universally, received by the early churches, East and West, North and South. (Compare Props. 72, 73, 74, 75.) 6. This doctrine was perpetuated by the followers and successors of the first teachers. (Compare Prop. 75.) 7. That it was only changed and opposed under the Gnostic and Alexandrian influences. (Comp. Prop. 76.) 8. That the Papacy materially aided in crushing the doctrine, because obnoxious to her teaching, claims, etc. (Comp. Prop. 77.) 9. That, thus almost exterminated under Papal influence, there was a revival after the Reformation, since which time it has again been taught by able and devout sons of the church, as shown in this Prop.

PROPOSITION 79. *The Kingdom of God, promised by covenant and prophets, is to be distinguished from the general and universal Sovereignty of God.*

This is, owing to lack of discrimination, *a most fruitful source* of mistake. Take the Kingdom in its initiatory form and its covenanted and predicted aspect, and it will be found *widely different* from the Sovereignty that God exercises by virtue of His Godheadship. The latter indeed is the source of the former, but *the Kingdom of covenant is a visible, outward Theocratic Kingdom*, manifested here on earth, identified with a certain people, promised in a definite manner, and ruled over by "the man ordained." As we shall show hereafter (Prop. 81), it is a Kingdom specifically promised to the "*the Son of Man*," who is the Son of David. These, and other aspects of it, clearly *distinguish it from* such a sovereignty.

Obs. 1. It is but justice to say that many of our opponents (as e.g. Thompson, etc.) and others (as e.g. Van Oosterzee, etc.) *justly discriminate* between this Kingdom and God's Sovereignty, telling us that we must not make this Kingdom denote the Supremacy of God as manifested in Creation and Providence, in His "Universal Government over this and other worlds." They *correctly* inform us that the promised Kingdom is *a special divine* organization with Christ as its Head, and with believing subjects, etc., while the other is the sustaining, guiding, controlling, directing disposition, mediate and immediate, of the Universe under the Divine Headship. They teach us that the one is given by covenant promise, and that the other ever existed, even before this special Kingdom was promised to man. They properly direct us to the language of Christ and of His disciples in preaching that the Kingdom "is at hand," as justly implying that something which did *not then* exist was to be set up in the future. And they happily direct us to two passages, given by the same writer, as illustrative of the two, viz.: Dan. 6 : 26 and 7 : 13–14.

Indeed, if we were to gather the fragmentary evidences thus presented to us by various writers, we should have an abundant array of proof, much of it derived from those who have no sympathy with us. Those who constitute the Church a Kingdom are forced by simple consistency into this attitude. Hence Kurtz (*His. Old Cov.*, vol. 2, p. 97) remarks : "It is essentially necessary to make a twofold distinction in the process of divine revelation ; that is to say, it is necessary to distinguish the preservation and government of the world in general, from *the more special* operations connected with the introduction and working out of the plan of salvation," etc. The sovereignty of "the Absolute," which figures so largely in many religious books, etc., and upon which so much stress is laid as "the Kingdom," is simply a decided removal from covenant and promise. The reader will compare Dr. Storrs' excellent remark, see Prop. 37, Obs. 7, as well as Kurtz's, Prop. 26, Obs. 3. Dr. McCosh presents the Universal Sovereignty ably in his "Methods of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral," so also Butler, Paley,

Chalmers, the Duke of Argyll, and others; but this is only the source or foundation of this special manifestation of government. Dr. Craven (Lange's *Com.*, Rev., p. 97), in his "Excursus on the Basileia," properly distinguishes between the two; and this is characteristic of numerous able Chiliasts.

Obs. 2. Others, however, do not discern between things that differ, and make the very Sovereignty which promises, overrules, bestows the means for attaining, and finally gives the Kingdom (Prop. 83), to David's Son—the Kingdom itself. Illustrations of this looseness will abundantly appear as we proceed in our argument.

Many excellent men mistake this sovereignty for the *covenanted* Kingdom, so that literally thousands, like that noble Christian, Alfred Cookman (*Life*, p. 359, etc., in some of his most eloquent utterances), locate the kingdom in the same, not seeing how it strikes *at the root of the most precious promises* given to man. Even some Millenarians, not fully grasping *the covenanted* truth, not consistently confining themselves to *the Theocratic* idea, also, in a measure, mistake and confound the Divine Sovereignty for, and with, *the Kingdom of covenant.* This is seen e.g. in the interpretation given to Christ's inheriting David's throne, which, over against *the most positive* covenanted declarations and predictions, they make the Father's throne in the third heaven, etc.

Obs. 3. It is noticeable that in works of Sys. Divinity this Sovereignty is placed under the part pertaining to God and His general government, and is separated from the promised Kingdom of Christ by treating of the latter under the Part relating to Christ and His work. A distinction is observed, made, and taught in a specific form, but *practically* it is ignored, and in definitions it is made to disappear, forgetting that thus *a radical defect* is introduced, and *a palpable contradiction* is involved. For, uniting the two and making them one, they at once make that, which they tell us was never (even for a moment), intermitted, the subject of recorded promises as something to come, to be inherited, etc.

Williamson (*Theol. and Moral Science*, p. 73) says: "The Kingdom of God! What is it? No more or less than the reign of God." This is true of the Divine Sovereignty, but it is not correct as he applies it, for on p. 311 he quotes "Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand," and ignoring the non-fulfilment of the imposed condition "repent," the non-intermittence of the Divine reign, he frames a new "spiritual kingdom, designating it as follows: "It is a new and more perfect dispensation." This illustration out of many is given to show how able writers *confound source and result, cause and effect*, and overlook *a specific covenanted and predicted* kingdom under David's son, with characteristics which, down to the present, have never yet been realized.

Obs. 4. The line of argument already presented (which forms but a small portion of the Scriptural reasons to be assigned), is amply *sufficient* to show, that *a specified Theocratic Kingdom*, incorporating the Davidic throne, which once existed, which was withdrawn, and which is promised to be restored under David's Son, is something *widely different* from the general Sovereignty of the Almighty over the universe. So plain, and simple, and self-evident is this Proposition, that no more space is required in its consideration.

We can indorse Dr. Moll's statement (Lange's *Com.*, Psls. p. 306): "There is a distinction to be made between God's general government of the world, and that *special* one—*the Theocracy*—which He established on earth, in and through the seed of Abraham. Even in the imperfect and typical (?) form which it assumes in Old Test. history, this is described as His descending to the earth and His ascending to heaven. This theocracy, insignificant as was its origin in Israel, has a world-embracing destination. It

shall gather into itself all nations, who, as one people of God, shall serve and adore one and the same heavenly King; and their princes shall accomplish those purposes which God has ordained for them, viz.: to be the leaders of their people to salvation, and their protectors in the service of God." Avoiding the typical, and keeping logically to the Theocratic idea, we receive and extend this language.

PROPOSITION 80. *This Kingdom of covenant promise and prediction, is to be distinguished from the Sovereignty which Jesus exercises by virtue of His Divine nature.*

This is distinctively shown by a simple fact (overlooked by the multitude) that the Kingdom is *never* promised to Him as "*the Son of God*" but as (the covenants and predictions demand it) "*the Son of Man*" or "*the Son of David.*" The following Proposition will develop this feature; now it is only necessary to say, that (1) the Sovereignty of God introduces *this special* Theocratic Kingdom in *the incorporated* Davidic line, and (2) to constitute this a pure, unfailing, perpetual Theocracy (viz.: *God ruling as earthly King*, etc.) the Divine *is allied or incorporated with* the person of this David's Son.

Obs. 1. It may be premised, in order to avoid misconception, that Jesus now in His Divine nature, in His Oneness with the Father, does exercise a dominion over all things. According to this nature He is Lord over all, and this is, in our estimation, most unequivocally taught in such passages as John 1 : 3; Col. 1 : 15, 19; Phil. 2 : 9, 11; 1 Cor. 8 : 6; Rom. 11 : 36; Rev. 1 : 5–6, etc. We fully admit the Divinity of Christ, revere His Divine attributes, make these *essential to a proper Theocratic ordering*, and acknowledge the Sovereignty that He possesses in His Divine right and possession. But independently of the actual realization of the Theocratic order as covenanted, and aside from the latter (for let the reader consider that *when* God Himself was Israel's Theocratic King, *He did not cease to exert* His general Sovereignty), this exercise of Divine Sovereignty is precisely the same as that we have been considering in the previous Proposition, viz.: God's Sovereignty, and *differs materially* from *this predicted* Kingdom which is *promised to Jesus*, "*the Christ*," not merely in virtue of His relationship to God but of that which He *sustains to David as his Son, and to man as the Man.* The reign, the dominion, or Kingdom that we are defending, is, in contrast with the other, that *of His humanity* (*as covenanted*), or, more properly speaking (embracing covenant as it relates to man, and God's own Theocratic right which is *not* the subject of promise), that of *the Divine-Human.* The Theocracy, by incorporating the Davidic kingship, embraces, as *the grand instrumentality* for its future re-establishment in sublime power and glory, *the Divine-Human*, now united in Jesus, the Messiah.

It has been well said by various writers (as e. g. Neander, *His. Ch.*, vol. 1, p. 506, note, and *Life of Christ*, p. 143): "The predicates 'the Son of Man' and 'the Son of God,' applied by Christ to Himself, have a reciprocal relation to one another, and imply *a distinction* as well as *the conjunction and unity* of the divine-human in Him." The careful student will observe that our argument receives additional force from the independent concessions made by able theologians, as e. g. Martensen (*Ch. Dog.*, sec. 174), when he properly dis-

criminates between the kingly power of Jesus, and the divine power belonging to Him as Logos, etc. Others distinguish in the same manner. Comp. e.g. Dörner's *Person of Christ* and kindred works.

Obs. 2. The early Chiliasts clearly distinguish between the Kingdom belonging to Jesus as the Divine-Human, and the Sovereignty vested in Him as God. Thus e.g. Lactantius ("Poem on Easter"), while firmly holding to the still future Kingdom of promise to be given to the Son of David, expressly asserts that Christ "reigns as God over all things, and all created objects offer prayer to their Creator." The idea, gathered from their writings, is this: in His Divine capacity He is represented as reigning, but this reign is *not the reign of promise*;—the latter is confined to a special covenanted outward visible manifestation of the human in conjunction with the Divine, *in an externally Theocratic ordering.*

Obs. 3. When Christ assumes the Kingdom at the time appointed, in view of His being the predicted seed of David, this does not by any means cause Him to lay aside the Sovereignty that He has with the Father over the universe. As Divine He is with the Father evermore, but as the Divine-human, He manifests Himself (and the Father through Him) *on earth in a specified form of reigning adapted to humanity.* Hence the predicted Kingdom is something that pertains not merely to the Divine but to "*the Christ*," i.e. the Divine-human united. The right comes to Him *in the covenanted line* through the human element (i.e. as the lawful seed of David) delegated by the Divine Sovereignty of the Father and rendered efficacious and Theocratic by the intimate and ever-enduring union of the Divine, *thus constituting Him in the highest and purest sense the Theocratic King.*

The reader is again reminded that this is fully illustrated by the Theocracy. When God condescended to reign as Theocratic King (i.e. to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler) over Israel, two things were noticeable: (1) that this Theocratic rule was something *diverse* from the general sovereignty over all things; and (2) that when the former was assumed, the latter was *not* laid aside, but continued ever in force. The one was a *special* merciful manifestation in behalf of man, the other lies *inherent* in the Godhead and pertains to the universe at large.

Obs. 4. It is amazing that theologians, without observing *the contradiction* involved, *confound* the Divine Sovereignty with *the covenanted Kingship* of Jesus, and yet acknowledge that Rom. 14 : 9; Phil. 2 : 9; Heb. 12 : 2, etc., teach that "the ground of His dominion is to be found in His obedience unto death, the death of the cross" (so Oosterzee's Dogmatics). Now certainly the Divine Sovereignty is not grounded *in any such contingency*, but the Kingship pertaining to Jesus, as the Son of David, is based upon His obedience, etc. (comp. Props. 83 and 84).

Flavel, in his *Fountain of Life*, represents Jesus as now reigning under two heads: (1) "the kingly office of Christ, as executed spiritually upon the souls of the Redeemed, and (2) the kingly office of Christ as providentially executed for the Redeemed." The first is based on 2 Cor. 10 : 5, supposed to be especially confirmed by Luke 17 : 20, 21. He has, over *against the express covenant* that specifies with distinctness the throne to be occupied by Jesus, Christ's *throne in the hearts* of believers. The second is derived from Eph. 1 : 22 (a present realization being taken for granted), which is supported by an appeal *to the Divine Sovereignty.* Two things are noticeable in Flavel's *ignoring* of covenant and covenant promises: (1) the means are confounded with *the end*, and (2) without *any regard* to the

context of passages, or to their reference to time (dispensation), they are quoted as applicable to his spiritualistic theory. Many writers, of usefulness and piety, follow the same *illogical and unscriptural* view of the kingdom.

Obs. 5. What Lange (*Com.* p. 268) observes in reference to the miracles of Christ, that "the distinction between the economy of the Father and of the Son must ever be kept in mind," is especially necessary in the study of this Kingdom; *otherwise* we will be led to a confusion of ideas and to palpable contradictions. There are some things which essentially belong to Jesus as the Son of God, as One with God; and there are other things which appertain to Him as "the Christ," the Divine-human. *Two extremes* are to be avoided: on the one hand to lay all stress on the Divine, and making, in this Kingdom, the human too subordinate; and on the other hand pressing the human to the exclusion of the Divine. *Both* are firmly and eternally united, and the very revelation of *the Son of Man*, as David's Son, will necessarily be an attestation to His divinity in the works that He will do, in the power that He will exercise, and in the relation that He sustains to the universe. The last feature is illustrated as given in Jno. 3 : 13 (comp. 6 : 62, and 17 : 5), where, according to some commentators (as Barnes, Lange, etc.), Jesus speaks of Himself as being in heaven at *the very time* He was also on earth speaking to Nicodemus (two ancient MSS. according to Tischendorf's N. Test. the S. and C. omit "which is in heaven"). Thus also when again present on earth, taking the Kingdom as Son of Man, this does not forbid His being, through the all-pervading attributes ascribed to Him, in heaven or in any part of the universe. These are deep things, and we must speak of them after the manner of man.

For we are not of those who think that the Person of Christ *can be fully* explained. He portrays Himself as a mystery, connected with the incomprehensible, revealed only to a few, and then only in some of His features. Much pertaining to Christ is still unknown, and has been the subject of controversy and impotent discussion. Hence the author has little sympathy with a class of writers who, in their exactness to define the Person of Christ rush to opposite extremes: the one party, while acknowledging the union of the divine-human, have the human completely absorbed in the divine; the other with equal preciseness making all human. Others receive, justly, *all* that is recorded, and therefore cleave to Jesus as "the Christ," being constituted such by *a permanent union* of the divine-human, *both* existing in ever-enduring harmony. Man is himself, in some respects, a mystery, and so long as it has been found impracticable to explain man (as e.g. union of soul and body) consistently and satisfactorily, it would be better (as indicative of modesty) to avoid attempting an accurate explanation of "the Christ." It is painful to read the varied and contradictory statements given in the writings of fallible men concerning Him, who, in the very nature of the case, being man and above man - man united with the Divine Mystery (God, the Incomprehensible)—is in a higher sense beyond our comprehension. We must rest satisfied with the description given of Him in the Word (which some writers portray with force and depth), without attempting to explain what the Bible has left indefinite and unknown.

Obs. 6. As if purposely to guard us against the error which is so largely prevalent, the phrase "Son of God" is not employed *in direct* connection with the Kingdom of heaven to be set up on earth. Indeed, our argument thus far indicates that such a declaration, as e.g. that the Kingdom is given to Jesus in view of His being the Son of God, would be *utterly opposed to the Abrahamic-Davidic covenant*, for it would virtually then be saying that God gives the Kingdom to God, phraseology *so hostile to propriety* that the Spirit avoids it (comp. Props. 82, 83, 84). The corre-

spondence thus happily maintained between the requirements of the covenant (and that which is inherent with God) and the language of the New Test., is one of those indirect, but *really powerful, proofs* of the inspiration of the Word. The student is directed to a few peculiarities connected with this phrase. It is used, for instance, to denote the power, divine or miraculous, which was lodged in Him because of His relationship with the Father, as in Matt. 4 : 3, and 8 : 29, and 14 : 33 ; Mark 3 : 11, and 5 : 7 ; Luke 4 : 41 ; Jno. 10 : 36, and 11 : 4, etc. Jesus Himself clearly makes a designed difference between the two phrases, as in Matt. 26 : 63, 64. The High Priest uses the one, asking "whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God?" Jesus, purposely *to identify Himself* with the covenants and the prediction of Daniel, employs in His answer the other, the "*Son of Man.*" The delicate propriety, the beautiful consistency underlying this, stamps the Record as true and divine. The same is the case in John 1 : 49–51 ; for when Nathanael "saith unto Him, Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God ; Thou art the King of Israel," Jesus, with exquisite tact, silently acceding to the title thus given to Him, directs his attention to the title which specifically (see Prop. 81) belongs to Him as the King of Israel by styling Himself "*the Son of Man*" in the "*hereafter.*" Uninspired men could *not* have kept up *such* a considerate and wonderful unity. This is preserved even in cases where a work (as e.g. the resurrection) is said to be done by Christ, which human power alone could not perform. Thus in John 5 : 25, where it is said that the dead shall hear the voice of *the Son of God*, He immediately adds, in order to avoid misapprehension, "*and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also ; because He is the Son of Man.*" Miraculous, creative, divine power is lodged in Him because *He is the Son of God ;* but Judgeship, the revelation of Kingship—for He judges as King—appertains to Him "*because He is the Son of Man.*" This change of title, this *precise and guarded* manner of expressing it, is sustained by *the most weighty reasons.* The predicate "*Son of God*" is given to show His ability to save, that requisite power is united with the human, as in Rom. 1 : 4 ; Heb. 4 : 14 ; 1 Jno. 3 : 8, etc. The predicate "*Son of Man*" is bestowed to identify Him as truly coming *in the covenanted and Theocratic order.*

The tendency of many Theologians is to exalt the divinity of Jesus to *the almost total exclusion* of the humanity, just as if the latter had performed its function and *was not destined* to remain in the future *an important and essential factor* in Redemption. So much is the latter ignored in the absorbing interest attached to the former, that its due relationship to covenants, to the purposes of salvation, to the Theocratic ordering, and to the history of the human race, is *not* observed. How often do we read expressions which ascribe the Kingdom of promise to "the Son of God" owing to the divine nature in Him, and arguments are plentifully adduced to prove that it must be so because of His Omnipotence, etc., while *the real ground* of the Kingdom being bestowed upon Him as "*the Christ*" is very differently represented in the covenant and by the prophets, viz. : *the relationship of Jesus to David as the covenanted seed ;* a relationship sustained, elevated, made rich in blessing, fruitful in honor and glory *by the union* of the divine. It is wrong, therefore, to estimate the human so lowly in the light of the divine, as *almost* to set it aside as if no particular value was to be placed on the same. Reuss (Introd., p. 16, *His. Ch. Theol.*), after saying that "God has no history," gravely asserts : "Any one who undertakes seriously, and without playing on words, to write a life of Jesus, by that very fact, and whatever may be the result of his labors, steps out of the strict enclosure of orthodoxy." Reuss forgets that Jesus *is the Son of David* as well as the Son of God, and that while the divine element, abstractly considered, cannot be limited by history, the Divine-human, the Christ, properly estimated from the Incarnation, *has a history* which must comport *with* the covenants and prophecies ; and that such a history, now and

when completed in the age to come, is a vindication of the faithfulness of God, etc. A history, if now necessarily incomplete, is *a sequence* of covenant and prophecy.

Obs. 7. The Divine has elevated the human, held in conjunction for the pre-ordained Theocratic rule, to the Father's throne, i.e. "the Christ," the Divine-Human united in one Person is "*set down with my Father in His throne,*" and that in virtue of His overcoming. Hence all power is lodged in Him both in heaven and in earth; He is exalted at the right hand of God; He is made "*both Lord and Christ.*" This *insures* the ultimate fulfilment of the Christship—for the Divine Sovereignty thus linked by the union of the fulness of the Godhead bodily with the Man Jesus shows that through "*this Man*" (as Paul calls Him) the Theocratic arrangement in the Davidic line, indicated by His being "*the Christ,*" will be carried out, and that thus God, in and through Him, will reign in the desired capacity *of earthly Ruler over humanity.* The present exaltation of Jesus, the resultant of His being esteemed worthy of the covenanted Theocratic position, is founded (1) on the Divine Sovereignty pertaining to Him as Divine; (2) on the contemplated and determined Theocratic rule; (3) on the provisionary measures instituted by and through Him, mediatory, intercessory, etc.; (4) on the honor and glory that appertains to Him both in virtue of what He is now, and of what He will yet be when manifested as "the Christ" in the covenanted office. Hence while immeasurably (Eph. 1 : 21, 22) exalted, *as becomes* a Theocratic King who is to rule on earth as God through David's Son, yet distinguishing as the Bible does *between* His inherent Divine Sovereignty as God and the future manifestation of the God-Man as Theocratic King, He is represented in the latter capacity as waiting, "*expecting till His enemies shall be made His footstool,*" etc.

This expectant position of "that man, whom God hath ordained to judge the world" (Acts 17 : 31), will be fully developed as the argument advances. Let it only be said, that believers rob themselves of much comfort and sustaining hope when only looking at the Divine they forget the exceeding preciousness contained in the sublime fact that *a man, David's Son,* is exalted above all dominion and power, thus *unmistakably insuring* the fulfilment of covenanted promises. The *surety* is thus given that the oath-bound covenant —which contains the blessings that a sin-cursed world requires—will inevitably be realized in every particular. The Davidic line, in which the Theocratic ordering runs, *thus exalted* in the Person of the promised seed, is a *pledge* given that "*the sure mercies of David*" will be abundantly verified at the time appointed by the Father. It is well too in this discussion to keep constantly in view that "the Christ," in His exaltation, at present sustains to us *the relationship* of Mediator, Intercessor, and Advocate. *Mercy and forbearance are* characteristic of His waiting and expecting position now; *mercy and wrath* of His Sec. Coming.

In Rev. 3 : 21, Jesus is represented as in His Father's throne. This in "the Christ" results from virtue of *the acceptance* of His sacrificial work, *His dignity* as the intended Theocratic King, and *the union* of the Divine with him. But while thus exalted, the special manifestation of the humanity *in its own right as Theocratic,* is reserved (for reasons that will hereafter appear) for the future. This is manifest even in the passage itself where two thrones are spoken of, viz.: His own throne—His by covenanted legal right as "the Man ordained," and His Father's throne, His also because of His Divine relationship. Attention is directed to this, in order that a due discrimination may be made between what pertains to the general Sovereignty of the third heaven, and what relates to *the special* Theocratic rule here on earth, and which alone is exhibited in and through "the Man." Overlooking this, Waggoner (*Ref. of Age*) makes this reign of Christ *on the throne of the Universe* the one that he resigns, 1 Cor. 15 : 24. But this cannot be so, seeing that God ruling *as a Theocratic King* does not necessitate the relinquishment of the other (Obs. 3), that Jesus acting as Theocratic King never gives up the oneness with the Father or the fulness of the Godhead, that the Sovereignty inherent to His Divinity

ever remains unimpaired, that no honor or power, or exaltation belonging to the Christ shall ever be diminished. The mistake arises from two things: (1) forgetting that God, without yielding other rights, etc., can act in the capacity of Theocratic King, and (2) misapprehending 1 Cor. 15: 24.

Obs. 8. We do not lessen or lower the exaltation or power, or divinity, or glory of Christ, in thus referring the predictions and promises of the Kingdom covenanted to David's Son *to an outward manifestation* still future. (*Comp. Prop.* 203). Instead of detracting from Him, we exalt Him as high *as the Record* honors Him, seeing that we accept of its Divine utterances *just as we find them,* feeling assured that the literal fulfilment of the covenant itself in the Theocratic ordering will only the more clearly vindicate the foundation upon which it rests, viz.: Divine Sovereignty as exhibited *in a special* Plan of Redemption realized in all its fulness. Therefore we gladly receive the declaration that "*all power in heaven and on earth is given to Me;*" that He is above all earthly kings; that all things are subject to Him; that He can do all things in behalf of His people, etc.; but we add to all this, *precisely what the Bible adds,* that, aside from His Divine nature, we do not yet see "*the Christ*" *as* "*the Son of Man*" openly exercise this power, outwardly manifest this exaltation, visibly bring all things into subjection, and here on the earth perform all things that are promised. So far as the Kingdom *pertaining to the Son of David* is concerned, some things, and those too relating to the very re-establishment of it, are held *in abeyance* (as will be shown), *until a certain period has arrived.* By this faith, we honor "*the Christ;*" for in this way our belief is expressed that *He will yet fulfil* the precious covenants and the predictions of the prophets, *just as they read;* we evince *our confidence* that He *is worthy,* as David's Son, to receive what is *directly* promised to Him, and to which He is entitled, *His inheritance, throne and Kingdom;* we express *our trust* that He, thus reigning in a special and triumphant *Theocratic* manner, will perfect Redemption, not from a part but from *the whole* of the curse; we *glorify Him* in exhibiting His own faithfulness in Salvation, crowned as it will be *by His promised Theocratic rule as* "*the Christ,*" showing forth the union of the human with the divine in the most conspicuous, honorable manner here on earth (comp. Props. 200, 201, and 204).

PROPOSITION 81. *This Kingdom, thus covenanted, belongs to Jesus as "the Son of Man."*

The Kingdom is primarily and exclusively (i. e. *by covenant and prophecy*) promised *to the Son of David*, although intimations are given (as e.g. in David's Son and David's Lord, and also in the perfect Theocracy instituted, etc.) that the Divine shall be united with that Son. We have only to refer to the Davidic Covenant where this *is distinctly* announced. Upon this Covenant is based the promise, repeated by the prophets, that the descendant of David should reign; and from the same, and its relation to humanity, arises the distinctive title "*Son of Man.*" The kingdom, therefore, is pointedly in harmony with covenant and promise, predicted as bestowed upon "*the Son of Man*," as e.g. Dan. 7 : 13. Hence, too, when Peter preaches his first sermon (Acts 2 : 30) he in the same strain declares "that God had sworn with an oath to him (i.e. David), that of the fruit of his loins, *according to the flesh*, He would raise up Christ *to sit on his throne.*"

Obs. 1. It is not our purpose to enter into a detailed account of the doctrine pertaining to the divine and human natures in Christ. Able writers (as Neander, Lange, Dorner, Hengstenberg, etc.) have done this, showing that *both are necessary* to constitute the Saviour, "*the Christ.*" The Infinite and the Finite, the God and the Man, the Absolute and the Relative, are united in this *the most astonishing* of all unions. We *dare not separate* what God has joined, and we declare, (1) that such a union is *perpetual*, and (2) that its foundation—overlooked by many writers—*is in the Theocratic Plan* as purposed (comp. Prop. 199). But while this is so, our argument, in accord with the expressed Divine Purpose, makes *much* of the human nature and *the important part it is yet to take in Redemption.*

This union of the divine and human has been the battle-field between faith and false philosophy, revelation and proud reason. This great truth, one of *the most profound and essential*, has been, for the last years, the centre of strife between its foes and its friends. Work after work levelled against the divine in Christ has been issued and hailed with delight by unbelievers, while believers have sent forth an equal number in defence of the same. But in this contest, while the divine and human are both acknowledged by the Christian party, it must be sadly confessed that, in the effort to exalt the divine, *too little* stress has been laid on the human. It seems to be taken *for granted*, that the human, having accomplished its mission on the cross, *is swallowed up in the divine*; that its sole work *is finished*, and that it was *no longer necessary* to continue and carry out the Plan of the Divine economy. Now contrary to all this, the early church faith, while conjoining the divine with the human and making the former the supporter and ennobler of the latter, *insists* upon the human maintaining *its distinctive and enduring relationship in the Christship* of Jesus. It is to be lamented that able works written in defence of the Divinity of Jesus *entirely overlook* the strong argument derived in favor of the same by the relationship that the Humanity of Jesus sustains *to the Theocratic order*. A Theocratic King,

if ruling as *covenanted*, must be *both* Man and God. While we may not run to the extreme of Robertson (Frederick, as quoted by Cobbe in *Darwinism in Morals*), saying "only a human God and none other must be adored by man," yet it is true that the incorporation of the Davidic line into the Theocratic order contemplates *the manifestation of God in and through humanity* as found in the predicted Son of David, so that he who beholds this Son sees the Father also, and this owing to the Theocratic position and relationship of the same. Hence justice to "the Christ," in any life of His, ought to show the requisite union of the Divine and Human in the Theocratic Plan, and, therefore, lay great stress upon the coming revelation of these essential factors.

Obs. 2. Various reasons are assigned by theologians for the use of this phrase "*the Son of Man*," a favorite with Jesus, such as its reference to the incarnation, to His relationship with man, to His being the predicted man, to his special peculiarity of personality, to His humiliation, condescension, and lowliness, to His being the ideal or representative man, etc. Now whatever of truth may be attached to any of these, the true reason for its usage appears to be the following: *it is the peculiar, distinctive, predicted name of the Messiah given to Him in virtue of His covenanted relationship to the Kingdom.* This is clearly seen, (1) by the covenant designating *the Man*, pre-eminently, of the seed of David to whom the Kingdom rightfully belongs; (2) by the fact that the Kingdom is promised *to such an one* in the way of identification and realization by David and others, and hence is, and properly must be, adopted by Jesus; (3) by the invariable linking of the name *with the reception* of the Kingdom by Jesus Himself, as e.g. Matt. 25 : 31–34; Matt. 16 : 27, 28, etc.; (4) by the remarkable—but too much overlooked—scriptural fact, that the Kingdom, when specifically promised, *is always promised to the humanity of Jesus*, i.e. to Him as "*the Son of Man*," and not to His Divine nature, i.e. to Him as "*the Son of God.*" This naturally results *from the covenant* specifying Him as the Son of David to whom alone the Kingdom is promised. Of course, as the Kingdom is also God's, being a Theocracy, the Divine is united with this inheriting, but for *the purpose* of identification and consistency with solemn covenant declarations, Jesus selects *the very title which accords with both covenant and prophecy, and which most directly indicates His covenant connection* with the Kingdom itself. The reader is only reminded that it is so far sweeping in its range that it also embraces, aside from the distinctive reference to the seedship of Abraham and David (indicative of covenanted relationship to the Kingdom), a second headship of the human family in the person of a Second Adam, made such by the Redemptive process.

This interesting subject urges us to say something more respecting the opinions that are usually entertained concerning the phrase. These are far from being satisfactory, seeing that they do not meet the requirements of its usage and the connection it sustains to covenant and prediction. Thus e.g. to say (1) as Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 528), that "the name Son of man" is a "*figurative* indication of the Messianic dignity," seeing that it is *a real* indication of the same, i.e. a real coming of such an one, based on the covenant with David. (2) That the name simply denotes the human nature of Christ is not sufficient, because it was not necessary to assume such a title to prove that He had a human body, but it was requisite *to identify* Him as *the specific Man* intended by the covenant. Dr. Campbell (*Diss. on the Gospels*) remarks, that the phrase meant that the Messiah "would be human, not an angelical, or any other being; for in the Oriental idiom, Son of Man and man are equivalent." This is only part of the truth; He was indeed human, a man, but He assumed the title *because* the covenant demands a man derived from the lineage of David, and this man promised is already designated by David (Ps. 80 : 17), and by Daniel (7 : 13), hence if Jesus is *indeed* the predicted promised One, it becomes Him *to assume* the name previously given to Him to distinguish

Him as *the intended One* from all other men. (3) Fairbairn indorses Campbell's view, but thinks that to it should be added the idea of a Divine Man, as it was in "the Son of man" that God was to appear to raise up man from his fallen condition, etc. Now while rejoicing in the divinity of the Man Jesus, and regarding it as *a grand essential* in the work of Redemption, yet planting ourselves firmly on the covenant and the development of it *as presented* by the prophets, it will be found that the phrase *is not used* to designate the divine nature of Christ, but His descent from David and His being the designated, pre-ordained One to whom the Kingdom, by virtue of such descent, rightfully belongs. It is freely admitted that with it can be associated other things, as His relationship to man and even to God, but *logically* the ground of the title lies *in the covenant*. (4) Some tell us that the name is to be taken in a typical sense; but that no type is intended is evident from the terms of the covenant, the birth of Jesus, the direct application of the name, and the future continued reception of the title. It indicates at His birth, in His life, at His Second Coming, *a particular Man*, i.e. the Son of David to whom the Kingdom is promised. (5) Others inform us that the name was "a mere periphrasis of the personal pronoun," but this is disproved by the use made of it by Stephen (Acts 7 : 56), by Daniel, David, and Jesus Himself. (6) Some declare that the name is only applied to *a temporary* humiliation, but that this is erroneous follows from His retaining the title *in connection* with His glorified and Kingly state (as seen e.g. Matt. 25 : 31; Mark 13 : 26, etc.). In this connection the strange utterance of Oosterzee (*Theol. N. Test.*, p. 75) may be quoted: "It (i.e. Son of Man) is nothing else than the *allegorical* designation of the Messiah in His lowly appearance on earth, derived from the vision of the prophet Daniel 7 : 13, 14." Having sufficiently answered this *unauthorized* interpretation, it may be well to add, that Daniel, in the passage designated, does not speak of *humiliation, but of exaltation*, and with *the period of Christ's highest glory* the title is associated as various Scriptures testify. (7) Others merely find that it was assumed to identify Him as the predicted One, regarding it as an accommodation. But it is more than this: *a permanent reality, and ever remaining such*, as the Divine Purpose indicates in Christ's greatest exaltation. (8) We are gravely told by one writer that the title was chosen as the lowest to manifest His humility, and to prevent His disciples from being overawed by His majesty. This, in view of the continued use of the title at the Sec. Advent, etc., presents an exceeding *low* estimate of the name and its preciousness. (9) A favorite notion prevails that it was significant of His being "the model man," "the representative man," "the ideal of humanity," etc. Whatever of truth there may be in the abstract in such representations, they are too one-sided to embrace its full meaning and *entirely overlook* its covenanted relationship to the Kingdom. Various other meanings, differing but slightly from those given, are presented by authors, and we may conclude by saying, that while the name embraces in its comprehensive meaning allusions to the Incarnation, the Messiahship, the covenanted relationship, and an affinity to humanity as the Second Adam, yet, in virtue of His being the covenanted Man or Son of David, its meaning reaches far beyond the present into the future, indicating the future conjoining and manifestation of the covenanted Son of Man and His Kingdom. These two *are inseparable*, and the one suggests the other. Hence it is incorrect to say, as an eminent writer does, that we are not to "seek the explanation of this name in any views bearing *on the future*." To confine the name to His First Advent or to this dispensation, is *to limit it within unauthorized bounds*, for Jesus repeatedly shows that this name stands allied with, and most intimately related to, *His final Advent and the revelation of His Kingdom*. Van Oosterzee, in his Art. "The Son of Man" (*Princeton Review*, July, 1878), accurately says, what we also must not overlook, that the very assumption of this name, whatever the intention, evidences—as no other man assumed it as a significant title—that "He was conscious of being originally and essentially different from man, and infinitely more." This is true, but to it we must add, that Omniscience gave Him this very title *in the covenanted line and Theocratic Purpose*, seeing that in Him, as David's Son, God—the Divine—would thus draw nigh to man in man. Fausset (*Com.* Ezek. 2 : 1 and Dan. 7 : 13) says, the "title, as applied to the Messiah, implies at once His lowliness and His exaltation in His manifestations as the Representative Man at His First and Sec. Comings respectively." Whatever of truth in this, it does not sufficiently express the covenanted and predicted Theocratic relationship. (Comp. Dr. Schaff's "*Excursus* on the Meaning of the Title 'The Son of Man'" in Lange's *Com. John*, p. 98; much of which we can incorporate with our view.)

Obs. 3. The manner in which Jesus employs this name is strongly corroborative and enforcive of our line of argument. In the use of

it Jesus speaks of Himself as of a third person instead of employing the pronominal or customary personal application. Writers say that this is a more intensive, dignified, majestic form of speaking, but Judge Jones (*Notes* on Matt. 16 : 27) comes the nearest to the truth when he writes : " Our God uses this form of designation as *a titular distinction* to denote His relation to this world as its Sovereign or Lord" —to which is to be added, in order to bring out the whole truth, that the same is founded *on His covenanted relationship* as the Son of David to whom David's throne and Kingdom (i.e. the Theocracy), and through the latter a world-dominion, is promised. It embraces then in its meaning *the personal King* to whom the Kingdom belongs, the perfected Redeemer and perfected Redemption through Him in accordance with covenanted promises, the exaltation of humanity and its intimate union with the Divine as intimated in the covenants, and, therefore, is a name that will *never be laid aside*, but continues forever perpetuated *as most significant, descriptive, and real.* For, in alliance with it is derived, as God has sworn, the salvation of mankind, not in prospect or in progress but completed, and, hence appropriately, the name is *not merely applied to the incarnate Jesus but to the glorified Christ.* If this were not so, a serious defect, vitiating our entire argument, would be found, but with it unity and an essential factor is astonishingly preserved.

With some surprise, we find even Renan (*Life of Jesus*, p. 144, who notices that the title "Son of Man" occurs eighty-four times in the Gospels, and always in the discourses of Jesus) saying : " But He is never thus addressed, doubtless because the name in question *could be more fully accorded to Him only at the period of His Sec. Coming.*" This is true, for applicable as the name was to Jesus at His First Advent, yet it is *preeminently so* at His Sec. Advent, and the decisive proof is, that He Himself repeatedly and constantly thus refers it, making the future coming in power and glory in the establishment of the Kingdom *the emphatic coming of the Son of Man* (as e.g. Matt. 16 : 27 ; 26 : 64 ; 25 : 31 ; 19 : 28 ; Mark 8 : 38 ; 13 : 26 ; Luke 9 : 26 ; 21 : 27 ; John 5 : 27, etc.). The covenant promises demand this, and our faith in the covenant is strengthened by *the significant* phraseology of Christ. As already intimated, the God ruling in a Theocracy is taken *for granted* as fundamental to the idea of a Theocracy (hence even the Jews, as in the case of the high priest, looked for " the Son of God " to come and reign), therefore the phrase " the Son of God " is omitted and the phrase " the Son of Man" is substituted for the reasons assigned, thus giving us, if we will but receive it, the idea of God ruling in and through humanity. Dr. Schaff (*The Person of Christ*), therefore, correctly makes the title "Son of Man" one of elevation, dignity, instead of one of humiliation (so also Trench on *The Parables*, Nevin, and many others). This enables us also to appreciate the perversion of the title by others, as e.g. that it denoted (Amner) the Roman Republic, or (Grotius) the Fifth Kingdom, or (Berg) the United States, etc.

Obs. 4. The most fruitful source of misinterpreting this Kingdom arises from not discriminating to whom this Kingdom is specially promised. According to the covenant—and this must necessarily be the basis of a correct Scriptural representation—it *is promised to the Son of David, the Son of Man.* Not noticing this simple fact, leads to grave misapprehension. Many authors (as e.g. Priest, in Introd. to *View of Mill.*) assert that Jesus Christ now reigns in virtue of His Divinity and attributes as God, and, therefore, we are *to expect no other reign.* But *this is a confounding of things that differ* (comp. Props. 79, 80). No one refuses to believe in the Sovereignty of God as God, but this is materially different from a reign which is to be manifested in and through *a Son of Man in a purely Theocratic manner,* i.e. God in and through David's Son *conde-*

scending to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler, which is the primary and true meaning of a Theocratic ordering as once witnessed and as covenanted. This Theocracy is given to this Son of Man (Prop. 83), and the reign is manifested through *the glorified* Son of David. Let it be repeated: it is not the Divine Sonship that constitutes "*the Christ*" (although an *essential* element), and it is not the Davidic Sonship that constitutes Him "*the Messiah*" (although *essentially* requisite), but it is *the two inseparably united* that makes Him "*the Christ.*" Now while this is so, the covenant and prophecies, in view of the incorporation of the Davidic line in the contemplated and purposed Theocratic Kingdom, point out *the Man,* in and through whom this rule shall be manifested. Thus we have (1) the Son of Man, as presented by covenant the central figure; (2) with this Son of Man is united the Divine to insure a pure and perpetual *Theocratic* rule; (3) this reign being Theocratic, and under a manifested Son of Man, is *diverse* from the general Sovereignty of God; (4) that to encourage our faith in the covenanted Theocracy stress is laid *on the future coming and reign of "the Son of Man."*

It is, therefore, a distinctive title, constantly having a fixed, determined meaning, and not, as our opponents assert, susceptible of a variable or indefinite meaning. Thus e.g. Alexander (*Com. on Matt.* 10 : 23) overlooked this personal title, and pronounces the expression "till the Son of Man be come," "an indefinite expression meaning *sometimes more and sometimes less,* but here equivalent to saying, 'till the object of your mission is accomplished.'" And in the same comment, he makes it equivalent to "the Kingdom (i.e. the Church) of Messiah finally established." The simple fact is this: the phrase "Son of Man," in its covenanted sense, does *not fit* into a spiritualistic system, and hence arises the various and conflicting senses applied to it, making it to denote more or less by way of accommodation. The Pre-Mill. doctrine alone gives it one determined and continuous meaning, and consistently preserves it throughout. One of the most repulsive and unscriptural statements, given (*Introd.*) under the plea of "the illuminating power of the Holy Ghost," is Swormstedt's (*The End of the World is Near,* ch. 6,) who, in his astounding interpretation of Rev. 12, makes (p. 78-9) the man-child to be the Second Adam born at the time of the marriage of the glorified church, and this birth consists in *the separation of the union of the Divine and human natures!* We give his idea thus: "The divine purposes, for which the two natures of God and man were united in the person of Jesus, viz.: the atonement, and intercession, and the perfecting the Second Adam, the seed of Abraham, having been accomplished at the moment the man-child is born, the mysterious union of the human and divine natures existing in the person of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is *terminated then,* and the glorified spiritual man, who is the Second Adam, stands forth before the glorified church, *separate and distinct from the Godhead.*" This is monstrous! evidencing but little knowledge of the Person of a Messiah, the Theocratic idea, the Second Adamship, the perpetuity of the Christ and of His Divine glory, the unchangeableness of Jesus. It is derogatory and dishonoring.

Obs. 5. The Theocracy is promised to this Son of Man, and this teaches us to anticipate two things. (1) The Theocracy is *a visible, outward Kingdom.* Now indeed overthrown, but its restoration promised under this "Son of Man," and *so openly, so visibly* that all flesh shall realize and acknowledge it. It is predicated of this Son of Man, that at His. Sec. Coming, He shall, through the power committed unto Him, overthrow His enemies and firmly re-establish *the downfallen* Theocratic Kingdom, and exhibit *in an outward rule, an external organized form,* the full realization of the Theocratic idea. (2) The very phrase "the Son of Man" *implies and necessitates the visibility* of His Coming and reign; to spiritualize it away destroys *both* its covenanted force and the fulfilment of covenant promise. Luther on this name, in his Dis. on Luke 21 : 25-27, re-

marks: "But, as He says, it is 'The Son of Man' whom they shall see, it is clearly expressed that it is *a bodily coming and a bodily seeing, in a bodily form,* though it shall be in great power," etc. Luther is correct, for unless the Son of David comes thus to reign (glorified as to humanity), the covenant *cannot be fulfilled,* and the Theocracy *cannot be established* (comp. Props. 121 and 122).

A number of interesting features connected as results from the Kingdom being that of "the Son of Man," must be left for future consideration, such as the decided indication of a personal reign, as the early churches held, the suitableness and grandeur of the view that the Son of Man should in His glorified humanity exhibit His promised sovereignty in the very place where He lived in humiliation, suffered, and died, the elevation of humanity in and through Him, etc. Some of the views held on this point present a sad commentary of human infirmity, which thinks to improve covenanted and oath-bound language by spiritualizing it, making it to mean something very different from the expressed grammatical sense.

Obs. 6. "The Son of Man" is fully identified with *the re-establishment* of the Davidic throne and Kingdom by covenant and promise. In view of this, therefore, it was eminently proper for Jesus to employ this phrase in the manner recorded. If the reader turns to Psl. 80, he will find David referring to the elect Jewish nation brought out of Egypt, with whom God is angry so that it is overthrown and placed in the hands of the heathen. Imploring the Divine interposition and recalling the covenanted promises, he prays with faith and hope in the future restoration of the nation: "*Let Thy hand be upon the Man of Thy right hand, upon the Son of Man whom Thou madest strong for Thyself.*"

To indicate how this idea of "the Son of man" was held by the Jews, we quote the following from the "Parables of Enoch," c. 46 : 1, 2 : "And then I saw one who had a head of days (i.e. was old, the Ancient of Days), and His head was white as wool, and with Him was another whose face was like the appearance of a man ; full of agreeableness was his face like that of the holy angels. And I asked one of the angels who went with me, who showed me all the secret things concerning the Son of man, who He was, and whence He was, and why He came with that head of days. And he answered and said to me, This is the Son of man who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who will reveal all the treasures of secrecy, because the Lord of Spirits (God) has chosen Him. . . . And this Son of man, whom thou hast seen, will arouse the kings and the mighty from their couches and the powerful from their thrones, and will loosen the bonds of the mighty and break the teeth of sinners." He is also called "the Chosen One," the "Just One," and the "Anointed." In ch. 48 : 3, a pre-existence of the Messiah is asserted, and in ch. 2 : 7, it is said : "For previously the Son of man was hidden, and the Most High God preserved Him before His power, and revealed Him to the chosen ones." As to our application to the Messiah of Ps. 80, compare e.g. Alexander *Com. loci,* and Acts 5 : 31.

Obs. 7. Hence at the Sec. Advent there must be, in order to fulfil the oath-bound covenant made with David (viz.: that one "according to the flesh" must be raised up to sit on *the restored* Theocratic throne), *a real, veritable Son of David.* The humanity, glorified as it may be, *cannot be ignored;* it is *an essential factor* in the Theocratic ordering. Therefore the coming of "*the Christ*" is represented as the Coming of "*the Son of Man,*" i.e. a coming in *the very humanity* assumed under covenanted relationship.

Various writers (comp. e.g. Alford, Lillie, Braune (Lange's *Com.*), Ger. Ver., etc., render 2 John 7 "is coming in the flesh," i.e. is coming in humanity, referring it to the Sec. Advent, while 1 John 4 : 2 "hath come in the flesh" is interpreted of the First Ad-

vent. However this may be, the coming of humanity in glory is *a result* of the first coming in humiliation ; and the one is just as reasonable and essential as the other. The Divine Plan requires both to effect the grand consummation. Even some of the apocryphal books do not rid themselves of this view. Thus e.g. in *the Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Sec. Cent.), the reign is attached to the humanity without discarding the Divine : "The Lord God, the Mighty One of Israel, shall appear upon earth as man." The book of Enoch also employs the phrase "Son of Man." Martensen, Oosterzee, and many others have properly insisted upon the fact that *the individuality* of Christ must be so maintained that "even a glorified individuality, a spiritual body, cannot be conceived of, without limitations," otherwise "we are in danger of that error, which has so often appeared among mystics and Theosophists, which loses sight of *a personal Christ* in the general life of the Godhead ; of the Christ of grace and salvation, in a pantheistic Christ of nature" (so Martensen). But if we were to assign a *firm reason* for such a view, it is found in the simple fact that covenant and prophecy, indicative of God's purpose, in their still future fulfilment *imperatively demand* it.

Obs. 8. The critical reader will not fail to notice that the Incarnation is *a covenanted necessity*, and that it forms *a fundamental part* of our system of faith ; for without it the fulfilment of covenant promises *would be impossible*.

This doctrine, therefore, enforces the view of Dr. Dorner and others, of the necessity of the Incarnation, even apart from the fall. This we derive from *the Theocratic* ordering, by which the purest and firmest rule, theocratically, can be inaugurated and permanently secured. Again : while many systems make the Incarnation a central point in Theology, they either apply it mystically (as e.g. a present assimilating of the man into the Divine, as the Divine took upon itself man's nature and transformed it, etc.), or else they virtually end its career as a still working factor in the Plan of Redemption from the death on the cross, or have it so overshadowed and absorbed by Deity that in the future it presents *no special prominence* as a leading characteristic of the Kingdom. Firmly holding to the covenant, and the promises based thereupon, many views, extensively prevailing and imbedded in the faith of multitudes, *must be discarded* as both derogatory to "the Christ" in His future manifestation as "the Son of Man," and to the oath-confirmed covenant of God that positively requires this revelation *of the Humanity* of the King. It is not only Schwenkfeld (Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 155) that has the "human nature absorbed by the divine," but many have the same in a kind of pious mystical Pantheism, by which they think to exalt the Divine at the expense of the human, urged to it by the old, old *gnostic* feeling respecting matter. The Incarnation, so necessary and exceedingly precious, introduces us to the personality of "the Christ," as promised ; it is provisional for the contemplated end. On the other hand, the "Turneyites" (*The Ch. Lamp*) hold that Jesus is not a true descendant of David's, not truly of his lineage, being "of the seed of David" but not "the seed of David," hence not truly David's son, but only David's Lord. Now this is flatly opposed to *the Davidic covenant*, for he was not merely a man, separate and distinct, but he was to proceed from the loins of David, *according to the flesh* (supernaturally as Isaac), and hence is constantly and invariably recognized *as David's Son*. Again, Fiske (*The Christ of Dogma*, p. 125 of the *Unseen World*), without a particle of proof, and over against express usage (John 1 : 51 ; 3 : 13 ; 4 : 27 ; 13 : 31, etc.), asserts, that in the Gospel of John, "the title Son of Man has lost its original significance, and becomes synonymous with 'Son of God.'" He makes a number of similar unfounded remarks, indicative of a desire to find flaws when they do not exist. Unbelief parades, with evident relish, the ideas of incarnation as presented in some mythologies, in order, if possible, to weaken the Christian idea, but we accept of the same as expressing a need and longing of humanity, viz. : that God should manifest Himself to man in a form indicative of union and accessibility. Neander (*Life of Christ*, 2 : 12) makes some remarks in this direction, showing that these "cravings of the spirit" express the "wish, even though unconscious, to secure that union with God which alone can renew human nature, and which Christianity shows us is a living reality" (com. Dorner on *the Person of Christ*). The Ch. Incarnation is not an isolated fact, but results from a regular, revealed Divine Plan, as will hereafter be shown.

PROPOSITION 82. *This Kingdom is a complete restoration in th person of the Second Adam or Man, of the dominion lost by the First Adam or Man.*

The reign of Christ as "the Son of Man" points us back to the fall in which humanity was so sadly involved, and then forward to the period when humanity, through this manifestation of this Son of Man, is fully restored to the blessings forfeited by the fall. Among these blessings a right royal one is grounded in the developing Plan of Redemption, by which man shall again be restored *to the dignity of dominion* through Him, who by virtue of His relationship to the human in the covenanted line, has obtained *the forfeited right* originally granted to man, and which, as King on David's throne, will be most gloriously exerted, being sublimely and irresistibly aided by the Divine united with Him.

Obs. 1. What the dominion forfeited by sin was to be, is clearly announced, e.g. by the Psalmist and Paul. We leave others inform us of its meaning and extent. Thus e.g. Barnes (*Com. Heb.* 2 : 6) says it constituted man "*Lord of all things*," that "*all things were placed under the control and jurisdiction of man*," that "*all things were subject to Him and all obeyed.* Man was made a little lower than the angels, and was *the undisputed Lord* of the lower world," etc. Kurtz (Sac. His., p. 39), states, that "he (man) is appointed *to have dominion over nature*, as the representative of God, and to conduct it to its highest development." "The powers of man were intended, agreeably to the divine appointment, to be engaged *in exercising dominion over all the earth.*" So also (Secs. 9 and 11, "*Bible and Astron.*," *His. of Old Cov.*) he was to be "*ruler of all creation*, of its varied forces and creatures." "The commencement was to lead to the goal, *man's dominion over the whole earth.*" Hodge (Sys. Div., vol. 2, p. 102) says: "God constituted him (man) *ruler over the earth.* He placed, as the Psalmist said, *all things* under his feet." "It was therefore *as a ruler* that he wore God's image, or represented Him on earth." "It was therefore *an absolutely universal dominion*, so far as creatures are concerned, with which man was invested." (Comp. *Commentaries* on Heb. 2 : 6, 7 ; Psl. 8 : 5–8.) These writers then tell us that, as the Scriptures affirm, this dominion was, in a great measure, lost, and that man, shorn of his power, could no longer act *as the representative of God.*

Such testimony, as the student well knows, could be endlessly multiplied, seeing that on this point there is a uniform teaching running from the Apostolic Fathers down, through the Reformers, to the present time. But alas! while fully admitting the fact, thousands are utterly unprepared to receive *the logical result* which Redemption in its restorative process introduces *as the goal intended.* Consistency requires, that if we believe *in perfect Redemption*, then we also must accept of *the legitimate result* following as indicated

in these pages, viz. : *an actual, real restoration of the dominion forfeited*, through the Messiah, and *not some other* dominion in the third heaven or universe substituted in its place. The forfeiture and the restoration must, logically and Scripturally, *refer to the same*. We append the pertinent statements of a recent writer, as illustrative of much that might be quoted. Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 308–9) says : "Man's original inheritance was a lordship or dominion, stretching over the whole earth." . . . "When he fell, he fell from his dominion," . . . "the inheritance departed from him ; he was driven from Paradise, the throne and palace of his Kingdom." And then follows a vivid portrayal of how "Satan was permitted to enter and extend his usurped sway over the domain, from which man has been expelled as its proper lord," etc. But then he vitiates his own concessions by making, in various places, the promises of a restoration to this forfeited dominion typical of something else. Multitudes make it equivalent to a reign in the third heaven, and religious literature is full of such erroneous conclusions.

Obs. 2. In the next place, all Christian writers on the subject inform us that this dominion is restored to man again *through Jesus Christ*, the second Adam. But, with the exception of Millenarian writers, they somehow confine it to Jesus in His Divine Sovereignty, overlooking what they themselves assert respecting *its being given to the Man Jesus*, and ignoring the fact taught that this dominion *is relegated from and through Him to His brethren* (the co-heirs). Such spiritualize the dominion, and do not allow *its ultimate realization in the very place where it was forfeited*, i.e. they refuse to believe in man's restored dominion *over the earth*, and make thus *an imperfect* Redemption. We hold that, as Scripture plainly teaches, this dominion is restored through the Son of Man ; that those who inherit with Him share in its exercise ; that it is manifested *here on earth* (being a forfeited dominion pertaining *only* to the earth); and that thus *completed* Redemption is experienced.

To illustrate how writers, in no doctrinal sympathy with us, insist upon the restoration of this dominion in Jesus as man, we quote Barnes (*Com. Heb.* 2 : 6, comp. Stuart's *Com. on Heb.* and *Excurs. IX.*) : "It was not true (v. 8) that all things were subject to Him, and the complete truth of that declaration would be found only in the jurisdiction conferred on the Messiah—*the man* by way of eminence—the incarnate Son of God." After showing that Paul's argument is based on man's losing the control or power originally given, which is restored in Christ, he adds : "It is found complete only in the *second man, the Lord from heaven* (1 Cor. 15 : 47), the Lord Jesus, to whom this control is absolutely given." It is true that some endeavor to weaken Paul's reasoning in favor of the restoration of this dominion, by making Ps. 8 refer to man in general, and that Paul employs the language only by way of illustration or accommodation. But to this we reply : (1) Paul *directly* applies the Ps. to Christ ; (2) the spirit and intent of the Ps. contains more than is applicable to man in general ; (3) the apostle teaches us that the Ps. is not yet fulfilled in the pre-eminent man, saying : "but now we see not yet all things put under Him ;" (4) the abundant references in other places of a forfeited dominion and the same restored under the Messiah sustains this interpretation ; (5) the incarnation and subsequent exaltation of Christ confirms the delineation thus given ; (6) the dominion under the whole heaven given at a future period to this man and His associated saints, shows that Paul, under the Spirit's guidance, saw a force and depth in the predictions which *alone* can be realized in and through the Son of man. Hudson (*Debt. and Grace*, p. 6) correctly observes : "The passage (in Ps. 8) can only be explained as a prophecy of Christ. This is required by the true sense of one important word, and is so understood by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1. p. 313), after advocating that "the renovated earth" is "the ultimate inheritance of the heirs of salvation," remarks : "And of what else can we understand the representation in the 8th Ps., as interpreted by the pen of inspiration itself, in the Epis. to the Hebrews, 2 : 5–9, and 1 Cor. 15 : 27, 28? These passages in the N. T. put it *beyond a doubt*, that the idea of a perfect and universal dominion, delineated in the Ps. is to be realized *in the world to come*, over which Christ, as the head of redeemed humanity, is to rule, in company with His redeemed people." (So compare Dr. Moll, Lange's *Com.* Heb. p. 54–5.)

Obs. 3. This dominion, here on earth, will be exerted by Jesus, the Man, through the re-establishment *of the Theocratic* ordering. It is the restored Theocratic Davidic throne and Kingdom, in its organized and associated capacity, under the leadership of the covenanted King that constitutes *the leverage* for the exertion of this dominion. The saints, made like unto Christ and associated with Him in His power, largely participate in it, *all nature* being brought into subjection to them. Thus the Scriptures will be *amply fulfilled.*

Obs. 4. Hence, while this dominion is even now lodged in the Son of Man, yet it is held *in abeyance* until the period of its manifestation in and through this Kingdom. This has already been shown by various considerations, and will appear still more conclusively as we proceed. Therefore it is erroneous (as a multitude of writers, including Hodge, Barnes, etc., just quoted), to say that this dominion was *fully attained and realized by the incarnation and the exaltation of the Son af God.* It certainly belongs to Him ; but we must leave the Scriptures to decide respecting its *actual* realization. From the Covenant thus far *provisionally* fulfilled, the most glorious portion remaining in a state of abeyance, we can already see that it is *a wrong inference* to suppose *an existing* realization when the same is related with *the restored* Theocratic Kingdom. *So long* as the Davidic tabernacle is in ruins, this dominion *cannot and will not* be exerted. The dominion is given to Him as "*the Son of Man*" (Jno. 5 : 27 ; Psl. 8 : 7 ; Heb. 2 : 6, etc.), and this at a pre-ordained time (next Prop.). He is constituted the absolute Lord over all because He is " the Son of Man ;" but this dominion pertaining to Him as the promised seed, related both to God and man, He did not fully (only on some occasions to indicate His power), exercise while on earth ; He does not now as " the Son of Man" put forth the power with which He is invested, for He *has not yet been revealed* as the King, the Judge, the Maker of all things new, the Repealer of the curse—we see *not yet all things put under Him,* and He is *awaiting* the time when His enemies shall be made His footstool. But the period of time is coming *when this will be done,* and the dominion, held in restraint for purposes of mercy and love, will be exhibited with God-like power and glory. As the Son of Man, the Second Adam, He becomes the Lord of the world, but that Lordship is *not yet* manifested, it remaining veiled *until certain preparatory* purposes are accomplished and the time arrives for its blessed appearance through the covenanted Theocratic-Davidic throne ;—for just as at the First Advent by the Incarnation the Christ is brought into direct relationship with humanity and from thence sustains His covenanted position in this particular, so also at the Sec. Advent by the Incarnation, as continued in " the Son of Man," " the Christ," in the inherited throne and Kingdom, is brought *into direct Theocratic relationship with humanity, and from this revealed position exerts His power in behalf of that humanity with which He is identified.*

Man, during the past ages, has sought to recover this dominion unaided and through his own power, and the Word represents it as a struggling of " beasts" for sovereignty, resulting in a mutual rending and destruction. Is this picture true ? Let history attest, with its constant wars, overthrow of states and kingdoms, man being the " prey of man," bloodshed and slaughter, murder and rebellion, etc. The Scriptures teach us that this Jesus, appointed for the express purpose, alone can, and will ultimately, restore it. In this connection the student will observe that this second headship in Christ

restores the human family to its destined but forfeited Theocratic rulership or dominion, and, therefore, to confine this headship simply to relationship to man and salvation from sin (which it includes), is to leave out *a specific and most precious blessing.* (Comp. e.g. Props. 120, 202, 204, and 207.)

Obs. 5. It is only in the Millennial age, *when* this Theocratic Kingdom is established, that this forfeited dominion is fully restored. This is evident from the vivid descriptions, not only of the universal and absolute rule of Christ, but also of the dominion and glory of the saints. Hence this era *must be preceded* by the Coming of "the Son of Man" (Prop. 119–121).

Such a restored dominion involves, as a matter of course, *the personal* presence and rule of the Second Adam *here on the earth*, where the First Adam would have exerted it. It teaches us that it is not a dominion exercised in the third heaven, for it is one committed to man and pertains to this earth. It is not to be sought in this dispensation, for down to the very end wickedness will abound. It is not to be found in the Church as at present existing, for down to the Advent the believer himself is under the pressure of the curse. It is, therefore, future, and associated with "the appearing and Kingdom," and with "the world to come."

Obs. 6. If such an external, outward dominion is lacking in the history of the earth, *then* an important restitution is wanting, and we receive an *imperfect* Redemption; with its restoration we obtain an important element of *perfected* Salvation. Writers abundantly admit that this dominion would have been witnessed *here on earth* if Adam had not fallen, but somehow they overlook the fact, that as the Redeemer is given to recover us *from all the effects* of the fall, it must, under the auspices of the restoring Second Adam, *again be witnessed on earth* when Redemption is completed. Simple consistency, the perfection of Redemptive work, the efficiency and honor of the Redeemer, the ability of God to save and the worthiness of the Saviour—*all* require this restored dominion.

The prevailing view, derived from the Origenistic, limits this dominion to a present reign of Christ in heaven; but this, aside from other considerations, vitiates even their own representations of its original design, viz.: to be "representative of God on earth," "a ruling for God over all the earth," "a dominion exercised over all things, bringing nature into subjection," etc. Taking their views of the original grant, *none of these things are witnessed here on the earth;* the Ruler is in heaven, and not on the earth, His followers are suffering and chastened, His rights as "the Christ" are unacknowledged by multitudes, etc.

Obs. 7. This dominion, promised, predicted and restored, is corroborative of the Biblical account of *man's noble origin and high destiny,* forming quite a contrast to the ignoble theories of recent scientists. And may we not suggest, that as the period of this restoration draws near, the efforts that are so persistently made by able men to degrade the origin of man to the lowest scale, is *not altogether* one of chance or fortuitous circumstances, but to the student and believer have a deeper and more significant meaning—being in accordance with the predicted characteristic of the times just preceding the restitution.

What the Roman Catholic writer, Schlegel (*Phil. of His.*, s. 1), says, in opposition to the idea of man's low origin, we, in view of the Divine unity of Purpose thus manifested, can repeat: "We may boldly answer, that man, on the contrary, was originally, and by the very constitution of his being, designed to be the lord of creation, and, though in a subordinate degree, the legitimate ruler of the earth and the world around him; the

vicegerent of God in nature." God will not allow sin to triumph in the utter destruction of this grant, but will evince that grace in Jesus, the Christ, that will secure the victory in this, as well as in all other, respects. Tholuck (*Com.* Rom. 5 : 12) produces a Jewish Rabbi, who remarks : "The secret of Adam is the secret of the Messiah," "As the first man was the one that sinned, so shall the Messiah be the one to do sin away." (Comp. p. 55, Lange's *Com.* Heb.)

PROPOSITION 83. *This Kingdom is given to the Son of Man by God, the Father.*

This bestowal of the Kingdom to the Son of Man by the Father, is *clearly and explicitly taught* in the covenant. Hence in agreement with it, we have the language of Dan. 7 : 13, 14; Isa. 49; Luke, 22 : 29 and 1 : 32, etc. The Divine Sovereignty insures it unto Him.

Daniel (7 : 14) says that "*there was given unto Him* (*the Son of man*) *dominion, and glory, and a Kingdom, that all people,*" etc. Luke (1 : 32): "*the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David,*" etc. (comp. Ps. 2 and 110, etc.). The Saviour Himself seems to refer to this fact in the Parable of the Ten Pounds (Luke 19 : 15), "*that when he was returned, having received the Kingdom,*" etc. It may be added : in view of the angel announcing that "the Lord God shall give," we have "*the Ancient of Days*" (in Dan.) interpreted as the Father (for to make the Son of man and the Ancient of Days the same is both harsh and inconsistent with the analogy of the Word). Because of the Theocratic nature of the Kingdom, and the Father bestowing this Kingdom upon the Son of David, it is sometimes called (Matt. 26 : 29) the "*Father's Kingdom*" (Matt. 13 : 39–43), "*the Kingdom of the Father*," because in *this Theocratic ordering* the Father and the Christ *are one*, both are associated together as in Rev. 11 : 15, and 22 : 3 ; because of the covenanted relationship of Jesus, it is more frequently spoken of as His throne and Kingdom. The different aspects under which this Kingdom is represented because of its Theocratic nature—the Divine participating in and enforcing the rule of the humanity—already enforces the idea of the perpetuity of the Kingdom (comp. Prop. 159). While it is difficult to say, on grammatical grounds (so Winer, Olshausen, *Com. loci*), that in Tit. 2 : 13 the great God and the Saviour Jesus Christ refer to the same person, yet it may be said : (1) that if it does (to Jesus), as many maintain (e.g. Beza, Clem. Alex., Mack, Matthies, Whitby, Bull, Usteri, Olshausen, Wiesinger, Horne, Middleton, Barnes, Bloomfield, etc.), then is it verified in the Theocratic personage and position of Jesus, in and through whom the Father is manifested (see Prop. 200). (2) On the other hand, if it refers to two persons or subjects, the Father and the Son as many others declare (as Ambrose, Grotius, Wetstein, Heinrichs, De Wette, Channing, etc.), then there is an evident allusion either to this period when the Father gives this Kingdom to the Son of man, or to the fact that a pure Theocratic ordering requires the intimate and enduring association of the Father with the Son in such a rule, so that the Father is manifested in and through the Son.

Obs. 1. This *giving* of the Kingdom by the Father to the Son of Man, shows, what has already been observed, that this Kingdom is something *very different* from the general Divine Sovereignty exercised by God. The Kingdom is an outgrowth from it, and the Divine Sovereignty will be exhibited through it, being constituted in *the Theocratic* form, which in its initiatory form was separated in its Rulership by two persons (i.e. God and David) but is *now happily conjoined*—making it thus efficacious, irresistible, and ever-enduring—*in one, i.e.*, "*the Christ.*"

Obs. 2. This Kingdom is given to the Son of Man *at a particular, definite time.* Now without entering into a discussion (see e.g. Prop. 121) concerning the period of time designated by Daniel, we only, at present,

remark: (1) that as this Kingdom is *unalterably associated* with David's Son *restoring the fallen* Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom (so both covenant and promise), and as such a restoration has *not yet* been experienced, it must, in the very nature of the case, *be still in the future;* (2) that the peculiar phraseology, corroborated by the prophets and applied by Jesus, *unmistakably refers it to the Sec. Advent*, which we have already seen (e.g. Props. 56–68), is the designated time for taking the Kingdom. Down to the present the covenant remains unfulfilled, and the Kingdom *continues postponed* until the times of the Gentiles have elapsed. The investiture, visible, is delayed for wise, and, to us accounted worthy to reign, glorious purposes. Hence, whatever may be alleged respecting the Divine nature of Christ, it is an established and plainly seen fact, that the Seed of David, as such, does *not now reign as the covenant requires and the prophets described* (i.e. a reign here on earth in the restored Theocratic order), but we are assured, both by the oath of God and the provisions already made, *that when the proper time arrives, this will be verified.*

Obs. 3. By simply keeping in the line of *the covenanted Kingdom* which the Father in the appointed time, still future, will bestow upon the Son of David, we know how to estimate that vast mass of mystical conceptions and spiritualistic descriptions given by Origen, Swedenborg, Randolp, and a host of others, of *the predicted* Kingdom being *now already realized* in some form, or to be experienced *immediately after* death. The Kingdom to exist *necessitates*, as a primary condition, *the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom*, seeing that the Theocratic ordering is bound up with the same. A Theocracy, without such a restoration, is, as covenant and promise teach, *an idle dream.*

This serves to throw light on the rendering of Acts 3 : 21, a passage disputed by the Lutherans and Reformed (Olshausen's *Com.*, vol. 3, p. 221, and foot-note of K.). The English version, although condemned by the Form of Concord, is evidently correct, seeing that the Kingdom is promised and given to the Son of Man *as the Seed of David.* Hence Peter, in strict accord with the facts as existing, represents Jesus as one whom the heavens receive *until* the time when He is manifested as King, and not as one who receives the heavens.

Obs. 4. Because we are told (Heb. 10 : 12), that "this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever sat down on the right hand of God," it is inferred that this exaltation of the human nature embraces the predicted rulership of the Son of Man. But in this very connection (next verse), as if to guard us against such an inference, it is added: "*From henceforth expecting*" (Barnes, etc., "*waiting,*") "*till His enemies be made his footstool.*" All commentators agree that this overthrow and subjection is still future, and the Scriptures teach in the plainest manner that it is connected *with His Sec. Advent.* This, therefore, fully corresponds with our argument, for the passage must be considered and interpreted in connection with many others.

Some press the word "forever" to an extent that would forbid a Second Advent; others, as Bloomfield, Barnes, etc., connect the phrase "forever" with the sacrifice (i.e. he never comes again to make a sacrifice); the writer has his doubts whether the sense of the Greek is correctly given, seeing that "forever" does not give the force of the preposition and of a word understood with which the adjective agrees. It is merely suggested, that as Jews were addressed and the subject was the covenant, the word was not supplied, being understood. Might it not be rendered, to keep up the connection, "ac-

cording to or in conformity to the everlasting covenant," or in something similar, i.e. to verify this covenant it became necessary, etc. However rendered, one thing is certain: it *cannot* conflict with express covenant promises.

Obs. 5. The Sovereignty of the Father is the foundation, the security, that *David's Son* shall obtain this Kingdom at the allotted time, and, therefore, this Sovereignty is also represented as giving up into the hands of this Son of Man all his enemies. Hence, in view of *the Oneness* of the Father and Son, one class of passages intimate that the enemies of Christ are given into His power by the Father, and yet when the work of subduing these enemies is specifically stated and in detail, it is one assigned to the Son (sustained by His relationship to the Father), because *the Father commits all judgment and the Judgeship to Christ as the Son of Man*, and Jesus, at His revelation, is described as coming in vengeance, etc. Therefore it becomes the student to allow *both* classes of passages their due position and weight in the order of procedure.

Waggoner (*Ref. of Age*, p. 128), confining himself exclusively to *the one class* of passages, lays down this caption: "The work of subduing His enemies is *never* in the Scriptures ascribed to Christ, but that "the Father subdues the enemies of Christ and puts them under His feet." The simple fact is, that the Father does this *in and through Christ* Himself, Christ acting as *the agent*, and hence Christ is frequently represented in the Scriptures as the One coming in wrath, in vengeance to perform this work. Waggoner is induced to take this position in order to support a singular and favorite theory, viz.: the one thousand years' reign in heaven. But for the time he overlooks his own argument, and makes (p. 134) the following concession: "(1) The Father gives them (the enemies) to the Son. (2) *The Son breaks them with a rod of iron and dashes them in pieces*; which dashing, as has been shown, takes place *at His Coming*." But to reconcile this incongruity, he resorts to a quibble unworthy of the subject, viz.: that "there is a great difference between having His enemies put under Him, and His destroying them." Indeed, admitting a difference (in the way we have indicated), how comes it that those very enemies, instead of being "subdued," etc., are represented (Rev. 19, etc., comp. Props. 115, 123, 161, etc.), as arrayed in open hostility to Christ, *making war against Him*, and are only brought into subjection, etc., *by Christ and His armies*. We dare not ignore the action ascribed to this Son of man at His coming, and what the Father performs *through* Him.

Obs. 6. The Kingdom being given by the Father to the Son of Man, we can, keeping this fact in view, appreciate the fact stated in 1 Cor. 15 : 27, 28, viz: "*But when He saith, All things are put under Him, it is manifested that He is excepted, which did put all things under Him*," etc. (Comp. usage of present tense, Prop. 69, Obs. 9). As this point will be brought up under the perpetuity (Prop. 159) of the Kingdom, it is only necessary to add, that a Theocracy—in the very nature of the case, as seen in the form of the Kingdom, in its past history as given, and in the manner of its future restoration under David's Son—must ever retain the position of being *subordinate* to the Divine Will of the Father. This Theocratic idea Paul seeks to impress, and this very subordination is *essential* to our doctrine of the Kingdom, being indicative of a Theocracy here on earth.

This subordination is manifested in the investiture as described by Daniel ch. 7, and will be most strikingly exhibited at "the holy mount." The place of public inauguration by "the Ancient of Days" will be noticed under Prop. 166.

Obs. 7. Even if (which we do not acknowledge) we should be mistaken in ascribing Christ's present reign to the Divine nature (making it identi-

cal with God's Sovereignty) and not to the human, and which is specially exercised over the church, and yet not so specifically, outwardly, visibly (as covenanted), so that the church can now be styled the Promised Kingdom, it does not by any means follow that Christ as the Son of Man has not still a future Kingdom to come here on the earth over which He will reign. Whatever view may be taken of this intermediate state of Jesus, the covenant predictions relating to the future are *too many and decisive to be set aside.* It is proper to state this, since even some Millenarians, losing sight of *the specific promises of the covenant,* and overlooking *to whom* this Kingdom is given, viz.: to the Son of Man, also depart from the Primitive Church view, in so far as to indorse the Popish notion that Jesus, as Son of Man, now reigns in *the covenanted Kingdom* over the church, without however *discarding* the doctrine of the future visible throne and Kingdom *for which* we contend. Believing this to be an error calculated to embarrass and destroy *a proper conception* of the Kingdom, to weaken and obliterate the logical and Scriptural connection existing between covenant and fulfilment, we therefore, distinguishing between things that differ, the more strongly cleave *to the oath-bound covenant,* and, until we see a fulfilment *commensurate* with God's most solemn declarations, reject all theories which are presented in place of the Kingdom itself.

Our position simply is this: that before the Kingdom *pertaining to David's Son* can possibly be inaugurated there must be *a restoration* of the fallen Davidic throne and Kingdom; that any Sovereignty exercised by Divine right is *not* the covenanted Kingdom. The position of others is, that in connection with the future reign of Jesus here on earth, He has also a Kingdom now in the Church. As this theory will be examined in detail (Props. 89–110), we leave it with the remark: that opposers to Chiliasm sometimes endeavor to bring our doctrine into disrepute by concealing or denying that all Millenarians concede to Christ a present reigning, the one party as a Divine being (as God, being One with the Father) and exercising special care over the Church as its Head, Mediator, Intercessor, and Advocate; the other party, as the Son of man over the Church, the latter being regarded either as a visible or invisible Kingdom, to give place finally to a new and higher stage at the Sec. Advent. No Millenarian writer ever noticed by the writer but ascribes to Jesus, in some form, a present reigning—a present exercise of exalted power.

Obs. 8. The exact time when the Father will give this Kingdom to "the Son of Man" is not revealed. Signs are indeed given in the fulfilment of predictions, etc., by which an approximative (comp. Props. 173 and 174) knowledge may be gained, but the precise time is reserved by the Father as something exclusively pertaining to Himself, Acts 1 : 7; Mark 13 : 32; Matt. 24 : 36.

This gives us a clue to the perplexing passage given by Mark (13 : 32), that the Son did not know the day or hour. Now let it be noticed that this Kingdom is given by the Father to "the Son of man" at the Sec. Advent; hence it follows, (1) that Jesus speaks of this future period as "the Son of man," i.e. as David's Son; (2) that the Father retaining *the prerogative* of bestowing the Kingdom, the time of the Advent connected with the same is also thus retained as intimately associated with it. Consequently the Divine, the Father in Christ, could not reveal what *exclusively belonged* to the Father—what pertained to the Divine prerogative—and, therefore, while the descendant of David is inseparably connected with the Divine, yet the Divine in such a matter (for "My Father is greater than I") may deny to the humanity—David's Son—the precise knowledge of the day and hour, for the reason assigned. For David's Son takes the things belonging to the Father, and shows those that are allowed, the human being subservient to the will of the Father and to the knowledge imparted. Tillotson, *Ser. on Mark* 13 : 32, 33, attributes this not knowing to the human nature of Christ, refering to Luke 2 : 52, etc.,

showing that the human nature did not necessarily, by virtue of its union with the Divine, know all things, or otherwise he could not, as man, be said to grow in wisdom, etc.

Obs. 9. When this Kingdom is given by the Father *then will be perfected* the covenanted arrangement concerning "*the Man,*" as indicated in 2 Saml. 7 : 19 and 1 Chron. 17 : 17 (comp. the Davidic covenant under Prop. 49). Then in a completed sense can it be said, taking Bh. Horsley's rendering: "And this is the arrangement about the Man, O Lord Jehovah,"—"And Thou hast regarded me (David) in the arrangement about the Man, that is to be from above, O Lord Jehovah." Therefore it follows, taking covenant promises for our guide, that this Plan respecting the Kingdom is made in virtue of the humanity of Christ, His relationship to Man in the Davidic line; and God the Father *will not allow this Plan to fail,* but will in due time exhibit His Theocratic rule in and through "*the Man ordained.*"

PROPOSITION 84. *As this Kingdom is specially given to the Son of Man as the result of his obedience, sufferings, and death, it must be something different from His Divine nature, or from "piety," "religion," "God's reign in the heart," etc.*

Our argument all along involves this, for we have (1) the Kingdom promised to David's Son; (2) this promise based on the foretold affirmations that this Son shall be spotless, without sin; and (3) the continued blessedness and perpetuity of the Kingdom asserted in view of the perfect character of this descendant of David. Numerous passages declare this; hence, when we come to the Apostles, they plainly inform us that His exaltation and reception of dominion is due to His obedience, sufferings, and death. Two passages alone clearly present this to us, viz.: *Heb.* 12 : 2; *Phil.* 2 : 8, 9. The latter part of the Proposition follows as a natural sequence.

We now enter into a detailed statement in following Props., to show that the Church is *not* the covenanted and predicted Messianic Kingdom, in any sense whatever. This is the more requisite, seeing that able Pre-Mill. writers, forsaking *the strictly logical and Scriptural ground*, also—with our opponents—make a Kingdom to exist in the heart (God's reign), another in the Church, and a third still future which is to come. This is misleading, and perverts *the precise* portrayal of the Kingdom as given by covenant and prophecy. Hence the space devoted to this subject, and the meeting of every possible objection urged against us. The Christian student, desirous for truth alone, will *candidly* weigh our reasons assigned, and give them proper credit in so far as they are supported by the Word.

Obs. 1. The first clause of the Proposition is fully admitted by Commentators (as e.g. Barnes, etc.), and by Theologians (as e.g. Knapp, *Ch. Theol.*, p. 351 and 355), as "*acquired*," so that in the language of Knapp, "He received it (the government) from His Father *as a reward* for His sufferings, and for his faithful performance of the whole work, and discharge of all the offices intrusted to Him by God for the good of man." This, of course, corroborates and confirms our previous Propositions respecting the Divine Sovereignty of the Father and of the Son, and of the Kingdom being promised *to the human nature* of Jesus and not merely to the Divine. It is matter of surprise to find, after the frank acknowledgment of writers on this point, that many of them subsequently *overlook* it, and ascribe this Kingdom solely to the Divine nature. Another thing must also here be noticed, while it is true that the Kingdom is thus acquired, it is not correct to conclude as e.g. Knapp does: "this government which Jesus administers, as a man, is *not natural* to Him, or one which He attains *by birth*, but *acquired*." This is opposed to the covenant promises, for it is distinctly announced as *a prerequisite* that He *must be* of the royal line of David. It is *the distinctive Son of David* to

whom this Kingdom belongs *by covenanted Divine right*. He only *confirms* His right and title to it, as the Representative Ruler in such *a Theocratic* Kingdom, by the life and death which He manifested. Hence by these expressions we ought not to be led to reject *the claims* which Jesus has by virtue of His birth. This, as seen by previous Propositions, would be a grave mistake. The Father only confirms His right.

As illustrative of the doctrinal position of multitudes, we quote Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol. of Apos. Age*, p. 154), who says: "The Kingdom of God, which Jesus desired to make a reality, commences with His personal appearance on the theatre of the world. His Advent and the setting up of the Kingdom are *one and the same thing*, because He is the Head and cause of the Kingdom, and the cause cannot exist without the effect." Jesus is also e.g. the Head of the firstborn from the dead, and the Agent of the renewal of the earth, but the resurrection of the saints and the renewal has not yet transpired. This reasoning would be conclusive, if it could be proven that there was no postponement of the Kingdom. As it is, it begs the whole question, for we assert that there is nothing that our opponents allege concerning Christ's reign in the heart and Headship over the Church, which we cannot, and do not, cordially receive, claiming, however, that all this does not constitute a Kingdom, but is purely *a provisional, spiritual, and providential* oversight and rule tending toward *the ultimate* realization of the Kingdom itself. We distinguish between *the means and the end;* those who oppose us either blend the two together, or assume the former to be the latter. In the extract just given, the personality of the Saviour is made equivalent to the Kingdom's introduction (so many), and no heed is given to any Scriptures which restrict it, at least, to succeed an obedience rendered. Others, to save themselves from this difficulty, postpone the setting up of the Kingdom to His resurrection, or ascension, or to the day of Pentecost, but in their efforts to avoid one obstacle, plunge themselves even into greater difficulties (as e.g. if the Kingdom *is* "God's reign in the heart," was that postponed until then?), making it requisite to have *a number* of Kingdoms to meet the various contingencies.

Obs. 2. Some of the most eminent writers and commentators not knowing *how* to escape the dilemmas incident to their theory of a present existing Kingdom of promise, gravely tell us that this Kingdom is "*piety*," or "*religion*," or the most favorite phrase (as e.g. Dr. McCosh, and others), "*God's reign in the heart.*" We leave them to reconcile a Kingdom *of promise, specially* covenanted to the Son of David in the line of his humanity, and for which He rendered Himself worthy on account of obedience, with *such interpretations* as these. If piety, religion, God's reign in the heart, etc., is *the Messianic Kingdom*, we may well ask what need of such promises of the Kingdom *in* the Davidic line and why not then date the Kingdom from Adam down to the present, seeing that "piety" or "religion," or "God's reign in the heart," has existed continuously? A host of questions suggested by our various Propositions indicate *the utter absurdity* of such a definition. Piety, religion, etc., are *prerequisites* to attain to this Kingdom, and are to exist in the Kingdom itself, but are far from constituting the Kingdom.

Obs. 3. The tender of the Kingdom to the Jewish nation, its rejection, postponement, the peculiar style of preaching of the first preachers—all go to show that "piety," etc. existed with a certain portion of the Jews, *without* the establishment of the Kingdom. Yet even those who advocate that Christ's Kingdom was only inaugurated after His death take this unguarded position, just as if these things were not previously exhibited. Their definition is *inconsistent* with their own admissions, and *fatal* to a distinctive Kingdom *given* to the Son of Man. It is not necessary to press this point.

An illustration, however, showing the inconsistency may be in place. Many eminent writers enforce this heart-reigning Kingdom theory (comp. Prop. 110), but when they come to explain the predictions (e.g. Dan., chs. 2 and 7) relating to this Kingdom they forget their own theory of a heart-kingdom, and affirm that the prophecies are realized in *a visible, external* manner through the establishment of the Ch. Church.

Obs. 4. It may, however, be well to give an illustration of the inconsistency of writers who insist on this Kingship of Christ's being exercised *before* He showed Himself thus worthy to receive it. Aside from many found in this work which declare that the Kingdom was manifested when Jesus appeared, lived, etc., (and mainly derived from this "piety," "God's reign in the heart" theory), we refer to, in many respects an admirable writer, Pressense. In his *Sermon* "On Jesus Christ as King," he has (1) Jesus King even in His humiliation; (this we admit, but the Kingship was held in abeyance); (2) Jesus King on the Cross (this we admit, but hold that His royalty was not manifested); (3) Jesus King in a signal manner after the resurrection; and all this to show that His Kingdom was established and manifested continuously *from His birth.* To all this, in connection with previous arguments against such a view, we only now say, how can such a Kingdom ruled over by Jesus during His life and at the time of His death be reconciled with the Scriptures which speak of, and the countless admissions of our opponents which advocate, an *acquisition* of a Kingdom of promise *in virtue of His obedient life and death?* Our theory is consistent and requires just such a position in the Son of David. The Divine Sovereignty only bestows this acquisition, and, when given, enforces it, but only in the covenanted Davidic line. Hence, to refer to the Divine attributes lodged with Jesus (such as His power over the angels, etc.), and from thence infer that He then exerted regal power, is evidence that the party making such an inference has *no idea* of the Scriptural difference existing between the Divine Sovereignty and the Kingdom (through which that Sovereignty will be gloriously displayed) *distinctively promised to David's Son.*

Obs. 5. This evinces what the covenant, etc., demands, viz.: a Ruler, who is such in virtue also of His humanity; and includes, that this Ruler has shown what no other Theocratic Ruler can do, *His perfect adaptability* for the position, i.e. to carry out the Divine Will in government. Keeping in view the goal of Theocratic government and its requirements, we find in the honorable obedience of Christ *the most ample and satisfactory assurance* that in His occupancy of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, He will indeed be a truthful and stable Representative of God. Therefore Peter says, 1 Pet. 1 : 21, etc.

In conversation with Rev. Dr. Rodgers on this point, he suggested that one reason why the sinfulness of the ablest and most highly honored of the Theocratic Kings (as e.g. David and Solomon) is so plainly recorded in Scripture, arises from the fact that thus is shown (1) the failure of mere mortals, through infirmity, to sustain the position perfectly, and (2) to evidence, by way of contrast through trial, the perfection of Jesus as Theocratic King.

PROPOSITION 85. *Neither Abraham, nor his engrafted seed have as yet inherited the Kingdom: hence the Kingdom must be something different from "piety," "religion," and "God's reign in the heart."*

We have shown that Abraham is to inherit the promises in this Kingdom (Prop. 49, etc.), and that saints inherit with him (Prop. 62, 63, etc.). The time of inheriting the Kingdom is specified, in accordance with our argument, e. g., in Matt. 25 : 34. Therefore to make "piety," etc., the kingdom is *an incongruity.*

To say that the Patriarchs were in this Kingdom, before the Advent of "the Christ," is a palpable absurdity; to infer that they and others are *now* in it, *when* it has not appeared in its covenanted form, and *when* it has been postponed to the Sec. Advent, is equally unworthy of credence.

Obs. 1. This is virtually to make "piety" inherit "piety." This is *a substitution of the means* by which the Kingdom is obtained *for* the Kingdom itself. The saints with Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, inherit the Kingdom because they are pious, religious, and acknowledge obedience to God. The ancient and the Christian believers receive their inheritance on the same conditions.

Consequently the "Plymouth Brethren" position, which would limit "the heirs of the Kingdom" to members of the Ch. Church, must be rejected as untenable. The positive statements of inheriting *with* the Patriarchs, the necessity of being engrafted and becoming the children of Abraham *in order* to inherit, etc., forbid such a limitation. Besides, such a view perverts the Scriptural idea of *the election and its continuation* (as previously presented in detail by us). It must never be overlooked, in order to avoid both extremes, that "heirs" are "heirs" of *the same promise* given to the Patriarchs, and that so long as simply "heirs" of the salvation and Kingdom included in that promise, they have *not yet* inherited. The time of inheritance is specific; it is determinately located *at the Sec. Advent.* To antedate it, or to substitute something else, or to fritter it away by a process of spiritualizing, or to limit it to modern believers, is to ignore the express, plain language relating to "the inheritance, not of law, *but of promise.*"

Obs. 2. With the idea that believers now enjoy the Kingdom in the present dispensation, the most unjust reflections and comparisons are instituted *derogatory* to the ancient worthies. Some of these we have noticed, but to impress the matter another illustration is given from Reuss (*His. of the Ch. Theol.*, p. 150), who seems to take it for granted that saints already have inherited, or are in the enjoyment of the Kingdom of God, to the disparagement of ancient worthies, thus :—"Before time the Kingdom of God presented itself *to the imagination* (!), now it reveals itself *in the heart.* Formerly knowledge, reflection, factitious duty conferred the privileges of the Kingdom; now it is the heritage of children and the childlike," etc. A mass of just such invidious representations might readily be presented,

drawn from various writers *utterly unscriptural and dangerous* in tendency. The simple truth is, that they are destructive of the covenant promises, of the true hope, and of the Kingdom of God itself.

We give another: Beecher, *Sermon* on "The Future Life" (*Ch. Union*, Sept. 5th, 1877), after referring to the apostles being mistaken (comp. Prop. 74) in their notion of the Sec. Advent of Jesus, then adds: "The *best* Jews had *a mistaken* notion of the Kingdom of God founded on the old prophets; but when you look at what was the scope and teaching of the apostles, I think that you will find that it amounts simply to a knowledge addressed *to men's hearts* by the understanding, the intellect, acting through the ministry of the imagination—if you can get that sentence into your mind. It is an intellectual teaching; but it is expressed through the imagination," etc. All that we *now* say is this: if Beecher is correct in his degradation of ancient believers, who trusted in the plain and indubitable gram. sense of the Scriptures, then how miserably (as our history of the doctrine conclusively proves) those who sat under *this intellectual* preaching of the apostles failed to have their "imaginations" impressed and exercised. It required the "imagination" of Origen or Whitby to bring forth this intended "intellectual teaching," which tramples on covenant and prediction, and makes men—even school children—of to-day wiser respecting the Kingdom than John the Baptist and the inspired apostles, owing to a continuous inspiration. Alas! what new paths!

PROPOSITION 86. *The object or design of this dispensation is to gather out these elect, to whom, as heirs with Abraham and his seed, Christ, this Kingdom is to be given.*

This Proposition is thus presented to recall, at this point of our discussion, some conclusions previously arrived at. We have shown (1) Prop. 57, how the kingdom was rejected, (2) Prop. 58, why it was postponed, (3) Prop. 59, that during this postponement a seed is raised up unto Abraham, (4) Prop. 63, that this seed, composing the elect nation, is the one to whom the Kingdom is given. Therefore, whenever the design of this dispensation is distinctively referred to, it is *to save them that believe, to proclaim* the terms of salvation by which, if observed, men *may become inheritors* of Christ's Kingdom, *to gather out* such a body of elect ones.

Obs. 1. It is not necessary, under this heading, to notice two mistakes by which the affirmation of the Proposition is obscured by error, viz.: (1) the regarding this dispensation as the final one, and (2) the belief in the conversion of the world before the Sec. Advent. These will be made, hereafter, the subjects of special remark (as e.g. the first, under Props. 140, 138, 139, 137, etc., and the second, under Props. 175, 121, 122, 152, 153, etc.).

Obs. 2. If our argument has any logical force, based on the plain grammatical sense of covenant, and prophecy, and fact,—if it has any Scriptural weight in insisting upon a restored Theocratic order under David's Son here on the earth where the previous Theocratic rule was inaugurated, —*then* the absence of such a Theocracy *in the form covenanted,* itself is sufficient to indicate that a dispensation or ordering under the personal reign of David's Son is still future, and that the Millennial glory in the blessedness of nations will only then be realized.

Obs. 3. Our Proposition is, conseqnently, only formulating, or recalling, the conclusions arrived at under previous ones pertaining to the election. It has been shown (1) that there is an elect-people, Prop. 24, etc.; (2) this elect-people for a certain and fixed time, is discarded, Prop. 59, etc.; (3) another elect-people is gathered out, Prop. 61, etc.; (4) the former election, now held in abeyance, is fully restored, re-engrafted in order to fulfil the covenant, Prop. 66, etc.; (5) hence the design of this dispensation, or "times of the Gentiles," in which this continuation of elected ones, grafted in, is going on, is not to establish the Kingdom but *to prepare the way* for the final restoration of that Kingdom to the covenanted people, Prop. 65, etc.; (6) and that it is by our identification with that people

that we also inherit with them, Prop. 64, etc. In the very nature of the case, this dispensation, as its progressive work indicates, can do no more than *prepare the heirs* for the Kingdom.

We see in this dispensation *only that* which unmistakably proves that the covenant *will be* fulfilled; to say that in it the covenant is already realized, is either to ignore or misrepresent (if not to degrade) the most precious of its promises. As preparative, it is exceedingly precious; as bringing present blessings and the prospect of the highest honor and glory in the future, it is indispensable; as a link in the chain of Divine procedure, it is necessary to preserve and perfect a unity of Purpose.

Obs. 4. Our argument regards this dispensation (1) as *preparative* to the Kingdom; (2) as introduced, because of the fall of the Jewish nation, *to raise up a seed* unto Abraham; (3) as elective and not national in the sense that it gathers *out of all nations a people* for God; (4) as extending to all nations in its offers of mercy, but resulting in no conversion of nations but *of individuals* only; (5) as spiritual in its designs and operations, so that *no introduction* of an outward exhibition of God's Kingdom is to be expected in it; (6) as one that will end *in unbelief and Apostasy*, just like previous dispensations, proving both the continued inherent depravity of man and the non-erection of the covenanted Kingdom; (7) as one that is, therefore, an extraordinary manifestation *of Divine grace and forbearance* in Him who knows the end from the beginning; (8) as one connected with *probation, trial, suffering, chastening, bereavement*, etc., and to exalt which into the position of the Coming one (freed from these evils), is to *do violence* to the Word; (9) as one which, in the establishment and perpetuation of the Christian Church, stands forth as *a constant sign or witness* that God's purposes do not fail; (10) and hence, as *a standing proof* that, however long delayed, *the oath-bound Davidic covenant* will be most amply realized.

Obs. 5. The covenanted relationship is recalled by the phrase, "*heirs with Abraham.*" Having fully shown the necessity of this (Prop. 61, etc.), the reader may again be reminded how eminent writers, viewing this dispensation as final, take the position, demanded by their theory, that the prophecies pertaining to this Kingdom have *no relation* to Israel as a nation. This is productive of discordant interpretation, unduly exalting the present divine arrangement *to the prejudice* of the truth. We are gravely told (e.g. *Alexander on Isa.* vol. 2, p. 31) that it is not only an "*error*" but an "*irrational extreme of making Israel as a race the object of the promises.*" Leaving former Propositions (such as Props. 24, 31, 33, 49, 51, 52, 63, 68, etc.), to speak for themselves, it may well be asked: how comes it *that the Theocratic ordering is inseparably connected with the Jewish nation as such?* How comes it then that all the promises and threatenings *revolve around that Jewish race as a central pivot*, which is still recognized in the N. Test. *as indispensable*, since into that race we *must be grafted*, and to inherit we *must be adopted as Abraham's children? Why* must we become Jews (i.e. of the seed of Abraham) in order to enter this Kingdom, if the promises are not given *to that nation*, and still pertain to them? *Why* even in the time of rejection are they so wonderfully preserved, and *why* is their restoration so plainly predicted, unless the promises remain linked with them? *Why* should the threatenings be carefully given to them and the blessings pertaining to the *very*

same people, be taken from them? Surely it is *illogical*, if not worse, to appropriate *the covenant promises* to ourselves, and leave *the curses* to the Jews. God has united them and bound them together in *an inseparable* manner with that people, and seeing the latter so fearfully verified, enjoins upon us the belief that the former will also yet be realized. *The "hope of Israel" is our hope;* and such hope is greatly increased by an intelligent and consistent Scriptural interpretation of the design of this dispensation.

Obs. 6. Noticing the design of this dispensation and not *overloading* it with things that belong to a coming one, Christianity itself, as it exists, is susceptible of *a more easy* defence against the attacks of infidelity. Thus e.g. we can more readily account for its want of success in some ages, its retrogressions where once predominant, its declines and revivals, its union with much that must be discarded, etc., for these and other events do not affect its object, or prevent the carrying out of the design originally intended. Humanly speaking, these may cause a delay, but the delay itself is an experience *of continued* mercy and forbearance so that the design may be completed. On the other hand, bind upon this dispensation ideas and notions which really belong to the future coming age, and at once—in view of the Church's mixed character, the comparative meagre extension of real piety after eighteen centuries of preaching, the losses Christianity has sustained in countries where once it existed in all its vigor, the corruption of doctrine and practice, the virulent controversies and spirit often exhibited, etc.—a resort must be had to apologetic shifts, mystical subterfuges, and philosophical glosses *utterly unworthy* of a candid and noble defence. Is there a student who has not been *saddened* by the apologies of eminent believers in behalf of the gospel, who, hampered by a Church-Kingdom theory, feel themselves compelled to excuse and justify a want of success, etc., *when no such special pleading* is demanded by the design God has in view, or by the real facts in the case? God's plan, and the time employed by Him, in gathering the elect, requires on our part no *abject* vindication.

Additional evidence in behalf of the Proposition will be found under Props. 87, 88, 89, etc. The reasons (additional) for the design are given under Props. 124, 142, 118, 120, etc. Others again are found under Props. 131–139, 140, 169, 154, 158, etc. We have already laid sufficient stress on Acts 15 : 14–16, so that we need not repeat, only saying that Dr. Brown, in his recent *Com. on* Acts, entirely omits to recognize *the eclecticism* indicated by the phrase "taking out of them." As illustrative of doctrinal position, we append the views of two men. Pressense (*The Early Years of Christianity*, p. 25) makes the "vocation" of the Church to be that of "illuminating and vivifying the world"—"to purify itself within, and to extend itself without, such is the twofold task of the Church, and the ages are given for its fulfilment." Here the preconceived idea of the conversion of the world through the Church suggests the vocation (comp Prop. 175). Now in contrast, we give Dr. Fausset's (*Com. Dan.* 7 : 11) brief comment: "The New Test. views the present æon or age of the world as essentially heathenish, which we cannot love without forsaking Christ (Rom. 12 : 2; 1 Cor. 1 : 20, and 2 : 6, 8, and 3 : 18, and 7 : 31; 2 Cor. 4 : 4; Gal. 1 : 4; Eph. 2 : 2; 2 Tim. 4 : 10; cf. 1 John 2 : 15, 17). The object of Christianity is not so much to Christianize the present world as to save souls out of it, so as not to be condemned with the world (1 Cor. 11 : 32), but to rule with Him in His Millennium (Matt. 5 : 5; Luke 12 : 32, and 22 : 28–30; Rom. 5 : 17; 1 Cor. 6 : 2; Rev. 1 : 6, and 2 : 26–28, and 3 : 21 and 20 : 4). This is our hope; not to reign in the present world course (1 Cor. 4 : 8; 2 Cor. 4 : 18; Phil. 3 : 20; Heb. 13 : 14)." Pressense's view is inferential; Fausset's is directly Scriptural.

PROPOSITION 87. *The postponement of the Kingdom is the key to the understanding of the meaning of this dispensation.*

So important is this fact that before entering into a direct description of the relation that the church sustains to this dispensation and to the Kingdom, we take the liberty of referring the reader to what has been proven concerning this postponement, Props. 58–68. If our position is correct (and we deem it, as the early church did, impregnable) then it follows, as a matter of course, that *many things* now applied by divines *to this* dispensation have *no relation whatever* to it.

The great point overlooked by many theologians is this: that there was a time in the history of Christ when the proclamation of a Kingdom *near at hand totally ceased*, as we have already shown; yea, not only ceased but gave place to an entirely different tone of preaching, viz.: *the postponement of that Kingdom to the Sec. Advent.* This, of course, materially aids, as our entire argument indicates, in showing *why* the present ordering is established and continued to the Sec. Coming. Another feature forgotten is the following: that it is impossible to comprehend the Kingdom without going back to the Old Test. idea of it, which conception once received and entertained prevents an improper view of the present dispensation. While the Old Test. idea is plain, having been carried out partially in an outward, external Theocratic manifestation, yet men, to evade its force, contend that it has proven *a failure*, not keeping in mind (1) that the failure was not in God's plan but in man's depravity, and (2) that God is providing the means, as predicted, for *the ultimate realization* of His Purpose, so that there shall be no failure in the future (comp. e.g. Prop. 201 and 202). If, as Neander and others, it is insisted that God originally desired such an outward Theocratic Kingdom, but, owing to man's perversity, gave up its prosecution in that form, and so modified His Plan that the present dispensation alone gives us a kind of spiritual Theocratic Kingdom in the Church, *then* it follows—(1) that God, starting out with the intention of instituting such a Kingdom, has been foiled in His own Plan; (2) that the perverseness of man can change God's purposes, although announced under oath (as to certainty) in the Davidic covenant; (3) that this dispensation, instituted to overrule that very depravity and insure the future realization of God's original Plan, which in no shape or form exhibits the previous Theocratic idea (as presented in its initiatory form and as given by covenant), must be viewed as an evidence of God's changeableness and inability to carry out His own Purpose of government.

Obs. 1. It is a rule, more frequently violated than observed, that for a correct understanding of Scripture we should pay attention to *the particular* dispensation to which portions of it are intended to apply. Volumes, otherwise containing valuable matter, are vitiated by bringing nearly all Scripture to be applicable to the present time, or dispensation. The *distinctions* made in Holy Writ respecting the promises and blessings are broken down, and the blessings, *en masse*, are heaped upon the Gentile believers. The "dispensation of grace to the Gentiles" (Eph. 3 : 2) is fully and completely identified with "the dispensation of the fulness of times" (Eph. 1 : 10), and the result is an interpretation which mingles and interweaves *that which God's Purpose separates.* The definite postpone-

ment of the Kingdom, once entertained, preserves us from this free and plastic moulding of Scripture to suit our own ideas of the fitness of things.

Just as the Old Test. points us to a future coming Messiah, so also does the New; just as the Old directs us to a still future incoming age of Messianic blessedness, so also does the New. Properly to discriminate is to understand. As God has fully evidenced the literal fulfilment of the prophecies pertaining to Jesus in the past, and—instead of abrogating such a continued fulfilment in the future by substituting a spiritual one—thus urges us to Abrahamic faith respecting the unfulfilled, we receive, with gladness, this distinctive feature of the New Test. (corroborated by the Old), and unhesitatingly cleave to it in hope. Men too often interpret Scripture to suit their own ideas of what is suitable. When the Duke of Somerset (*Ch. Theol. and Mod. Skep.*) sarcastically refers to Paul's allegory: "After all this confusion of types the allegory fails, as commentators remark, in the very point which it was adduced to illustrate; since, according to Scripture, the Son of the bondwoman and his posterity were free of the law, whereas Isaac's descendants—the children of promise—became the slaves of the law;" and then in apparent triumphant triumph asks, "Are Protestants expected to receive Paul's allegories as the Word of God?"—we answer, Yes, by receiving Paul's own statement as to the time of fulfilment; not locating it in the past or present, but in the glorious future, when all the children of promise are gathered and inherit.

Obs. 2. Among the things which the postponement of the Kingdom effectually removes, is the prevailing opinion that *the Church is the promised Kingdom of the Messiah.* Admit the postponement, and it will be *impossible* to make the church, as present constituted, said Kingdom. For, *if postponed,* how could it be in existence? This prevents us from giving the church in its present fighting and struggling condition those *exaggerated eulogistic* praises which only pertain to it in the dispensation still future. This leads us carefully to discriminate what things appertain to past dispensations, what to the present dispensation, what to the church as now constituted, what to the church as she shall finally be manifested in glory with the King, what to the Kingdom itself, what to the future dispensation, and what to the eternal ages. The *importance* of such a position cannot be too highly urged, since upon it largely depend the views we take of numerous prophecies and promises.

This position also forbids many extravagances, as e.g. the Shakers (Nordhoff's *Communistic Soc.*, p. 133), dating the last dispensation from the establishment of their church under Mother Lee, calling themselves the "Church of *the Last Dispensation,*" or that of the Swedenborgians, Mormons, etc., applying to their rise, society, etc., promises that belong to a still future dispensation. These utterly ignore both covenant and postponement, and overlook the continued design of this dispensation (comp. Prop. 140, etc.). These extremes are only an outgrowth of conceptions, with which the Church is largely leavened, as will be hereafter shown.

PROPOSITION 88. *The Church is then a preparatory stage for this Kingdom.*

This follows from the preceding, for the church then resolves itself into an association of believers by which its growth, perpetuation, etc., is insured by the use of means of grace connected with such an organization, and by the care and oversight extended to it by its living Head. It is *preparatory*, because its office is, under divine assistance, to gather out of the nations the elect, i.e. those who are grafted into the Jewish Commonwealth, who shall, by virtue of adoption as Abraham's seed, be accounted heirs and inheritors of the Kingdom with Abraham. It is simply calling and preparing "*the heirs of promise*," the "*heirs of that kingdom* which God hath prepared for them that love Him."

In this gathering out of believers to form this elect people—the inheritors—is found the ground for a firm belief in the perpetuity of the Church. God's purpose, no matter how adverse at times the Church's circumstances, how hostile the world, how corrupt her mixed condition, etc., will and must be inevitably carried out. The number that God has predetermined will be secured, so that His Theocratic Plan may be realized in power and glory.

Obs. 1. Discarding the simple truth of the Proposition, eminent men of ability have arrayed themselves against each other, contending for some favorite church theory, manifesting an amazing variety of definitions, subtle divisions, imaginary distinctions, and irrelevant display of learning. This has resulted mainly from elevating the church into a Kingdom under the mistake that this dispensation being final, and the prophecies locating the Messiah's Kingdom here on earth, the church *must of necessity be the predicted Kingdom.* This has borne its fruit in the way indicated, and also, what is more sad, in covering up the covenant promises pertaining to the Kingdom, in spiritualizing them to make them consistent with human opinions, and in arraying themselves as hostile toward the preaching of the disciples and apostles, until at the present day, with here and there a few exceptions in all denominations, but *little faith* is exercised (as predicted), either in the *Pre-Millennial Advent* of the King, or in the *future* establishment of His Kingdom, *as covenanted*, here on earth.

Obs. 2. If we are wrong in this, and other Propositions linked with it, it can be easily decided against us by producing a passage where the church is *directly* called a Kingdom. A due examination will reveal the fact that *no such Scripture* can be found. Such a vital, foundation doctrine is *inferred;* and the influence comes the more naturally, since, overlooking the postponement, and regarding the preparatory stage of the church in a light different from that which the covenant throws upon it, it was taken *for granted* that a Kingdom being preached as once nigh, must have come.

And, as a literal Kingdom, such as covenant and prophecy describe, did not come, it was supposed that the church then must be it. The Origenistic interpretation, so destructive to early Millenarianism, appeared as *the patron and champion* of this inference, until under its wide-spread influence, the inference was changed into a supposed axiomatic truth. Being also in the line of ambition, etc., it was tenaciously held by all who were favorable to hierarchical tendencies, and any who rejected it as inference and assumption were regarded as heretics. Indeed even now, it is *so deeply imbedded* in religious belief and system, that to call it by its true name, *a mere inference*, is to excite prejudice, bitterness and wrath in the hearts of some who *profess* to love the truth for the truth's sake.

Obs. 3. We are not surprised that the result just mentioned should follow, for if it can be shown that the covenanted Kingdom is *something different* from the church; that the Kingdom is held in postponement until a certain predetermined number of elect are gathered; that the church is appointed to gather and cherish these elect, and hence is *preparatory* in its action, *then* this view of the Kingdom, showing that the church's relation to this Kingdom is *a subordinate and preparatory one*, *prepares us to appreciate* the claims of Popery, Puseyism, hierarchical tendencies, nationalizing churches, and a host of similar *exclusive* demands put on faith and practice, all of which are founded on *the assumption* that the church is *not preparatory to the predicted* Kingdom, but is in truth *the covenanted Kingdom itself*. Our doctrine is *too humiliating* for such, and *therefore* fails of acceptance.

The Church-Kingdom idea is deeply rooted in prevailing Theology and Literature. It is a notion long held in veneration, embellished by eloquence and poetry, supported by philosophy, strengthened by policy, power, and age, enriched by the cumulative reason of many centuries, and the mistaken concessions of piety. Ideas consecrated and cemented by the expressed opinions, attachments, and submission of men of ability and learning are not to to be eradicated, saving by a higher hand, when fulfilling His own counsels and covenanted promises. It will require the secret stage of the Sec. Advent with its momentous results, and the incoming Antichrist with his persecution of the Church, before this notion—so fruitful in causing unbelief—will be discarded by the Church.

Obs. 4. As stated, it is owing to the view taken of this Kingdom, that such *widely antagonistic* notions are published respecting the church. One writer, e.g. accepting of the prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom and applying them to the church as *now* constituted, emphatically declares that the Mission of the church is *a failure*. This is announced by a host of writers, and is hailed with delight by multitudes with the addition, that hence prophecy (inspiration) is found unreliable. Another writer, receiving the same predictions as also declarative of the church's present position, endeavors to meet the requirements of prophecy *by exaggerating* the church's progress, etc. One author, seeing a non-fulfilment of prophecy, places Christianity on a level with other religions, predicting its *mergence into* a universal religion adapted to meet the longings of the prophets. Still another writer receives the same predictions as illustrative of the church's Kingdom state, and to establish this point, proceeds to fasten on the obvious grammatical sense *another and widely differing one* to make prophecy and history correspond. While another accepts of the predictions in their plain grammatical sense, finds in them the true Mission of

the church which is *no failure*, locates their fulfilment as *a comparison* of Scripture indicates, needs no *immoderate* exaltation to make church and prophecy tally, sees in their non-fulfilment *no reason* for invidious comparisons, and forces upon them *no sense* that would be discarded by the universal laws of grammar and rhetoric. This, to the student, indicates what influence is exerted upon our theological opinions by our views of the church. This only points out a few diverging lines, others will be presented as we proceed.

Obs. 5. The Romanist and the Protestant have made the question of the church a battle-field, in which many a past strife is noted by history. The Romanist making the church the Kingdom of God (called in the Dog. Decrees of the recent Council "the Kingdom of Christ") set up here under *a specific form* of government, held that by becoming obedient to that church the soul alone was brought to Christ, so that the Kingdom was the power that led to Christ, etc. The Protestant, who accepted of the Romanist idea of such a Kingdom, held that by faith, in and obedience to, Christ the soul was made to enter the Kingdom of heaven. The former made the church as a Kingdom a condition of salvation, the latter, a means of preservation and development to the saved. But both in one form or other, *forced* both by Scripture and the actual condition of the church, made this church or Kingdom *a preparatory stage* for another and higher Kingdom still in the future. A singular feature in the controversy is this: that both parties agreed in making *this Church* the Kingdom of Christ either as Son of Man, or as Son of God, or both united, and the higher Kingdom in the future at the end of the age, they made, *against express Scriptures*, to be exclusively the Kingdom *of the Father or of the Divine*. To the latter view, the student will find but few exceptions.

Obs. 6. Many, impelled by the idea that if the church is a Kingdom there ought, of necessity, to be a *unity*, have sought for this in various ways —in an outward union of believers, in an exact agreement of doctrine, in some form of church government, etc. Whereas, if they had retained the belief of the earliest age respecting the church, they would have seen that *the uniformity* they sought after is *not a prerequisite*. Diversity, as seen in the Apostolic Churches by contrasting the Jewish and Gentile, is not opposed to *the Scriptural idea* of the church. For, not being regarded as a Kingdom but as *a preparatory stage for* the Kingdom, some latitude was allowed in its external manifestation and even in non-essential doctrine and practice (see e.g. decision of Council at Jerusalem, Acts 15 : 19, 28) while unity was *based on fellowship with Christ* and consequent *adoption* as Abraham's seed.

Obs. 7. It is our deep conviction that the word *ekklesia*, translated church, was *designedly* chosen to express what the church really means. Let the reader notice how we have shown that to raise up a seed unto Abraham certain elect, those of like faith unto Abraham, are *chosen out of* the nations. The word therefore, *ek* out of, and *kaleo I* call, denotes *to call out of*, and hence means precisely what the Apostles in Council, Acts 15 : 14, denominated its object to be, viz.: *to call out from among the*

nations a people, etc. Why was the word rendered church chosen in place of the more familiar one synagogue, unless it be that the former more explicitly expresses the idea intended? (Vide Prop. 175, and Comp. Hagenbach's *His. Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 194.)

PROPOSITION 89. *Christ in view of this future Kingdom, sustains a peculiar relationship to the Church.*

Christ, now, in virtue of His divine nature, has absolute control over all nations, over the church, etc., but He only exerts that Sovereignty (Props. 79 and 80) as God in Providence, etc., not as the Son of Man (e.g. Props. 81–83), David's Son, in His human nature. That nature is also highly, immeasurably exalted because of its union with the Divine, and of its being intended for the coming visible Theocratic Government to be (Prop. 200) the Representative Ruler of God. This Rulership now belongs to David's Son, is His both by right of covenanted birth and obedience, but is not yet realized and will not be until the establishment of the Kingdom. For, we have no distinctive announcement of its actual participation in reigning as covenanted *until the Second Advent*, at which time it is plainly and specifically stated that He reigns not merely as the Son of God, but really and truly as the Son of Man.

Obs. 1. Indeed, if we refer to the covenant, *this must be the case*, for the Kingdom directly covenanted to David's Son is *not a reign* over other worlds, over the universe, or over the church as a church—is *not even a reign* in the third heaven, or some place *outside of* this earth—but is pointedly stated to be *a reign over David's Kingdom*, which is extended to embrace the whole earth. To say then, whatever may be the honored position of Jesus in heaven, that *He now is reigning in the covenanted, predicted Kingdom of promise, is directly opposed to God's oath-bound covenant.* This gives us then the proper idea of Christ's relationship to the church. As Divine, One with the Father, the church is under His care and protection; as Son of Man He sustains a Headship over the church; as the future revealed King, His interest in the church is deep and abiding.

Obs. 2. To avoid misconception, and the charge of lowering Christ's dignity or position, it may be in place to repeat that we most cordially receive and hold to what is said concerning Christ in Eph. 1 : 20–23, and other passages. But with the aid of a comparison of Scripture, we avoid the conclusion that many arrive at, as e.g. in Eph. 1 : 20–23, that the authority vested in Him *is now in all respects* exercised. We hold, that so far as its actual exercise and realization is concerned, part of it must be regarded *prospectively*, as seen e.g. by verse 22 compared with Heb. 2 : 8, i.e. that part referring *to the Davidic covenanted Kingdom*, in the world to come. (Comp. Alford, Steir, Meyer, etc.)

Obs. 3. The Headship of Christ over the church refers not so much, as is supposed, *to Rulership over* the church as to His being *the Chief or Head*

of Rulers, i.e. that the church is in some peculiar and distinctive manner *associated with* Him. What this is, will appear under the Props. (154 and 156) relating to the reign and priesthood of the saints. Christ Himself intimates this distinction when He calls faithful believers "*brethren*" and not "*servants.*" The church is represented as *Christ's body*, simply because that body are "co-heirs," joint inheritors with Him in the Kingdom, and therefore they are purposely never called "*the subjects of the Kingdom*"—a phrase coined by man and *contradictory* to both the honor and position of the body, which takes *a much higher rank.* It is inconsistent, to say the least, to call "inheritors" of a Kingdom, the subjects of it.[1] Individual subjection or allegiance does not constitute a Kingdom, lacking as it does *the essentials* of a Kingdom, such as are promised. Jesus is called, and by right, and in the covenanted manner, is, "*the King of the Jews,*" "*King of Nations,*" "*King of the World,*" but is *never* called "*the King of the Church.*" The nearest approach to the latter is found in our English version Rev. 15 : 3, where He is called "*King of the Saints,*" but this is opposed by some of the earliest of the MSS. (as e.g. the Sinaitic and Alexandrine) and various versions, so that it is rendered "*King of the Nations,*" "*King of the Worlds,*" "*King of the Ages,*" and in the Greek texts in general use, it is given "*King of the Nations*" (comp. Lange, Alford, etc., loci Tischendorf's N. T. etc.), which is more in accord with the general tenor and spirit of the Word. The saints, elected *to be associated* with Christ in Rulership, are indeed subordinated to Christ. He is the Head, the Chief, and they being also kings with Him, it is rightfully His title to be styled "*King of Kings,*" seeing that the latter are inferior to Him, but while subordinate, their rank, etc., elevates them as brethren and joint rulers above that *of mere subjects in the ordinary use* of the Word. They are truly subjects in one sense only, viz. : in the one given, e.g. 1 Cor. 11 : 3.

[1] The reader will of course discriminate here : the Church is subject (Eph. 5 : 24, etc.) to Christ, and this, in the very nature of the case, is indispensable, but this subjection is *preparatory* to the future glorification and exaltation of the Church, for when allied with Him in glory, this subjection is swallowed up *in joint rulership*, etc. with Christ, though still subordinate, as David's Son is to the Father ; and hence our argument merely is, that believers, in view of their future position, are never called "the subjects *of the Kingdom*," *which* is opposed to their being "kings and priests reigning with Christ" in the Kingdom. Believers are "*heirs*," and not the subjects of *the covenanted* Kingdom. Origen (*Ag. Celsus*, B. 4, ch. 10) refers "the Kingdom of God," as "reserved for those who are worthy of becoming *its subjects*;" we prefer the Scriptural phraseology, if it were only to remind us of future exaltation and glory.

Obs. 4. The Kingship of Jesus Christ, as David's Son, the Theocratic Ruler, is to be manifested in a period of time, called by way of pre-eminence "*the day of the Lord,*" "*the day of Jesus Christ,*" etc. This will, under Prop. 138, be shown to be still future, dating from the time of His Second Advent. The covenant promises, if actually fulfilled, require this ; and hence until their realization, the church occupies the position of *waiting* (e.g. 1 Pet. 1 : 7, 13) for this Revelation of Jesus as King. During this expectation all things are working in behalf of the election, the contemplated gathering, the manifestation of the Sons of God. The Head is preparing the members, by the bestowal of blessed privileges, sacred ordinances, rich experience, and His own ever-abiding Presence, *for the coming exaltation* of the Kingdom. Communion with Christ and with

each other *necessitates a churchly arrangement*, so that the requisite elect may be taken out from among the nations to place the future Theocratic Kingdom *on an immovable basis.*

As simply illustrative of the conclusions adopted against us, we refer to a writer in the *Princeton Review* (Ap., 1851, p. 196), who endeavors to prove that "the Church is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ," in view of a spiritual reign in the heart and the Headship of Jesus. But aside from the numerous considerations hereafter presented by us against the theory, we may well ask, whether such an alleged Kingdom is *a restoration* of the Kingdom of God withdrawn from the Jewish nation on account of their sinfulness. Is there a single mark by which an identification can be made out, when we are assured by God Himself that *the same* Kingdom (Theocracy) overthrown is *the identical* Kingdom re-established? To resort, by way of apology and explanations, to types and spiritualizing, is to declare that God's words, sworn to, mean one thing in the plain grammatical sense, but are to be understood in a sense which men add to it to accommodate their respective Kingdom theories.

Obs. 5. In this postponement of the Kingdom, specifically promised to the Son of Man, we do not, by any means, detract from that power which is given to Jesus, or deny that to His will all things are subject. The question to be answered is, does He *now* exercise that power and make manifest that subjection *in the covenanted* Kingdom? The reply comes unhesitatingly, that we see *no such* Kingdom yet established which *meets* the requirements of covenant and prophecy, if the latter are received in their plain grammatical sense. Indeed, our opponents concede to us that so far as the church itself is concerned, that power is held in abeyance and its manifestation delayed, as is evidenced by the existence of tares mingled with the wheat, of different forms of evil, of kingdoms opposed to His will, etc. This conception, in the light of the covenant, the preaching of Jesus, the postponement of the Kingdom, etc., we apply to the church so far as the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom are concerned, showing that the former cannot *with any consistency* be substituted for the latter.

Obs. 6. Overlooking the design of the establishment of the Christian Church, viz. : to raise up a seed unto Abraham by gathering out of the nations a people for His name, until the throne and Kingdom, *now desolate*, shall be restored to its covenanted position, has led to some remarkable features in philosophizing. Deeming the church a Kingdom, and seeing how little in its external history it exhibited the ideas we attach to a Kingdom, some eminent writers have presented us with a kind of Christianized pantheism, which endeavors to make out a systematic organic development by asserting a continuation of the Divine and human natures of Jesus Christ in believers through the church, thus elevating the latter into a Kingdom. To make out such an organic history, the Papacy and a host of outgrowths are embraced, as in the main legitimate results of Christianity itself, etc. If a spiritual interpretation does not suffice, a mystical is added to exalt the church into the proportions of a kingdom ; and when stripped of its persuasive generalities, it resolves itself into "a perpetually growing incarnation of God and deification of man," or "the development of the Divine essence in man." The trouble is, that this dragnet draws too much weight for the strength of its meshes. When compared with the simplicity of the covenant, with the history of believers and of the church, with the union and fellowship as presented by the Word, it is *merely* man's hypothesis. Its refutation has preceded, and will follow.

Thus e.g. Rev. S. Miller, advocating Dr. Nevin's theory, in his *Mercersburg and Mod. Theology*, p. 41, etc., forms a Kingdom, embracing the divine-human life, drawn from Christ, which he designates a "*new Kingdom*," not in the sense of renewed, but entirely new. This Kingdom, according to his view, was only inaugurated by the divine-human life of Jesus, and is entered by the person who partakes of the divine-human nature of the Christ. This mystical conception is, as our line of argument conclusively shows, utterly opposed by covenant, prophecy, the preaching of John, Jesus, the disciples, and apostles, etc. The Word always speaks of this Kingdom as something visibly, externally manifested in the form covenanted. Even if we were to adopt Miller's notion that the Church is an organism starting in the person of Christ, and being "a continuation of the Incarnation" by the imparting of the humanity or life in Jesus, it would not follow that it is the covenanted, predicted Kingdom. In a conversation with him (for he was an honored uncle of mine) on this point, he said he might receive Chiliasm and still retain his view, on the ground that this was preparatory, or as a stage in his development theory. Shortly before his death, he made Chiliasm a study (with what result the writer does not know), being deeply impressed by the historical argument in its favor. One remark of his deeply impressed the writer, viz. : that Eschatology had not received the attention that it deserved, in view of the end contemplated by Redemption, for, evidently, the prevailing views were defective, lacking Scriptural unity.

PROPOSITION 90. *Members of the Church, who are faithful, are promised this Kingdom.*

There is only *one* kingdom, Prop. 35, etc. Saints who become the seed of Abraham, are to receive, *inherit this kingdom of promise*, 1 Thess. 2 : 12; 2 Thess. 1 : 5; 2 Pet. 1 : 11; Matt. 25 : 34, etc. The Kingdom preached by the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples continues to be proclaimed, Acts 8 : 12; 14 : 22; 20 : 25; 28 : 31, etc., and believers become "*heirs*" of it, Jam. 2 : 5. The wicked shall *not* inherit it, 1 Cor. 6 : 9. The apostles represent themselves and co-laborers as working for it still future, Col. 4 : 11; 2 Thess. 1 : 5; 2 Tim. 4 : 18; Heb. 12 : 28, etc.

Obs. 1. This Proposition is only intended to specify one of the results arising from preceding Propositions; and it is decidedly corroborative of our argument that the Scriptures employ language to indicate *the futurity* of the Kingdom. If the church is the Kingdom, and believers are now in it, why designate them "*heirs*," etc., of a Kingdom? If the future Kingdom, as Theologians so confidently assert, is only a continuation of such a Kingdom, why employ then the specific language of *inheriting* a Kingdom still future, if that is only a *prolongation*, etc., of this one, and the inheriting *has already commenced?* If believers already by entering the church, enter into the *promised* Kingdom of God, and if this Kingdom is merged into a future one, it would be somewhat inconsistent to urge them to strive for that which they *already* possess; or, at least, the language ought to be so changed that they are urged to retain their hold upon a *present* Kingdom lest they forfeit the future prolonged one.

The early Church view is content, and so are we, to receive the language unchanged as confirmatory of our doctrine, so that, as Clement (sec. Epis.), it exhorts all that "all *may attain* to the Kingdom of God," asserting that in the future "*we shall enter into His Kingdom, and shall receive the promises.*" But such is not the teaching of monkish theology, Roman Catholic, and even in much of Protestant, Divinity, which declares that being already in the Kingdom you shall obtain the continued Kingdom. The incongruity, to say the least, of representing "heirs" *as already* possessing the Kingdom is scarcely noticed, and even the appointed time of inheriting, *specifically located* at the Sec. Advent, is ignored. This only shows how prejudice can refuse to receive *the plainest* statements of the Word. Believers are not in this Kingdom, but "*called unto*" it (1 Thess. 2 : 12; 2 Thess. 1 : 5, etc.); the passages which are supposed to teach the contrary will be noticed in detail under following Propositions. For the present, it is sufficient to say that the Bible is not contradictory, and the few places which are alleged to be contradictory must, in the nature of the case, be explained by the general analogy on the subject. Oosterzee (*Ch. Dogmatics*, vol. 1, p. 67, and vol. 2, p. 696) introduces a division, "Of the Church, or the Training School of the Kingdom." The idea of a training school is excellent, suggested both by Scripture and experience, but to make the notion still more distinctive and Scriptural, we suggest "the Training School *for* the Kingdom," which is one of the objects intended by the Church.

Obs. 2. Making the church the promised Kingdom, and believers in the enjoyment of it, has logically led some of our opponents (not all, for many recoil from it in view both of experience and the sad history of the church), to proclaim, that the promises relating to the reign of the saints are *now also* fulfilling. We leave one of the earliest give his view. Thus, e.g. Augustine (*City of God*, B. 20. s. 9) says: "The church could not now be called His Kingdom, or the Kingdom of heaven, *unless* His saints were even *now reigning* with Him;" and endeavors to make out such an existing Kingdom by showing that the saints now reign, summing up: "in fine, they reign with Him who are so in His Kingdom that *they themselves are His Kingdom.*" Leaving the reign of the saints for a distinct Proposition (154) it is sufficient to say that earlier Fathers distinctly oppose Augustine in his wholesale and mixed interpretation. Thus e.g. Barnabas (*Epis.* ch. 6) declares, that saints do not rule now; and speaking of the promised dominion adds: "We ought to perceive *that to govern implies authority*, so that one should command and rule. If therefore, *this does not exist at present, yet still He has promised it to us. When? When we ourselves also have been made perfect (so as) to become heirs of the covenant of the Lord.*"

This notion that saints *now possess* the Kingdom, now have dominion, etc., has wrought great mischief, as Eccl. History attests, not only in hierarchical tendencies, in perverted and extravagant claims of authority, but also in fanaticism, as e.g. Anabaptists, Mormons, Hackett, the Prophet who was proclaimed (July 16th, 1592) "the sole Monarch of Europe," and many others. Our doctrine closes the door against *all* such claims and vagaries. The reign of the saints, as delineated in the outlines of the Divine Purpose, confirms our position.

Obs. 3. Only believers *are promised* this Kingdom. Faith and its fruits are essential to its inheritance. This is pointedly declared in Scripture, as e.g. Gal. 5 : 21; Eph. 5 : 5, etc. If the Jews were accounted unworthy because of lack of faith, etc., to receive this Kingdom—if they were rejected and a seed must be raised up unto Abraham, we may rest assured that it will be, it must be, "*a righteous seed.*" This becomes *the more necessary* in view of the position that this seed is to occupy in the Coming Kingdom, viz.: that of co-rulers with Jesus Christ. Therefore the Word assures us that even out of "*the many*" but "*few*" will be chosen, and those only because they are believing and faithful.

In opposition to Holy Writ we have the theories of man. Thus e.g. Kingsley (*Sers. on Nat. Subjects*, 1 Ser., p. 14) makes man by nature a member of Christ and inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven. He so secularizes the Church, calling it the Kingdom of Christ, of heaven, etc., that the world is the Church and the Church the world, including all men, but specially manifested as a Kingdom when recognizing its relation to God. Some Amer. Universalists entertain very much the same view, so that all men belong to it by right, and will ultimately be identified with it; now the Kingdom, however, is only exhibited in and through those who acknowledge the truth, etc. The same idea is given to us by Prof. Seeley, author of *Ecce Homo* (p. 339) when making the Church a Kingdom, he says that it is such because "based upon a *blood-relationship*, the most comprehensive of all, the kindred of every human being to every other."* This notion is paraded by

* This idea of blood-relationship reminds one of what Bungener (*The Preacher and the King*, p. 205) states of a certain La Tremouville, who, in his pride of birth, his arrogant dependence on blood-relationship, declared: "God would look twice before He damned me." Many, who make no such claim, still feel themselves good enough for God's Kingdom, without any heart and life preparation, not realizing that God is no respecter of persons.

the Free Religionists, Humanitarians, etc., and is covertly stated by some who desire to be regarded as orthodox. Such opinions, however, are flatly *contradicted* by the Word of God, not only in the distinction made between the righteous and wicked, but by that feature which our entire argument enforces, viz.: that "*Salvation is of the Jews*," not because it originated or was at one time identified with them, but because it pertains, *by covenant relation*, to them. To them the promises were given, not to all men; and *the only way* to obtain the promises *with* them is to be *engrafted* into the true olive tree. Now all are invited to become *the seed* of Abraham, but comparatively *few* accept of *the terms* of adoption. Instead of being related to the Kingdom of God by nature, by a common humanity, by the assumption of our nature by Christ, we must by *the obedience of faith* present ourselves in *the line* of the covenanted, chosen people; and when, in the predicted time, God shall restore that chosen people to its forfeited position, *the engrafted ones* inherit the Kingdom with the Son of man.

Obs. 4. In Matt. 16 : 18, 19 Jesus seems to distinguish between the church and the Kingdom by placing the Kingdom of heaven in opposition to it, enforcing the idea that the church leads to, or is appointed as a means to attain unto, the Kingdom. The church is founded and, in addition, the keys of the Kingdom are (Prop. 64) committed to it, so that through its instrumentality believing members may finally inherit the Kingdom. It would be an easy matter to select from our opponents a multitude of writers who indorse this view, that in this passage the church leads to the Kingdom, but in correspondence with their theory make the Kingdom one in the third heaven and not one on the earth. Others include in the expression both the church and the third heaven, while others confine it exclusively to the church. Its true meaning must be sought for in other passages, as in the covenant and specific announcements of the Kingdom.

Obs. 5. The passage Matt. 8 : 11, 12, when "*many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of heaven, but the children of the Kingdom shall be cast out*," etc., not only confirms (1) the Proposition; (2) the election of the Jewish nation; (3) the offer of the Kingdom to the covenanted people, but it also establishes (4) the fact, that the church is not the Kingdom here mentioned, seeing that this Kingdom is related in the covenanted manner with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Hence commentators generally apply this Kingdom either to the third heaven or to the one still future.

Obs. 6. Flesh and blood cannot inherit (i.e. to become a ruler in it) this Kingdom, 1 Cor. 15 : 50. Just as it is with the Head, the Mighty One, that the covenant and promises demanded *an immortal Ruler*, so it is *with His members*, the body. As King He is to be manifested in His *glorified* form—a David's Son possessing all that is requisite to fulfil the Word; so also the saints, as co-heirs, kings and priests must be *in their glorified condition before* they receive the Kingdom. Hence, while in the church, in flesh and blood, they *only await* the promises—hope and pray for their realization. The church, then, instead of possessing a Kingdom, as actually existing *according to promise*, only possesses it in anticipation, in looking for and expecting its arrival.

Obs. 7. Prophecy does not predict a Kingdom *to exist between* the First and Second Advents of Christ as a prelude to the Kingdom of the Eternal Ages. To make out such a prediction, Prophecy must be wrested from its

connection, or else it must be spiritualized to make it sufficiently accommodating.

The extravagances in this direction culminate when men of learning and ability make themselves out to be *already in* "the New Jerusalem state," *in* "the enjoyment of Millennial glory," in possession of "the latter day glory," etc. The Church in its present imperfect state is eulogized until it assumes the portraiture of the predicted Kingdom, but such eulogies are at the expense of *a consistent* interpretation and of *the real* history of the Church. As this infatuation, derived from Origenistic sources, is so general, it may be proper to pass over some views in detail, although our argument, based on the covenant, scarcely needs the addition.

PROPOSITION 91. *The Kingdom of God is not the Jewish Church.*

This is evident from *the Theocratic* government by which State and Church were united; from the same as administered under the Theocratic-Davidic arrangement; from the overthrow of the throne and kingdom while a churchly arrangement remained; from the preaching of John, Jesus, and the disciples, saying "the kingdom of God is at hand," showing that it did not then exist but was promised to be "at hand" or "near" on condition of repentance; and finally from the rejection of the Kingdom and its postponement *until after* "the times of the Gentiles." Whatever churchly or religious organization existed among the Jews after the overthrow of the Kingdom, they themselves, as we have shown, did not regard the Kingdom of God as existing just prior to the First Advent.

Obs. 1. This Proposition in this form is the more necessary, since many writers spiritualizing this reign into "God's reign in the heart," "piety," etc., endeavor to make out that the Kingdom was actually realized *without the cognizance* of the Jews, and *in opposition* to the first preaching. We would rather accept of the expectations of the pious Jews, of the direct preaching of the disciples, etc., than of such a theory, simply because the former is *in accord* with the most solemnly pledged covenant of the Word, while the latter *totally ignores the oath-bound promises.*

Obs. 2. This Proposition is yielded to us by many of our opponents, some already quoted, who make the Christian Church something new, and hence a Kingdom in a form in which it did not previously exist, although a continuation of the Jewish Church. But if the Christian Church is *a prolongation* of the Jewish in another form with increased light, privileges, etc., it goes far toward establishing the Propositions that follow concerning the church. If the one was *no* Kingdom as admitted, then the other following is *none*, for these writers to make out a union between them, tell us that members of both are justified by faith, saved by grace, adopted by God, and participate finally in the same promises and redemption. Real consistency requires both to be elevated to the position of a Kingdom, which some do, although *hostile* to covenants and promises. Logically there is no escape here, and those writers are really the most consistent (although opposed to the facts as they existed), who make no discrimination between the Jewish and Christian Churches, pronouncing both to be the Kingdom of God for the reason that the characteristics of believers at the present day in the church are precisely the same (as e.g. faith, obedience, love, hope, etc.), that they were in the Jewish Congregation. Hence,

if certain traits, qualifications, characteristics, as many assert, denote the Kingdom, then the Kingdom existed in both churches. The latter, however, remains unproven.

Obs. 3. We find on this point the most contradictory statements. Writers who fully admit that the Kingdom is to be established *only* under Christ, and who even tell us that this dispensation is thus distinguished, are forced by the interpretations given to the Kingdom itself to locate it back of this dispensation in the Jewish Church; and then to reconcile their theory inform us that the Kingdom existed *in one form* in the Jewish Church and now it is exhibited *in another* in the present Church. But all this is *antagonistic* to the most prevalent and confidently given interpretation of the Kingdom. If the Kingdom is what Dr. McCosh, and others, inform us, "*God's rule in the hearts of men*," then *no difference* should be made between the churches, for such a rule has ever been manifested. Such a Kingdom has ever existed even before the Theocracy was set up; such an experience is compatible without the establishment of a Kingdom here on earth, as we see in Adam, Abel, Enoch, etc. Gratefully accepting of God's Sovereignty, of the duty of obedience to Him, etc., it does *not follow*, as shown by preceding Propositions, that this constitutes the predicted Kingdom. If it does, *then* covenant language has *no definite* meaning; *then* the Prophets and the early Preachers *miserably mistook* this Kingdom, promising as *in the future* what learned men tell us *ever* existed. No! that class of writers, equally learned and more scriptural, are correct when they assert that the predicted Kingdom is one that had *no existence* at the time of the Advent, and that it is one which Christ Himself is to establish.

Obs. 4. Any definition of the Kingdom under Christ, which affirms nothing more than was experienced by the pious Jews at the First Advent, *is most certainly defective.* Such are "God's reign in the heart," "religion," etc. Such definitions should, in the very nature of the case, excite *a mistrust* that there must be error somewhere, because opposed in spirit to express prediction and promise. The Jews, such as Simon and others, were utterly ignorant of the honor they possessed of being *already* incorporated with a Kingdom they *waited, looked, and prayed for.* Such definitions, however well meaning, are virtually a *lowering* of Scripture promise and of the intelligence of ancient worthies. Feeling this deeply, sadly, we write plainly for the sake of the truth.

Obs. 5. The reader's attention is recalled to our argument which clearly shows, under Propositions pertaining to the covenants, etc., that the Church itself as it existed *before* the formation of the Theocracy was no Kingdom here on earth; that such a Kingdom was *first* presented when *the Theocratic* form of government was instituted, *God Himself* condescending to act in the capacity of *an earthly Ruler* over the nation, and *State and Church* were firmly united in mutual support. After this government was overthrown or temporarily set aside, owing to the unworthiness of the nation, the Church remained as previous to the Theocracy; but *it is never recognized* by the Prophets as the Kingdom—the believer being directed to look for and await its coming. This posture of waiting the pious portion of the nation occupied.

Obs. 6. It is right, therefore, to say, that the Church has **always existed**; and even, as some do, to declare, that the Christian is *a continuation* of the previous Church in another form and with added privileges; but *it is wrong* to assert that the Church, without the previously ordained *visible Theocratic order* in actual union with it, is the Kingdom of God in the sense given by covenant and Prophet. *It lacks the God-given distinguishing Theocratic arrangement which can alone elevate it to the position of a Kingdom here on earth,* viz.: *God through man acting in the manifested real capacity of earthly Ruler.*

Obs. 7. To illustrate how the Jewish Church is elevated, in a circumlocutory way, to the position of a Kingdom, we select an example. Thus, Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 65) affirms (quoting Owen's *Prel. Diss. to Hebrews* to sustain his point), that the Church has always existed; that Christ did not take one away to set up another; that the Christian Church is the same as that before the Advent; and afterward in his work calls this Church, which he has made identical, *the Kingdom of God.* The truth is, that all who take Fairbairn's position respecting the Church, and then designate it "the Kingdom of God," cannot avoid *logically* making (notwithstanding their disclaimers to the contrary that Christ's Kingdom was only established at His Advent, and is the only Kingdom of promise), the Jewish Church the same Kingdom.

Obs. 8. This last is attempted in another quarter, judging from the book notices in the *Evang. Review* (Oct. 1873), and *Scribner's Monthly* (Dec. 1872). Abbey, in a work called "*The City of God and the Church Makers,*" takes the ground that the Christian Church and the Jewish are not only the same, but that they are one, beginning in Eden, basing their essential likeness as the same Christian Church, City of God, or Kingdom of heaven in Christ, He being an eternal person, etc. While there is propriety in the efforts to rebut the antagonism which some erect between the Old Test. and New Test. churches, yet there is the same old mistake of recognizing the Sovereignty of God or of Christ as constituting the Kingdom, and an ignoring of the plain covenanted fact that the Kingdom is promised to Jesus Christ, not merely in virtue of His divinity, but as Son of David, the predicted Son of Man. This simple and undeniable truth, in connection with the history of the covenanted development, overturns all such theorizing. All notions of the Kingdom that do not stand *the test of the Covenant* must be discarded.

Those who affirm that the Church is the Kingdom of God, and claim that John the Baptist was *in* the Kingdom, are met and confounded by even a single passage, Matt. 11 : 11, where the least in the Kingdom is represented as greater than John, showing that by the Kingdom something else than the Church is denoted. Some, such are the contradictions involved, forgetting their own definitions of the Church as a continuous Kingdom, apply this passage, for fulfilment, to believers after the day of Pentecost. (Comp. Prop. 39). The least reflection will show that the Jewish Church had not *the covenanted characteristics* of the Kingdom, for as Daniel (7 : 22) says, the time had not yet come that the saints possessed the Kingdom, etc.

PROPOSITION 92. *This Kingdom is not what some call "the Gospel Kingdom."*

Having met with the phrase "Gospel Kingdom" in writings, and having heard it from the pulpit, this favorite expression of some may require a few remarks. By the phrase is evidently meant either this dispensation or the church or religion, or the proclamation of the gospel. It is a phrase of human coinage, nowhere found in the Bible, and is incorrect when applied to the present time. The gospel is good news, glad tidings *concerning* the Kingdom. Hence the phrase is never found in the writings of careful authors.

Obs. 1. It is strongly corroborative that the language of the Bible falls in so accurately with our line of argument. We read of "the Gospel *of the* Kingdom," seeing that the Gospel itself has no power to produce the Kingdom, but is simply preliminary to it, designed to call the elect, who become "*heirs*" of the Kingdom.

A writer (*Proph. Times*, 1873, p. 105) makes a distinction between "the Gospel of the grace of God" and "the Gospel of the Kingdom of God," which appears, in some respects, to be well founded. The favorite terms of some theologians, such as "the Kingdom of grace," "the Kingdom of the cross," "the mediatorial Kingdom," are not found in Scripture, and while freely acknowledging the astonishing and unmerited grace existing in the Church, and that the future Theocracy is one of grace, yet the titles, however well intentioned, are not applicable, being misleading in their nature. When Jesus directly predicts the results of the preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom, it is never intimated that any one of them is to form out of the Church, or believers of the Gospel, a Kingdom. The passages which are wrongfully inferred to teach the contrary will hereafter be examined in detail. The *means* are by multitudes mistaken for *the end*, as e.g. by *the Homilist* (quoted by Nast, *Com. on Matt.*, p. 323), which makes the Gospel to be "the Kingdom of God," because it produces "the reign of God over all the powers of the soul." To "preach the Gospel," or to "preach the Kingdom" (e.g. Luke 9 : 2, 6), is to present motives, etc., urging and inviting persons to become worthy of it when it, the Kingdom, comes in power and glory.

Obs. 2. Aside from other considerations, we have shown (Prop. 59, Obs. 5), that the Kingdom was tendered to the Jews but owing to their sinfulness was to be taken from them (i.e. could not inherit or receive it), and was to be given to another chosen, gathered people. The Kingdom was taken from the Jewish nation, but the nation, as all admit, *retained the Gospel*—the privileges of this dispensation, of the church, of religion, in brief, *of all that pertains to the Gospel.* It follows, therefore, as a national sequence that if the Kingdom was taken from them, that Kingdom did *not* consist in "the Gospel Kingdom," whatever meaning may be attached to it, for to this, if it denotes the present dispensation of the Gospel, the nation was made *first* accessible, the preaching of the Gospel commencing at Jerusalem. Other objections will be noticed in what follows.

We append Dr. Brown's (*Com.*) comment on Matt. 21 : 43 : "Therefore I say unto you, 'The Kingdom of God'—God's visible Kingdom or Church, upon earth, *which up to this time* stood in the seed of Abraham—'shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof,' i.e. the great evangelical community of the faithful, which, after the extension of the Jewish nation, would consist chiefly of Gentiles, until 'all Israel should be saved.'" But (1) the Church was *not* taken from them ; (2) this very "nation" thus called *is of the seed* of Abraham, natural and engrafted ; (3) that the bestowal of this Kingdom *is future*, when the "nation" is gathered (comp. Props. 57–66). Some commentators, not knowing what to do with the passage, owing to their Church-Kingdom theory, conveniently pass it by. Those especially who take the ground (induced by Heb. ch. 11, Gal. 3 : 8 ; Heb. 4 : 2 ; 1 Cor. 10 : 2–4 ; Eph. 2 : 19, 20 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 10, 11 ; Jude 14, 15 ; Dan. ch. 7, etc.) that the Ch. Church is only a continuation of the more ancient Church, are *pressed* by the passage. Imagination is the basis of numerous interpretations and applications.

PROPOSITION 93. *The Covenanted Kingdom is not the Christian Church.*

Desirous to respect and honor that overwhelming majority of able and learned men, who hold and teach that the Christian church is *the Kingdom of Christ predicted by the prophets and so solemnly covenanted to Him*, yet truth and justice demand *an unequivocal denial of this doctrine.* The reason for such denial is found in *the terms of the covenant itself.* The church possesses *none* of the characteristics of the kingdom promised to David's Son. The Theocratic relationship, the throne and kingdom of David, are lacking.

Obs. 1. The Christian Church is an association of believers in Christ, who, led by the same consciousness of God, truth and spirit, accept of the terms of salvation, repentance and faith, and continue in the use of the means of grace appointed by the Redeemer. It is an association exclusively for religious purposes, separate and distinct from civil or secular interests. It is different from the Kingdom once established in that State and religion are separated, hence involving no civil or State relationship, for members of all nations and States, without absolving their allegiance due as citizens to their respective civil powers, can become members of this exclusive religious organization. It is different from the Jewish Church, before and after the Theocratic rule, in that it embraces new ordinances, discarding the Mosaic, and is open to both Jew and Gentile by an expression and experience of faith in Jesus Christ. It was formed solely on account of the rejection of the Kingdom by the Jews, in order that through it a body of believers might be raised, through whom finally, when all gathered, the Kingdom might be reorganized in the most effective and triumphant manner. Originated for *this special purpose* it was designed, as its commencement proves, to be separate and distinct not only from the Jewish State but all other States. Union with secular powers was not contemplated, because it was not in accordance with *the design* of its establishment, viz. : to call and gather *out of* the nations and kingdoms a believing people. If the object had been to organize a Kingdom, we then undoubtedly would have had *a specific form* of government given to us, and direct declarations concerning the union of State and Church, and the exercise of civil and political power. *The absence* of such directions abundantly confirms our argument. It is necessarily outward so far as the persons, ordinances, assemblies, expansion, form of worship, etc., is concerned ; and inward, so far as individual experience, adoption, union with Christ, etc., relates. It is a community of saints, who, while occupying various positions in life, are not deprived by it of civil, social, or family relations, but rather by the formation of such a community find their con-

duct in all these relations regulated and controlled. Having no ecclesiastical constitution for government (such as were afterward produced by human invention), given by *divine* authority, it rests in a few indispensable commands respecting its organization and perpetuity, acknowledging in these *the Sovereignty of God and the Headship of Christ*, and constantly realizing by obedience to the religious and moral precepts, of which it is the guardian, that it is under Divine guidance, and in reality the product of Divine power and grace.

This interpretation of the Church, with the exception of the excessive High Church view, which, against the testimony of both Scripture and History, insists upon the immediate establishment of a Hierarchy, and with the exception of that of Erastianism, which, against the Apostolic order, prescribes a union of State and Church, is substantially that adopted by many of our opponents, who, however, are forced by their theories *to add* to it the notion of an existing predicted Kingdom. Aside from the latter idea, when we read the interpretations given by various writers directly of the Church, we find but little difference from the one presented, and none *to necessitate* the view that it is a Kingdom. Neander tells us that the Church is "a union of men arising from the fellowship (communion) of religious life; a union essentially independent of, and different from, all other forms of human association." Then what he adds enforces our position instead of his own: "It was a fundamental element of the formation of this union, that religion was no longer to be inseparably bound up, either as principal or subordinate, with the political and national relations of men," etc. (See *Ch. His.*, sec. 81, ch. 4, and then compare sec. 52 where he *contradicts this* by giving the Church such relations and a world dominion.) We might well ask, Why *not* so bound? There must be some substantial reason. Mosheim (*Inst. of Eccl. His.*), in his preface, is guarded not to call the Church a Kingdom, whether intentional or not. Admitting that as an association it is governed by certain laws and institutions, and has its officers, he calls it "a society or community" formed by the body of Christians. Dr. Hagenbach, in his *Acad. Address* on Neander's services as a Church historian (*Bib. Sacra*, Oct., 1851), shows that according to Planck in his *His. of the Origin and Formation of the Christ. Eccl. Constitutions*, the Church is no Kingdom, but a union of individuals voluntarily coming together, bound by the same religious belief, etc. Da Costa attributed, according to Hurst (*His. of Rationalism*, p. 360), only "a relative value to the Church of the Gentiles, the Church before the Millennium," refering us to the Millennial era for a proper and developed Kingdom. This is the position of many Millenarians (Da Costa being regarded one), and seems partly also to be the idea of some of our opponents, especially of Neander, in his view of the final world-dominion. These few quotations are amply sufficient to illustrate our own view, that in the definition of the Church there is nothing that requires us to entertain *the idea that it is a Kingdom.*

The reader can find numerous illustrations in various Confessions, His. of Doctrines, Sys. Divinities, Theological writers, Works on the Church, Controversial Essays, etc. In this wide field the student will find every shade of opinion, from that of an association of believers to Schleiermacher's "living organism, i.e. the body of Christ" (or Lange's "the planting and development of the salvation and life of Christ in the social sphere," and "the typical commencement of the world's transfiguration"); from that of a simple congregation of receptive men and women to Schlegel's "great and divine corporation," "free, peculiar, and independent corporation," or to the most extravagant idealistic and mystical conceptions, or to the sterner idea of an existing, conquering Kingdom in a visible form (as e.g. Papacy), destined to a world-dominion. High-Churchism, Low-Churchism, Broad-Churchism, Spiritualism, Mysticism, etc., have here a favorite topic, but always, with few exceptions, considered *isolated* from the covenanted relationship. Many of the definitions could be adopted, provided the assumed transformation into a Kingdom were set aside. The most simple definition is that of the Apostles' Creed adopted in an art. in the *Princeton Review*, Ap. 1853, entitled "*The Idea of the Church*," viz.: that the Church is "the communion of the saints," in which, leaving out the notion of "a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy," two affirmations are presented: (1) "the Church consists of saints, and (2) of saints in communion—that is, so united as to form one body."

Obs. 2. The first churches and the apostolic Fathers and their immediate successors, as already shown had *no conception* of the Church being the

promised Kingdom of the Covenant and Prophets. They looked and prayed for its speedy coming at the Second Advent. Origen was the first one who made the Church the mystic Kingdom of God (see p. 112, *Voice of the Church*, by Taylor). Others followed in his interpretation; and if we narrowly examine history it will be found that two things materially aided in entrenching and extending this notion of Origen's. The first was the Hierarchical encroachments which such an opinion sustained and flattered. The second was the fact that religions everywhere, among the Romans, Greeks, Egyptians, Asiatics, etc., were firmly united with the State, thus paving the way for a similar union and the exhibition of the Christian religion in a sphere not inferior to Pagan.

The student will be amply repaid in tracing these influences in confirming the Origenistic notion, and thus giving power into the hands of designing, and even of conscientious men. Against this conversion of the Church into a Kingdom there was a protest, which was ultimately silenced as the Papacy increased in power, until finally it was only held by the Paulicians and Waldenses (see p. 126, *Voice of the Church*, by Taylor). Coming down to the Reformers, great allowance must be made for them, seeing that the magnitude of the work before them scarcely allowed it to be consummated within the period of their lives. They could not readily rid themselves of all the prejudices engrafted by former Church relationship, and resulting from the growth of centuries. Their immediate successors, as all Church historians sadly acknowledge, instead of prosecuting *the work of Reformation*, engrossed themselves in disputes, and pressed each other on points of differences—many non-essential—until as a measure of advancement they seized the former Church idea, and taking advantage of the Kingdom notion as a source of protection and strength, they granted fatal concessions (which the Reformers refused), even to Royalty and the civil magistrate, vesting to a certain extent ecclesiastical power in their hands, uniting Church and State, elevating the civil head to a religious position over the Church, which speedily brought forth *its bitter fruit* in proscriptions, disallowance of freedom to individual conscience, heresy-hunting, the imposition of extended symbols and formulas, depositions, imprisonments, banishments, and even in some cases, death itself. The leverage underlying all this was *the unfounded* doctrine, that the Church being a Kingdom here on earth, a real power in actual sway over men, such power was to be manifested and exerted in *an external authority* felt and acknowledged by all. For the exertion of such authority, civil and ecclesiastical power were, more or less, combined. While history abundantly attests this to be the case with their followers, the Reformers themselves held views which it is difficult to explain as consistent with the notion that the Church is the predicted Kingdom of Christ. They speak of the Church as a *voluntary* association for strictly religious purposes, and with all their concessions to the civil magistrate, they still emphatically declared that Church and State were separate in their existence, and they could not merge the one into the other. (Neander's *Ch. His.*, Mosheim's *Eccl. His.*, Fisher's *His. of Ref.*, etc.). Their language is sometimes *contradictory*, but that they opposed, on the one hand, a secular rule of believers, and, on the other, an absorption of religious power by the civil head is positively stated. The contradictions that we find noticed by historians clearly indicate that they had *no well-defined and authoritative* conception of the Church as a Kingdom. Indeed, we find them using language respecting the future manifestation, and even speedy, of Christ's Kingdom at the Second Advent, the very spirit of which is opposed to the Church's now exerting a predicted kingly authority, and which fully accords with our own doctrine. The reader will find extracts given from Luther, Calvin, and others, by Taylor (*Voice of the Church*), by a Congregationalist (*Time of the End*), by Brooke's (*El. of Proph. Inter.*), by Elliott (*Horæ Apoc.*), and others, which are difficult to reconcile with any other theory than that of the doctrinal position of the early Church, viz.: anticipating the Kingdom of Christ to be set up at His Second Coming. With all the honor that is due to these noble men, with respectful consideration of their vast and splendid services, yet the student feels that on some important points they are indecisive, indistinct, and somewhat contradictory. Hence their opinions, whatever they are, must be subjected, as they themselves desired and expressed, *to the test* of Scripture (Prop. 10).

Obs. 3. One class of our opponents who contend that the Jewish Church which existed at the First Advent was no Kingdom, certainly cannot

make the Christian Church such, if the Kingdom as they inform us only denotes "God's reign" for that was characteristic of the Jewish Church. Another class, too circumspect to fall into so palpable an inconsistency, insist upon the points of identity between the Jewish and Christian Church, and pronounce them to be one and the same Kingdom of God. That this is erroneous will appear from the following considerations (1) *The announcements* of the Kingdom with which the New Test. begins is opposed to it, Prop. 19; (2) *the expectations* of the pious Jews, Props. 20, 47, 40, 41, and 43; (3) *the condition* of the Church does not accord with predictions of the Prophets respecting the Kingdom, Prop. 21; (4) the Church does *not correspond* with the preaching of John, Jesus and the disciples, Props. 22, 23, 38, 39, 54, 42, 44; (5) the Church is not like the Kingdom of God once established, *lacking* the Theocratic arrangement once instituted, Props. 25, 27, 28, 29; (6) the Church is not like the Kingdom once established, *overthrown and promised a restoration*, Props. 31, 32, 33; (7) the Church is not the Kingdom, otherwise the disciples were *ignorant* of what they preached, Prop. 43; (8) that the Church is the promised Kingdom is opposed *by the covenants*, Props. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52; (9) the preaching of the Kingdom as nigh and then its *postponement* is against making the Church a Kingdom, Props. 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, etc.; (10) the preaching of the apostles after Christ's death *confirms* our doctrine, Props. 70, 71, 72, 73, etc.; (11) the Church was *not taken* from the Jews but the Kingdom was, Prop. preceding, etc.; (12) the Church is not the Kingdom because it will not be given *until* the elect are gathered, Props. 62, 63, 65, 68, etc.; (13) *The Second Advent* is the period when the Kingdom is established, Prop. 51, 52. In brief the Propositions preceding *all contain so many reasons* for not making the Church *the promised* Kingdom of David's Son. The simple fact is, that if we once take the covenanted promises in their plain sense, and view the testimony of Scripture sustaining such a sense, it is *utterly impossible* to convert the Church into the promised Kingdom without *a violation* of propriety and unity of Divine Purpose. The remaining Propositions that follow, nearly all, are additional proofs sustaining our doctrine.

Incidental proof corroborative of our position, can also be alleged. Thus e.g. the conduct of the apostles, after the Christian Church was established, to conciliate the Jews in attending the sacrifices and services in the temple, and adhering in many respects to the laws and customs of Moses, can only be satisfactorily reconciled with our view, that the Christian Church (just as the preceding Jewish) is *preparatory* to the Kingdom. If a Kingdom was established, as Fairbairn and others assert, then the charge of unbelievers, that they had but an imperfect notion of the Kingdom and its proprieties, remains in force (and crushing, because if imperfect in knowledge on so important a matter as the goal, how can we trust them in other matters?) But from our standpoint we see only a matter of prudence, a manifested desire to avoid difficulty, etc., which, connected with things non-essential, was far from being inconsistent with *a correct view* of the church, its meaning and design. In the controversy between Paul and Peter, our opponents forget what they previously asserted respecting Peter's knowledge of the Kingdom in Acts, ch. 2 and 3 (excepting some, who tell us that even in those sermons he manifested great ignorance, possessed only "the husk," etc.)—for they inform us that Peter had low ideas respecting the Kingdom. They forget also that Paul's objections to Peter were based (1) on the rites and ceremonies being non-essential; (2) non-essential, but yet burdensome and leading to bondage; (3) non-essential, but yet calculated, if pressed too far, to obscure repentance and faith in Christ; (4) non-essential, so that even he (Paul), for the sake of conciliation, attended to some rites, but without sacrificing Christian truth. Nowhere does Paul base his rejection of Mosaic rites, etc., upon the fact of a Kingdom being established, but upon the fact of the provision made through Jesus for salvation, and the call of the Gentiles

through repentance and faith. The Church-Kingdom theory feathers the shaft which infidelity (so e.g. Duke of Somerset, *Ch. Theol.*, p. 76) sends against inspiration, seeing that Paul is pressed as the exponent of a Kingdom, over against Peter, James, etc. Our attitude and belief indicate *no such antagonism.* If one is overtaken in weakness by the effort to conciliate the prejudices of the Jews, this only intimates the nature and design of the church, and is no reason for the rejection of fundamental truth, because it is a mere matter of conduct, probationary discipline, test of character, etc., to which the apostles, having to fight the good fight of faith, were, like all other men, subject—the very church relationship evidencing the same.

Obs. 4. Some occupying higher ground, take the view that the Kingdom of God existed continuously before and in the Christian Church, asserting that the form of the Theocracy was changeable and temporary (so Kurtz, *His. of the Old Covenant*, p. 110), but that the essence was retained and transferred to the Christian Church, thus forming an unbroken Kingdom of God. To this we observe: (1) That *the Theocratic* arrangement as specified in the Davidic covenant is *not changeable or temporary.* It is promised *by oath* that His throne and Kingdom as established in His Son is eternal; (2) to make it temporary is equivalent to saying that God's effort to act *as an earthly Ruler* was *a failure;* (3) the only change that was made in the form was that caused by the Jews seeking a visible King and *in this God acquiesced, and incorporated the principle,* as we have shown, in His purpose of Redemption; (4) admitting the change of form, then the Church has *less honor* than the past Theocracy, in that it has not God for *its earthly Ruler*, and that, therefore, in this respect, there is *a retrogression* from the higher Kingdom to the lower; (5) it overrides with inconclusive proof the reasons we have *already presented* for the contrary view.

To avoid repetition, it is taken for granted that the reader has passed over the previous Propositions, and hence a mere reference to the line of argument is deemed sufficient. The answer to Kurtz is found in *the Davidic Covenant*, the prophecies based on it, and the first preaching derived from it. It is a most *solemnly pledged truth*, confirmed by *the oath* of the Almighty, that *the Theocratic order*, as under David, *will be restored* and most gloriously perpetuated at the appointed time under his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence it is *impossible* to allow to the church the features of *a restored Theocratic Kingdom as covenanted;* for there is no restored Jewish nation, no restored tabernacle of David, no restored earthly rule of God, no Theocratic rule manifested through David's Son, etc. Men may claim that this or that church is "the Theocratic Kingdom" (so Papacy), or "the Kingdom of God" (so many Protestants), or "Christ's Kingdom on earth" (so Shakers), or even "the New Jerusalem state" (so Swedenborgians), etc., but all, without exception, lack the covenanted and prophetic *marks*, so that a firm believer in the Word *cannot* allow any of them this coveted honor.

Obs. 5. It may be well in this place to illustrate the arguments that are employed by others to elevate the Church into a Kingdom, and we therefore select a work which has been specially written to perform this service.

In *The Kingdom of Grace*, ch. 2, the author gives us his Scriptural, and other authority. The Church is a Kingdom, (1) because "the Kingdom of God is *within* you," forgetting that this was addressed to the wicked Pharisees who were so unconscious of a Kingdom *within them* that they inquired concerning it, see Prop. 110; (2) "My Kingdom is *not* of this world," which we also teach, as will be shown under its appropriate heading, see Prop. 109; (3) that Jesus claimed to be King, which claim we admit to be just, but is far from proving the establishment of the Kingdom; (4) Jesus did not set up any direct claim to occupy David's throne while living, which we admit and clearly point out the reason for not so doing, viz.: *the postponement* of the Kingdom, see Prop. 58, etc.; (5) that David's Kingdom was *not* of heavenly origin as the church:—this is

incorrect, as the reader will see by referring to Props. 28, 31, etc., and the covenant, Prop. 49, all proving that it was *God's own ordering*, the throne and Kingdom claimed *as His own*, and the King himself being divinely consecrated or anointed to his position; (6) that Christ has not yet raised up David's throne, and therefore it is argued, that He never will,—this argument is presuming to point out what is right and proper for Deity to perform, and has been already answered; (7) the preaching of John, "Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand,' is "evidently the gospel dispensation," for nothing else appeared near at hand but this, etc.—the reasoning is this: the Kingdom was predicted as near, the church was established, and hence the church is the Kingdom, which overlooks *the change* in the style of preaching, Prop. 58, and *the postponement*, Prop. 68. He continues (8) quoting Isa. 9 : 6, 7, and bases the alleged fact of the church being the Kingdom on, "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end," saying: "This expression is, in my view, fatal to the theory of Millenarians; for, according to the principles of that theory, the government of Christ is to have *no increase* after the Second Advent. The elect will all have been gathered in against that great day, when the Son is to be revealed in glory from heaven." It is surprising to charge our theory with a doctrine which it *pointedly repudiates*, as can be seen by the early church view and the history of our doctrine down to the present, which insists on the reign of Jesus on the restored throne and Kingdom of David over the Jewish nation, and the spared Gentiles, etc. (9) Refers us to Rev. 3 : 21, claiming from the passage that Christ is on His throne, and now reigns in the predicted manner, but (*a*) the Word says that He is "set down with my Father on His throne," indicating great exaltation, but contrasted still with the "*my throne*," which in a special manner belongs to Him as Son of man; (*b*) he makes in this theory, as a present result, all the saints *now rewarded, crowned*, associated with Christ *in His rule*, against *the most direct* teaching to the contrary; (*c*) and following His theory, as given in another place, he makes these same rewarded and crowned saints *lay aside* their received honor to appear at the judgment-bar and receive their sentences; (10) He asks what advantage would it be to have Christ's visible throne on earth, for He could only be seen by a few; those in foreign countries, as China and America, could not see Him, unless "they should have new organs of vision given to them," etc. This is altogether *unworthy* of notice, and is only reproduced to introduce the remark: suppose after all that the apostolic Fathers and that long line of noble witnesses to the Kingdom as covenanted, and as held by Millenarians, are correct, would not such writers, who speak so *disrespectfully* of the Saviour's throne, its lowness and degradation if planted here on the earth, appear before that King with *the deepest confusion?* Brethren, who think that they do God's service by opposing us, should at least exhibit the respect due to discussions in which the Saviour's glory is involved. This observation is the more necessary in view of what follows. (11) For, he makes sport of the dominion attributed to Jesus by Millenarians, taking *only as much* of it as happens to suit his style of witticism. Thus (*a*) he refers to Winthrop (*Lectures*), arguing that the original grant of dominion (Gen. 1 : 26-28), lost by the fall, is restored by the Second Adam, giving as proof Ps. 8, comp. with Heb. 2 : 5-9. (*b*) He examines this with the following result: (1) Adam reigned personally over fish, fowl, cattle, creeping things, etc., so the Second Adam must do the same, and "what a glorious Kingdom this will be of our blessed Saviour! But we did not know that this was the Kingdom which He bought with His precious blood." Comment is unnecessary, for argumentation that can stoop to such absurdity, disallowing the dominion *we give* to Jesus, is *unworthy* of a serious reply (comp. Prop. 203). (2) He informs us that the phrase "Son of Man," in the 8th Ps., has not "the remotest allusion whatever to the man Christ Jesus,"—that it denotes man only, and sarcastically inquires whether the animals, etc., are to be also resurrected over whom He is to reign. (3) He says that Heb. 2 : etc., *only* applies to man so far as dominion over animals, etc., is concerned, and *not* to Christ; objects to Winthrop's making "the world to come" to mean "the inhabitable earth to come," on the ground that we are not at liberty to add a word as understood;—that we make by such application to Christ verses 8 and 9 contradictory;—that Son of man when it has a reference to Christ begins with *a capital letter;* that our theory makes David's language unmeaning, which only indicates humility, for David could not say, "Who is Jesus Christ that thou visitest him," etc. Against this argument based on the dominion promised to "the Son of man," it is sufficient to say, (1) that it is opposed to the views of multitudes who are hostile to Millenarianism. The commentators, as e.g. Barnes, Stuart, etc., decide in our favor—while theologians of all classes almost universally contend that Winthrop's argument is correct. (2) That it is in opposition to the early church view, and in direct conflict with the promises given to Christ; that as the Second Adam, the Son of man, *all things* shall be in subjection to Him. (12)

Lastly he refers to Ezek. 36 : 23-28 (admitting the literal restoration of the Jews), Ezek. 37 : 11-14, and Dan. 2 : but as these passages will be discussed under Propositions, we leave them with this conclusion : Such is the line of argument which a work devoted to make out the church a Kingdom, a visible and spiritual one, is *only able* to produce. From it the reader cannot fail to see that it *infers* such a Kingdom, being utterly unable to produce *a decisive passage* which declares either that *the Son of man* now reigns *as predicted* or that the church is *at present* His Kingdom.

The reasons given by Brown (*Sec. Coming*) are of a similar nature (only not so disrespectful in tone), and the Scriptures relied upon to sustain a present Messianic covenanted Kingdom are the following : Acts 2 : 29-36, Zech. 6 : 12, Rev. 5 : 6, and 3 : 7, 8, 12, Isa. 9 : 6, 7, Acts 3 : 13-15, and 3 : 19-21, and 4 : 26, 28, with Ps. 2, Acts 5 : 29, 31. As all these passages are frequently referred to and explained,—as they have no reference to a present existing Kingdom as covenanted (that being inferred),—as they must be considered in the light of the general analogy of the Word,—it is sufficient, for the present, to allude to them, so that the student may observe the exceeding slight foundation upon which the prevailing view rests. A *direct* passage in favor of the Augustinian view cannot be produced ; it is supported entirely by inference, as e.g. Fairbairn (*On Proph.*) infers it from the two discourses of Peter in Acts ; and Mason (*Essays on the Church*, No. 1), after correctly defining the church, supposes it to be the Kingdom of God, because he infers that such passages as Isa. 66 : 12, Isa. 49 : 23, Isa. 6 : 3, 5, and especially "He that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles," must apply to the present existing church. Now, we cannot, for a moment, allow that a Kingdom the subject of covenant and prophecy, the object of faith, hope, and joy, can be left, if really established, to mere inference. And more, we cannot believe, that if set up as many theologians tell us, the early church for several centuries would be unconscious of the same.

Obs. 6. A main leading feature in this effort to make out of the Church the predicted Kingdom of the Messiah, is found in applying to the present, things relating to the Church which are spoken of *as prospectively* (the present used as the future, Prop. 65, Obs. 9), as e.g. Heb. 12 : 22, 23. Promises are given which can only, as we shall hereafter show, be realized by the Church as *a completed body.* This principle must not be overlooked, as e.g. the marriage of the Church, which (1) one party confines to the Church now on earth as married to Jesus ; (2) another asserts is done as every believer enters the third heaven, so that recently a prominent theologian delivered a funeral discourse in which he made a distinguished minister, deceased, sitting down and already enjoying the marriage supper, etc. ; (3) while still another declares the same to be still future as the Scriptures and the early Church locate it, viz. : to occur only at the Second Advent. It will be satisfactorily seen, as we proceed, that many promises, that are *only to be realized in the future* Kingdom, are seized and appropriated to the Church ; and this is not only done by the Popes quoting and applying to themselves, as earthly Heads of the Church, Millennial predictions, but by Protestants in their laudation of Churches. This is done not only from motives of self-interest and ambition, but with a sincere desire to indicate the honor, stability, and perpetuity of Christ's Kingdom. Well may the former be attributed to some of the representatives of the Papacy who even appropriated descriptions *applicable to Jesus* unto themselves, while the latter is seen in the well-intentioned denomination of the Church by the phrase "*the City of God,*" given by Augustine, followed by the multitude, and recently re-introduced by Mansel, Abbey, and others. It is notorious that the names Israel, Judah, and Jerusalem are regarded by a host of writers as synonymous with the Church, without *any regard to the connection* of the prophecy that *the same* Israel, Judah and Jerusalem acted and overthrown for its sinfulness, is to be restored to favor, and is thus meant. The curses pronounced,

are all carefully heaped upon them severally and shown in their case to be sadly realized, while the blessings promised to the *identically same nation and city* are taken from them and carefully bestowed upon the Gentile churches. Is this *honest* to the Record?

Obs. 7. This view of the Church, as we have already seen (Prop. 78), is not inconsistent with the earliest creeds. Those modern phrases and definitions so current are *unknown* to them. They embody a Scriptural idea of the Church, and are consistent with the doctrine received by the first churches (Props. 72-76). The later confessions of various denominations, generally, when speaking of the Kingly office of Christ and His Kingdom either deal in general expressions susceptible of different interpretations, and therefore indecisive; or else passages are quoted which teach both the Kingship of Christ and His Kingdom, but are practically misapplied by not more explicitly asking *when* the same shall be manifested. Thus in looking over several, Isa. 9 : 6, 7 is the favorite passage with them in making the Church the Kingdom of the Messiah. Instead of asking *when* this is to be verified, leaving parallel passages and the preceding context of Isa. 9, which predicts this to occur *in union with the Jewish nation* at a time of mighty national deliverance (see verses 3, 4, 5, Barnes, Hengstenberg, Gesenius, etc., loci), they appropriate the passage *isolated and torn* from its connection. In one confession, more plain than others, it is asserted that "Jesus Christ hath here on earth *a spiritual Kingdom* which is His Church," etc., and the *proof* texts given are Matt. 11 : 11 and 18 : 19, 20. Neither of these texts have a *direct* bearing and are *inferred* (wrongfully) to teach it.

Obs. 8. The same is true of works on Systematic Divinity. Thus, e.g. Dr. Hodge in his recent work gives as *proof* texts Isa. 9 : 6, 7; Ps. 2, etc., which only assert that Christ shall be king; also Dan. 7 : 13, 14; Ps. 45, 72, and 110; Luke 1 : 31–33, without attempting to show that they are *correctly applied*, but in a manner, as if such an interpretation was *never questioned* by the early church and many witnesses in the church. This is *characteristic* of many of them, and is especially weak when the design is to give *a systematic view* of Christian doctrine thoroughly founded on the Word in a clear and decisive form. Theologians of eminence take singular and contradictory views of the church as a Kingdom. One of the latest, Dr. Thompson (*Theol. of Christ*, ch. 10), endeavors to define the Kingdom of God. He opposes the view of Dr. Oosterzee, who makes the Kingdom of God a new thing not formerly in existence; he tells us, "To the men whom Christ addressed, the Kingdom of God was no new idea, or rather, it was no new phase; but it can hardly be said to have represented *any definite idea* to a generation that had so far lost the meaning of their own law and history"—this against the preaching of John and the disciples, see Props. 39, 43, etc. After correctly and forcibly stating that this Kingdom is based on a Deliverer and redeemed people, although probably in a sense different from ours, he then informs us that the Kingdom is "not simply his providential government over the world at large, nor his universal government over this and all worlds" (thus sustaining our Propositions on the Sovereignty of God the Father and the Son); "nor the king and high priest set up in His name; but the presence and power of God felt and acknowledged *in*

the hearts of those that trusted in Him and did His commandments" (comp. Props. 84, 85, 110, etc.). Subsequently he represents it as "the idea of a living present God who dwelt *in the hearts* of all true worshippers, *as a monarch* living among his subjects." Such a Kingdom he says Jesus preached, meaning "the presence of God as a Saviour realized *to the soul*," and gives utterance, under what he calls "*a spiritual conception of the Kingdom*," to a number of things as embraced in the preaching of Jesus that, so far as the Record goes, Jesus Christ *never* proclaimed. In reply, see the Props. on the preaching of Jesus and disciples.

If Jesus really did preach such a Kingdom as Thompson claims, it ought to be decided and established by the Gospels, but these *unmistakably prove the contrary* by the stubborn fact that neither the Seventy nor the Twelve comprehended the nature of the Kingdom to be *such as he teaches*. Another proof will be found below in next Prop., Obs. 2. We are indeed told that the more devout and spiritual, such as Zacharias, Simeon, Joseph of Arimathea, expected just such a Kingdom, but this is not only unproven, but contrary to the general, universal expectation of the Jews, Props. 20, 21, 40, 44, etc. Again, he declares that "the Kingdom consists in doing the will of the Father;" that "coming to the realization of God in His supreme Lordship over the soul, is the Kingdom;" that the Church, "held together by a personal faith in Him, did not constitute the Kingdom of God in the most pure and absolute sense;" that "the external, visible Church may shadow forth that Kingdom," while "the true Church of Christ" (i.e. as we understand him, true believers in union with Christ, hence the invisible Church) "is identical with the true Kingdom of God." All these definitions are *of human origin*; not one is *to be found* in the Bible (those expressions from which it might be inferred will be subsequently examined in Props. 108, 109, and 110), and every one of them mistakes the requisite qualification *for entrance* into the Kingdom, for the Kingdom itself. Repentance, faith, obedience, union with Christ, etc., are *essential for inheriting*, but do *not constitute* the Kingdom itself. The covenant forbids it.

Obs. 9. The church, as we have shown, being designed to gather out and raise up those who should be rulers in, inheritors of the Kingdom, it is necessary for them to possess certain qualifications. Those just mentioned are specified, and therefore true believers, instead of being *in* the Kingdom, are represented as being *in a state* of probation, of trial and testing. The very nature of probation *is opposed* to the idea of the Kingdom as given by the Prophets, and hence in the Epistles believers are exhorted to hold fast to faith and obedience that they *might attain unto* the Kingdom, 1 Pet. 1 : 7 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 5–11, etc.

Obs. 10. The church, instead of being represented as a Kingdom, is held up to us as *a struggling, suffering* people, Col. 1 : 24 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 8 ; 2 Cor. 1 : 5 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 4 ; 2 Pet. 4 : 12, 13, etc. The founders, the apostles, themselves suffered, Acts 14 : 20 and 9 : 16 ; Eph. 3 : 13, etc. Saints are to fill up the measure of Christ's sufferings, Acts 14 : 20 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 5, etc. Saints have endured martyrdom, and as such are still waiting until the body is completed. Take the descriptions given of Christians still groaning (Rom. 8 : 23), as given by Delitzsch (*Ser. Ap. to Sys. Bib. Psyc.*), in their trials, temptations, struggles against sin, etc., and how can this possibly be reconciled with the idea of a Kingdom *such as the Prophets predicted* under the Messiah, e.g. Isa. 25, etc.? "Pilgrims and strangers" in the Kingdom as promised, is something incredible. Tertullian (*Treat. on Prayer*, ch. 5), teaching that the Kingdom in the Lord's prayer is *not* the church, whilst admitting, as we do, that "God reigns in whose hand is the heart of all kings," locates the Kingdom, petitioned for, in the future at the end of the age, and in view of *the present condi-*

tion of believers rebukes those who pray that this age may be protracted, on the ground that such a petition is virtually opposed to the spirit of the Lord's Prayer, and virtually asks for a delayment or detention of the Kingdom, saying, "Our wish is that our reign be hastened, *not our servitude protracted*," etc. Such should be our spirit and prayer. For "the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord," and if Christ, whilst on earth, instead of reigning as Son of Man, suffered for us, etc., we should, in our pilgrimage, anticipate reproach and suffering and not reigning or the enjoyment of a Kingdom. The *sad history* of the church teaches us that there is a deep and abiding meaning in Luke 12 : 49, and that she has indeed had a time of fire, and her trials indicate that this is not yet the Kingdom of peace under the benign reign of the Messiah as delineated by the Prophets. Individuals truly have peace with God in believing, but *if faithful* do not find it with their fellow-man, the world, or even in a great extent in the church itself.

Obs. 11. Those modern phrases of ministers and people, "of extending, enlarging, building up, etc., *Christ's Kingdom*" are *not to be found* in the New. Test. They are the result of viewing the church as the Kingdom. The absence of such phraseology and eulogies of the church derived from Millennial descriptions must also have some weight with the student. For, if the church is what the many tell us, then surely we ought to find the portrayals of it as a glorious Kingdom to be extended by believers given by inspired men. But our argument logically and scripturally shows that such language from them would be *fatal* to the covenant itself. Christ Himself personally, and not men, can build up this Kingdom at the appointed time.

Much is said in books, sermons, hymns, prayers, etc., under the impulse of misguided zeal, respecting the Church's building up the Kingdom of Christ. This is a remnant derived from Popish sources, and reminds one of the Spiritual Exercises of Loyola (Littell's *Liv. Age*, vol. 122, p. 646), commending to the Order "the contemplation of the Kingdom of Christ Jesus under the similitude of a terrestrial king, calling out his subjects to the strife." The believer certainly carries on a warfare, constantly and unremittingly, if faithful, against temptation and evil, and in behalf of the truth and God's appointments, but never in behalf of an existing Kingdom. The latter is never asserted, and is, therefore, of human origin. What must we say, then, when bodies of Christians send forth circulars and proclamations urging believers to pray for the upbuilding, etc. of a present existing Kingdom, when in fact none exists in the sense they suppose, or, when an official oath is required of ministers (as in Prussia, established in 1815, and renewed in 1835), in which they swear that they will "extend in my congregation the Kingdom of God, and of my Lord and Master Jesus Christ," when such a Kingdom is given by the Father (Prop. 83) to Jesus at (Prop. 66) His Sec. Advent? Strange where man's wisdom, if the covenants are forsaken, leads him! Such a mode of procedure is unbecoming the eminent divines who have, unreflectingly, indorsed it, and may safely be left to others, as e.g. Mormons; for so Miss Eliza R. Snow, the Mormon Prophetess in the poem "*Our Prophet*, Brigham Young:"

> "Help him to found thy Kingdom
> In majesty and power," etc.

Obs. 12. The church is not this Kingdom of prophecy, because the establishment of the church does *not meet the conditions* of the prophecy respecting the period of suffering, etc., preceding the Kingdom. Notice (1) the views of the Jews (Van Oosterzee, *Theol. of N. T.*, p. 53), that they expected the Messiah to come in a time of great trial; (2) this derived from the declaration of the Prophets, as e.g. Zech. 14; Dan. 7

and 12; this the language also of Jesus to the Pharisees, Luke 17, Matt. 24; (3) but instead of war, etc., as portrayed by Zech. and others, the Christian Church was established in a time of peace. The destruction of Jerusalem was afterward witnessed. This period of general peace is much admired and lauded by writers, and justly so, but their inquiries in this direction only proves *the more conclusively that the church cannot be substituted for the predicted Kingdom*, inasmuch as the very commencement of the former is not in accord with what is prophesied of the latter.

If the student refers to Props. 115, 123, 133, 147, 160, 161, 162, 163, etc., he will find the Scriptures relating to the period of war, suffering, etc., just preceding the establishment of the covenant Messianic Kingdom, showing that there is a wide and material difference between the First and Second Advents. And may it be most reverently said, that this very distinction of the condition of things as witnessed at the First Advent, and as shall be observed at the Second, is one of those incidental but forcible proofs of an all-pervading Plan which God purposes to complete.

Obs. 13. That such a Kingdom is not to be sought in the Christian Church appears also from the views entertained by our opponents of the general judgment. If the judgment exists in the form and manner given *by them*, and the believers, as well as unbelievers, are to be judicially tried at the end of the world, etc., then it is difficult to reconcile such a judgment with present admittance *into* the Kingdom of Christ, for the simple reason that the Scriptures assure us that entrance into by inheriting the Kingdom *is inconsistent with a future judging* of such persons. For such admittance is represented as *a reward* for previous well-doing and results from an investigation and approval of character (Matt. 25 : 34; Luke 22 : 29, 30; 2 Thess. 1 : 5, etc.).

Obs. 14. Those who believe that the church is the Kingdom, differ widely among themselves as to *when* it was established and in *what* it consists. As we have repeatedly seen, the time of its commencement varies, and a copious variety of definitions exist. This in itself would be undecisive, as differences in opinion may exist, and yet the truth may be in some one of them, but such, when they are found in *the same party*, clearly show that with them the subject is *more or less* involved in obscurity, giving rise to numerous conceptions of it. One theory steadfastly adhered to indicates at least unity, whilst several feebly conjoined, or antagonistic, manifests weakness. If we take the descriptions of the prophets and covenant promises, it is impossible to believe that the Kingdom of God should possess *such characteristics* that its commencement cannot be definitely and decisively fixed, and that its meaning cannot be precisely given. If we look at the prophetic announcements of the conspicuous nature, etc., of the Kingdom, it seems *incredible* that it should occupy the indefinite position assigned to the church.

As soon as spiritualizing is applied to the Kingdom, *then* antagonistic interpretations and opposite definitions are given, until we have in the same person two, five, ten, and even twenty different ones (see Prop. 3). This is the case with even the most recent writers, so that e.g. one (Van Oosterzee) makes Christ the Founder of this Kingdom at His First Advent, and another (Thompson) has Christ only reviving what previously always existed. The utmost latitude is given to generalities, which mean nothing, and qualifications for the Kingdom (and even the Gospel, preaching, etc.) are elevated into the Kingdom itself. *Surely* all this—in the light of positive prediction that the Kingdom when established is something recognizable by all men, something that all will

acknowledge as indisputable in its manifestation—should *prevent* us from accepting this Origenistic view of the Church).

Obs. 15. Making the church the Kingdom of God is *a plain violation* of some important rules of interpretation. Thus, e.g. take those given by Horne (*Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 393) on the doctrinal interpretation of the Scriptures, and we have a constant disregard paid to rules 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11, and (p. 407) to rules 1, 2, and 3. For, as already repeatedly intimated, the view so generally entertained respecting the church is one of pure *inference*, whilst the general tenor concerning the Kingdom, the covenant and predictions in which it is specially discussed are practically ignored, preference being given to a few isolated passages (easily reconcilable with the general analogy), or to parabolic captions, which, in the nature of the case, must only be explained in the light of the more extended and detailed accounts given of the Kingdom. Besides this, our doctrine is *the only one* which preserves a consistency in the Old Test. idea of the Kingdom as held by the pious Jews, as preached by John and the Disciples, as covenanted, and which does not degrade the ancient worthies into an ignorant or mistaken people; interpreting as it does the Biblical view of the Kingdom in accordance with the ancient language, expectations, covenant, preaching, etc., and not with the Origenistic ideas and more modern modes of thought and spiritualizing.

Consequently we must logically and Scripturally reject any theory, no matter by whom advocated, which would make the Church, or religion, or piety, or the Gospel, or the dispensation, or the qualifications for eternal blessedness, equivalent to the Messianic Kingdom. Covenant, prophecy, provisionary measures, fulfilment, ancient faith, all forbid it. The Church, however exceedingly precious and necessary, is in no sense the Kingdom, being simply preparatory for the Kingdom. Sustained as it is by the Divine Sovereignty; upheld as it is by the presence and authority of the Head, it has not the characteristics of the promised Kingdom. It is sad to find that men who exert a wide influence upon theological teaching do not discriminate in this matter, as e.g. illustrated in Robinson's *Greek N. T. Dic.*, which makes the Kingdom to be the Christian dispensation, and then a principle in the heart, and then a people under the influence of holiness, and then to be perfected at Christ's Kingdom. (Comp. e.g. for reply to such places as Prop. 59, Obs. 8; Prop. 65, Obs. 2; Prop. 68, Obs. 1; Prop. 66, Obs. 1; Props. 67 and 70, etc.) Such definitions overlook the most simple statements in reference to this Kingdom, as e.g. that this Kingdom is allied with a Coming of the Messiah—not in humiliation, but in glory; with a restoration—not dispersion—of the Jewish nation; with a completed gathering of the saints, etc.

PROPOSITION 94. *The overlooking of the postponement of this Kingdom is a fundamental mistake, and a fruitful source of error in many systems of Theology.*

One of *the most important events* connected with the history of Jesus (Props. 58, 66, etc.) is *entirely ignored* by the multitude; an event, too, *plainly stated*, and upon which result fearful (to the Jews) and merciful (to the Gentiles) consequences. This remarkable event, interwoven into the very life of Jesus as *a controlling force*, is *the postponement* of the once tendered Kingdom to the Sec. Advent.

Obs. 1. This doctrine, noticed by, and influencing the faith and hope of the Primitive Church, is now, under spiritualizing and mystical ascendency, passed by in numerous Commentaries, Lives of Christ, Systems of Divinity, Introductions to Theology, Histories of Doctrine, Practical Theology, and Exegetical Works, *just as if it had no existence*. The fact is, that many writers, with their minds prejudiced and blinded by a previous training, never even suspected its existence; for, following the lead of others, swayed by previously given systems of belief and exegetical indorsements by favorite authors, they receive their guidance without mistrust as in accordance with the truth.

The leaders themselves proceed thus: *overlooking* the postponement of the Kingdom, and *assuming* that a Kingdom was somehow established, they proceed, one in this fashion and another in that, to find this Kingdom somewhere, if not visibly at least invisibly, associated with the Church or the Divine Sovereignty. In their estimation, and assumption of an unproven theory, a Kingdom must be erected, if it takes four, six, eight or more Kingdoms in different stages and places, with various meanings attached (comp. Prop. 3), to make it out, and this moulds the interpretation of Scripture, for every passage not in harmony with it must be spiritualized *until it is forced* into an agreement. And this creature of pure fancy, so antagonistic to the covenanted Kingdom, which they are pleased to give the title of "the Kingdom of God," some even, like the author of *Ecce Homo* (p. 23), consider "greater than prophecy had ever attributed to the Messiah Himself." In brief: the Prophets and the Covenants are "too materialistic," "too Jewish" for this *refined* spiritually conceived Kingdom. Alas! men, eminent for piety, ability, and usefulness, materially aid in this *wide departure* from the primitive truth. While some of those theories form pleasant pictures, and are finely portrayed, still, like some of the imaginary paintings of the old masters, they have no reality upon which they are based—they, however widely spread and deeply rooted, are only the results of human suppositions. The writer has often been saddened to find believers, from whom he has derived much valuable information on various subjects when entering into the discussion of the progress of doctrine, entirely discard the Primitive Church view as if it had never been so generally and publicly entertained, although the postponement forms the basis of the call of the Gentiles, the establishment of the Ch. Church, and the distinctive Chiliastic views of the early Church (referring the Kingdom, etc., to the Sec. Advent). Some writers even suppose that the preaching of Jesus as the Christ is the present realization of the Kingdom in the person of Jesus. They illogically make the "preaching of the things concerning the Kingdom" the equivalent of the Kingdom itself.

Obs. 2. A truth *so fundamental* to a correct understanding of the Doctrine of the Kingdom, is buried under a load of prejudice, preconceived opinion, mysticism, etc. Infidel and Orthodox, unbelievers and believers, alike maintain on this point a friendly relation. Thus e.g. Renan (*Life of Jesus*) makes Jesus set up an ideal Kingdom, which is to appear immediately, and which, he tells us, is established. Dr. McCosh, in replying to Renan (*Christ and Positiv.*, p. 243), admits the establishment of the Kingdom, and designates it a spiritual one. Rejecting the early church view (founded on the plain, unmistakable, *grammatical sense* of Scripture, and received directly from *inspired* men), which found *a profound meaning in this postponement*, and heartily embracing the Origenistic interpretation, which *sadly mars* the covenants and recognizes no postponement, this *must necessarily* have a moulding influence, a coloring power over *all related* subjects. One of *the most radical defects* in modern theology is found on this point, and, so long as persevered in, certain avenues of knowledge are closed; mystical interpretation; vain attempts to conciliate the Divine utterances with prevailing theories of church and state; labored, unavailing efforts to trace a methodical progress in the teaching of the Saviour and disciples; spiritualistic applications which effectually degrade the ancient faith of the church; the overshadowing and ignoring of highly important truth—these and other evils attend such a position. Thousands of volumes attest to the fact that, with *this link missing*, it is in vain to form a complete, perfect chain in the Divine Purpose, and at the same time preserve the integrity of the preaching of John, Jesus, and the disciples.

The sad consequences of overlooking this postponement is e.g. duly exemplified in the work (*John on the Apoc. of the N. Test.*) of Rev. Desprez (commended by Drs. Noyes, Williams, and Stanley). This writer, no doubt urged on by the critical attacks of unbelief in this direction, fully and frankly acknowledges *all* that we have stated concerning the preaching of the Kingdom and its expectation by the apostles and their immediate successors; but overlooking the plain and distinctive Scriptures which portray its postponement, he arrives precisely at the same conclusion with the destructive critics, viz.: that all this matter referring to a Jewish Kingdom, to the Second Coming of Christ, and to the final re-establishment, must be ruled out *as no part* of the Word of God (being the result of Jewish prejudice, misapprehension, etc.), because the lapse of time has fully demonstrated that *nothing* of the kind occurred as they expected. Alas! when accredited ministers of the Gospel give themselves up to such fearful destructive and delusive criticism to the delight of unbelievers! Of course, such an attitude at once eliminates a large proportion of the teaching of the Gospels and Epistles, utterly rejects the Apocalypse as revolving around a chimera, sets aside the covenants and God's oath as untrustworthy, and overshadows all the remainder with a heavy pall of doubt. If Desprez is correct, what *confidence* can we possibly have in the apostles, or in the utterances of any of the inspired writers; for if in error on the leading important subject of the Kingdom, *why not also* in error on the resurrection, the atonement, and, in brief, all other doctrines? No! never can such outrageous, *dishonoring* interpretation be received, although Desprez boasts of a phalanx of interlaced shields (of proof), for it lacks coherency in that it totally ignores the proof given by these writers themselves respecting *the postponement* of the Kingdom. The past is no criterion in the sense alleged by Desprez (although it proves the correctness of the postponement), and he had better wait until "the times of the Gentiles" are fulfilled before he thus decides. If Gentile domination ceases, if the Jewish nation is restored, and Jerusalem is no longer downtrodden, etc., and then the Kingdom does not come, it will be in place to receive his criticism; until then it amounts to nothing.

Obs. 3. The rejection of the postponement of the Kingdom, is a rejection of *the only key* that can unlock the singular and otherwise mysterious

sayings of Jesus. The consistency of the Divine narration of Christ's Life, and of the faith and conduct of His disciples before and after His death, *is alone preserved by its adoption.* We have learned and able treatises on this life of Jesus, which give varied and subtle theories in order to reconcile events and sayings, and to preserve the unity of Purpose, but every one of them, even those written by believers (as Neander's, Lange's, Cave's, Fleetwood's, Milner's, Pressense's, Taylor's, Farrar's, Beecher's, etc.), must, more or less, resort to the favorite "germ" theory, to "a hidden leaven development," by which is understood that the truth is at first concealed or enveloped in language which—if understood *as it reads*, according to the letter, is error—the "growing consciousness" of the church, by a spiritualizing process through such men as Origen, Augustine, Jerome, etc., is to bring forth in its developed form, having discarded "the husk."

Volumes, some from most gifted, learned, and pious writers, are filled with just such mystical and philosophical reasoning, and all arising from a *misconception* of the covenanted Kingdom and an *ignoring* of its postponement. Another class of learned writers, rejecting in part the Origenistic principle of finding a concealed meaning or another sense, subjecting the New Test. to a searching grammatical interpretation, find that such a Kingdom, as we argue for, was promised, preached, and fondly expected, but, *overlooking* this postponement so explicitly declared, tell us that Jesus, failing in the designed restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom (expecting but not receiving aid through angelic interference—so Renan), He then contented Himself, under the pressure of circumstances, to sacrifice His life and found a spiritual Kingdom. Some men (*Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, pub. by Lessing, etc.) declare that Jesus in His efforts to establish a Kingdom, failing of the popular support, miserably perished, the victim of ambition. Becker (in his *Univ. His. for the Young*, quoted by Hurst, *His. Rat.*, p. 190) thinks that Jesus received the idea of putting forth His claims from John and John's father, and that an arrangement was made between them to take advantage of the predictions relating to the Messiah in the Old Test., with the same result. Bahrdt, and many others recently, exult and triumph over this fancied interpretation, without in the least noticing *how the expressive language and predictions of Jesus*, in postponing this Kingdom, refutes their scandalous and vindictive assertions. What must we think of men who only take as much of the Record suitable for the purpose of condemnation, and carefully leave unnoticed the very testimony included in the same?

It may be suggestive, if not instructive, to contrast two classes, who both ignore the reasons assigned for and the predictions of Jesus relating to this postponement. In *Ecce Homo*, the writer informs us: "He (Jesus) conceived the Theocracy restored as it had been in the time of David, with a visible monarch at its head, and that monarch Himself." "Christ announced the restoration of the Davidic Monarchy, and presented Himself to the nation as their King; yet, when we compare the position He assumed with that of an ancient Jewish king, *we fail to find* any point of resemblance." Now let us consider the reply of *Ecce Deus* (p. 333) to *Ecce Homo*, viz.: that the Davidic Kingdom was only "*typical*" (just as if the covenant included a type) "of government and purpose which lie beyond the merely political horizon." And the writer argues from the fact that because such a restoration was not effected at the First Advent and since, Jesus *never* announced the restoration of the Davidic Monarchy (i.e. the language descriptive of it is "typical" of something else), and then, satisfied with his *illogical* reasoning, in his own fancy triumphantly concludes: "If *the facts* contradict the theory, *what confidence* can be placed in the theorist?" Precisely so: *both* writers ignore plain facts as given by Jesus and the apostles respecting the Kingdom, and not content with leaving these out of the question, confess that their unbelief is grounded on a *non-fulfilment* of prophecy and prediction, *just as if* God is bound to fulfil them, not according to *His own Purpose and Time*, but, to accommodate Himself to their mode of exercising faith. Such writers had better wait until "the times of the Gentiles" have ended, until the elect are gathered out, until the Sec. Advent arrives, until Christ's intermediate predictions are fulfilled, before rashly giving us those conclusions. We see from this what estimate to place on rationalistic criticism, which concludes, because the Kingdom that was covenanted, predicted, and preached was not at once realized; that, after all, Christ's relationship to the Old Test. was one of *mere accommodation* to circumstances; and this is

arrived at by persistently turning away from Scripture, which tells us *why* it has not yet been realized and *when* it is to be witnessed. The same is true of that class, who, because the Kingdom did not appear in the form grammatically expressed, declare that the language applicable to it must either be understood spiritually or as pertaining to the Church—i.e. a Kingdom, in some form, visible or invisible, must be recognized to suit preconceived views.

Obs. 4. Let the student reflect over the singular attitude of the Primitive Church, viz. : in view of this very postponement laying *the greatest stress* upon Eschatology or doctrine of the last things, *looking forward* with hope and joy to a speedy Advent, the re-establishment of the glorious Theocratic Kingdom under the Messiah, etc., and can such a state of things *be satisfactorily explained* to take place *under inspired* teachers and their immediate successors without condemning *the doctrinal position* of the early church and reflecting upon *the founders* of the church, *unless* the same doctrinal teaching is accepted as Scriptural? Leaving the history of the doctrine for future reference, it is sufficient for the present to say that the idea of the postponement of the Kingdom had a most powerful influence, for at least three centuries, *in moulding the doctrinal views* of the church. Hagenbach (*His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 74), in summing up the general doctrinal character of the early church period, indicates this feature, when he says: "*The doctrine of the Messianic Kingdom ruled the first period.* This turned upon the point that *the Lord was twice to come:* once in His manifestation in the flesh, and in His future coming in judgment."

It has been remarked by many (as e.g. *Ecce Homo*, p. 22), that at the First Advent there was a general expectation that the Messiah would, by an irresistible and supernatural exertion of power, crush His enemies and establish His Kingdom, and that "this appeared legibly written in the prophetical books;" that He was rejected by His countrymen because He refused to put forth such power, etc. We have seen, under various Propositions, *why* He refused to exhibit such power. The time had *not yet* arrived, for the moral conditions imposed were not observed by the nation. But notice: the Primitive Church, instead of spiritualizing those prophecies, *only postponed the fulfilment to the Sec. Advent;* the traditional doctrine, the general expectation derived from the prophets, still continued in the Church, *only allied with* the Second Coming of Jesus. The apostles, instead of correcting this opinion, favor it by speaking of Him as one who, in strict accord with the prophets, shall come with supernatural power to destroy His enemies, etc., while the last revelation (the Apoc.) informs us that He will come "to make war," etc. The student, if judicious, will carefully consider this correspondence, and seek for its basis where alone it is to be found, viz. : in the Scriptures themselves. This meets the objections urged in various works, as e.g. Hengstenberg's *The Jews and the Ch. Church.*

Obs. 5. Writers commenting on the passage, "*Nevertheless I tell you the truth, it is good for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you,*" etc. (John 16 : 7), have much to say concerning the coming of the Holy Spirit as an advance doctrinally, etc., but fail to tell us *why* the Holy Spirit, whose *special* (for He had been previously present), manifestation is thus announced, could not come unless Jesus went away. This was necessary, because the sinfulness of the nation had postponed the predicted promised Coming of the Spirit with the Kingdom (comp. Prop. 170), hence a special interposition of the Saviour was requisite *both* to prepare the way for the gathering out of the elect and to give an assurance of a future fulfilment by an inchoate fulfilment secured through the obedience and exaltation of Christ.

This also enables us to answer the question proposed by unbelief, why Jesus Christ does not personally manifest Himself, at least now and then, to remove the unbelief of

the world. The reply is, that having been rejected by the covenanted elect nation, and that nation suffering the consequences of such rejection, the Kingdom itself being postponed until the time arrives for the removal of the inflictions imposed, the withdrawal of the Messiah is part of that punishment entailed. Until "*the times of the Gentiles*" are ended, an open, visible manifestation cannot be reasonably expected. Besides this, the engrafting of Gentiles is, as we have shown, done on the principle of faith and not of sight. It ill becomes the dignity of the King to appear before the time fixed for the cessation of punishment and the gathering out of an incorporated people by faith. Killen (*The Anc. Church*, p. 46) asks the question, why so little notice is taken of the seventy in the New Test., and answers, because it was typical or symbolical of the future transmission of the Gospel. They could, however, be no type of the future, owing to their *exclusive* mission and message. The answer is found in the speedy postponement of the Kingdom ending their mission to the nation, and a sufficient amount of evidence being produced to show both the tender of the Kingdom and the rejection of the Messiah.

Obs. 6. The postponement of the Kingdom (with the events connected therewith), being the truth itself joining other truths in an intelligent and satisfactory manner,—is admirably adapted to meet and remove the objections of the Jews. The Jews, abiding by the plain statements of the Old Test., survey the various prevailing theories, advanced respecting a *present existing* Messianic Kingdom, and finding them one and all *antagonistic* to the covenanted and predicted promises, reject Christianity itself,—as if this *humanly interpolated* view was a part of Christianity (which it was not for the first three centuries). Compare Prop. 193.

Thus e.g. the objection urged by Rabbi Crool (*Restoration of Israel*), against Jesus as the Messiah, is, that He did not sit on David's throne or set up the Davidic Kingdom *as it was predicted* by the prophets and as *covenanted*; and also, that the Jews, instead of the promised peace, joy, exaltation, etc., under the Messianic Kingdom (if it really commenced at or immediately after the First Advent), found trouble, suffering, dispersion, etc. Now to such objections, *the postponement*, with the Scripturally given reasons for its occurrence, affords *the only satisfactory* reply, seeing that we leave the covenanted Kingdom intact, the covenants and predictions just as they are written, and the promises to the Jewish nation, in its covenanted relationship, *to be yet fulfilled* in all their greatness and glory.

Obs. 7. This acceptation of the taught postponement effectually removes the chief argument against, what some are pleased to call, "prophetical literalism." Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 495, Ap. F.) attempts to make the charge preferred against his system (viz.: that it is calculated to repel Jews), to recoil upon us by boldly asserting that "prophetical literalism, essentially Jewish," aids the Jews in rejecting Christ, because we claim that many things referring to Christ still remain unfulfilled. (Comp. preceding Obs.) This is unfounded: for we show *a sufficiency*, already fulfilled, literally, in Jesus *to justify His being received as the Messiah*, while the main leading objections relating to the covenants, the Kingdom, the covenanted position of the nation, its supremacy as predicted, etc., are answered by us without *any perversion* of Scripture under the plea of spiritualizing, accommodation, a better sense, etc. The proof is found in the conversions effected by the relative systems.

We hold to the covenants as given to the Jews; accept of the predictions received by them; indorse as they did the literal fulfilment respecting the Kingdom, so that we are not guilty of that spiritualizing of promises into a vague and invisible fulfilment *so exceedingly* unsatisfactory to a Jewish mind. We do not take the promises expressly given *to the* Jewish nation and heap them, without regard to their connection, *upon the* Gentiles. Our position, and the proving the fulfilment of covenant and promise in the future; our showing a postponement to the Second Advent of predictions especially near

and dear to the Jewish heart, *must necessarily* be more acceptable to Jewish faith than the wholesale disclaimers of popular systems. The Jew finds in our system of belief a harmony with the language of Scripture that he sees in no other; and so much is this the case that many Jews have accepted of the Messiah under its influence, as witnessed in the numerous Jews who have been *Millenarians*, publishing Millenarian works and editing Millenarian periodicals. Indeed Fairbairn breaks the force of his own objection, for if our "prophetical literalism *is essentially Jewish*" it cannot be hostile to, but must be favorable to, the Jews. Besides this, it is worthy of notice, when once the principles of interpretation of the Alexandrian school (indorsed by Fairbairn) predominated, conversion among the Jews became fewer and fewer, until finally, under the spiritualizing system, they for centuries almost entirely ceased. And it was only after a more literal interpretation of the Bible was revived, that conversions among them increased. (Comp. works of McNeil, Margoliouth, Brooks, Bicheno, etc., and sermons before the London Soc. for the Conv. of Jews by Cooper, etc., etc.)

Obs. 8. The most amiable piety, as well as the grossest unbelief, is alike arrayed against an acknowledgment of this postponement, owing to *the pervading influence* of the church-Kingdom theories. It is observable that the former even in its comments on things which are utterly inconsistent with the state of the predicted Messianic Kingdom (which the prophets make one of peace, release from suffering, deliverance from enemies, etc.), endeavors, by the force of the sheerest inference, to conciliate such a state of things now existing with the prophetic delineation of a Kingdom in a peaceful and flourishing existence.

Thus, to illustrate: Steir (Lange's *Com. Matt.*, vol. p. 199, Doc. 1) attributes the intimations of Jesus that His disciples must endure persecution, tribulation, etc., to the fact that a Kingdom *very different* to the one expected must *intervene*. But where is this intervening Kingdom, combined with suffering, etc., *covenanted or predicted?* Jesus, too, nowhere says that His followers must endure tribulation *in His Kingdom*; more than this, in view of the covenanted and predicted blessings, He could *not truthfully* say it, for one single utterance of this kind would raise up *an irreconcilable antagonism*. The New Test. perfectly agrees with the Old, fully sustains the gladdening consistency, by attributing to and associating with the Messianic Kingdom *only* happiness, blessing, honor, and glory. Once to be *in* the Kingdom *is freedom* from all evil and deliverance from the curse. The peculiarity has already been noticed, that in the Old Test., so far as the Kingdom is concerned, there is no discrimination between the First and Second Advents. So much is this the case, that if we had only the Old Test. and knew nothing of the First Advent, as separate and distinct from another, we also, like the Jews, would believe this Kingdom to be subsequent to His First Coming. (We have shown why this feature became *necessary*, because of the tender of the Kingdom at the First Advent.) While this is true, the postponement of the Kingdom, in view of the refusal of the nation to comply with the required moral conditions, indicates *what* coming is meant, not the coming to humiliation, rejection, and death, but the coming in glory. We are, therefore, not at liberty *to change* the nature of the Kingdom in order *to accommodate it* to the state of things existing during *this period of postponement*.

Obs. 9. The Kingdom being thus postponed, and the process of the gathering out of the elect now going on, is sufficient reason why *no additional Revelation* is necessary. The Apocalypse of John, to encourage our faith and hope, includes all that is additionally required to be known, appropriately closing the direct Divine communications, and confirming the voices of the Prophets. Jesus Himself refrained from penning down anything, contenting Himself with the testimony of chosen witnesses, because He foresaw that such writing, if given, would have been perverted by His enemies and employed against Himself in accusation to the Roman power (as was even done through His reported words).

For the same reason, in part, the Apocalypse is given in symbolical language, and the apostles (as Paul in Thess.) are guarded in their expressions. After the reader has

passed over our entire argument, the reader will find abundant reason *why* the Kingdom is mentioned in the Gospels and Epistles without entering into the specific details given by the prophets, and *why* the same is represented under symbolic forms in the Apocalypse. Taking into consideration the nature of the Kingdom, the restored Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom, which *necessarily* embraces a restored Jewish nation, etc., a more extended and detailed notice would *unnecessarily* (owing to this postponement) have excited the jealousy, hostility, and persecution of the Roman Empire.

Obs. 10. Jesus having come to fulfil the Prophets, and that fulfilment being in large part postponed to the Sec. Advent, the statements of the Prophets remain and include in them *a sufficiency* of information needed. To fully know what His mission was, and how it will be eventually realized, we must refer not merely to His life, to the preaching and testimony of His disciples, but also to what the Prophets have written, ever remembering that the covenants form *the basis* of all pertaining to the Kingdom. From these united, the doctrine of the Kingdom can be clearly adduced.

We strongly suspect (giving it as a suggestion) that in view of the postponement, and this being merely a preliminary stage to the final ushering in of His Kingdom, He, foreseeing (as has happened) how the words of the Prophets descriptive of this Kingdom would be perverted from their literal meaning and torn from their connection to sustain Church and hierarchical claims—He, foreknowing how His own words as reported would be changed in their meaning for the same purpose, left as little as possible on record indorsing the preliminary nature of this dispensation, in order to avoid *additional* perversion and spiritualizing of language; and in order, above all, to make the covenants, and predictions pertaining thereto, the objects of continued humble faith and hope. The prophecies that He has fulfilled, the testimony of Himself and disciples, the incorporation of all this in a regular Divine Plan possessing unity of Purpose, and which is only sustained and manifested when the prophecies which He is to fulfil at His Sec. Coming are included, evince that we possess *a sufficient* guide.

Obs. 11. By this postponement the special Davidic covenant remains unfulfilled (excepting that David's Son and Lord is born, and qualified for the immortal reign), and "*the tabernacle of David*" *continues* "*fallen down*" *and* "*in ruins,*"—"*The house*" *remains* "*desolate.*" It demands the *harshest* interpretation to deny or spiritualize away *existing facts.* Yet men, involved in a system which, of necessity, must have the predicted Kingdom in actual establishment, endeavor to get rid of all this in *the most summary* way. Thus e.g. take any prediction relating to the Messiah reiguing on David's throne (as e.g. Isa. 9 : 7, etc.), and see *how* it is connected with (1) a fearful overthrow of the nation, preceding, and (2) a deliverance of the same nation, *contemporaneously* with the reign. Take prophecy after prophecy, and notice *how* the rule of David's Son is *inseparably allied* by the Prophets with the Jews *nationally,* and well may we stand surprised at *the bold presumption* which rudely *severs* this connection made by inspired men, giving *the curses* to the Jews and *the blessings* (*promised to the same nation*), to Gentile nations. Why such *an unjust and arbitrary* interpretation? Simply because the Alexandrian-monkish theory, having the predicted Kingdom *unpostponed,* must in some way bend these prophecies to suit its pre-determined condition. Alas! great and good men have been engaged in *this destructive work,* forcibly reminding us that "*the wisdom of man is foolishness with God,*" and that "*the things of God*" can only be obtained by observing what the Spirit has recorded and retaining *what is written unaltered.*

We give numerous illustrations from eminent men, who, with an honest desire to honor Jesus, deliberately *change* the divine record of facts. Unbelievers take a much

shorter method to get rid of the covenanted and predicted Kingdom, as e.g. Tuttle (*The Career of the Christ. Idea in History*), who reiterates and compresses an old view: "He (Jesus) was actuated by a grand political motive, which met with a sad defeat; then we observe the sorrow of disappointment. The temporal scheme is laid in the dust." Both parties, the one believing and the other unbelieving, do not allow the Scriptures to present their own testimony on the subject; both come to the Word with *preconceived* views of its teachings, and under a pious prejudice or a hostile feeling, explain the same so as to make it harmonize with their respective opinions. Both do injury to the truth as revealed: the one, by so dressing it up that its natural appearance disappears; the other, by attempts to destroy it. The one party may, indeed, plead a sincerity of purpose, and the other may give as its motive the claim of reason, etc.; but the truth, God's truth, *as written*, is dependent for its realization upon neither of them, and will find its ultimate verification notwithstanding the misconception of its friends or the cavils of its enemies. Some few, however, properly discriminate, and realize the importance of this postponement. One of the best articles on the subject is from the pen of Dr. Craven (Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 95), which fell under the writer's notice after these Propositions had been worked out. It was a gratification to find the same so strongly corroborated by such a scholar; and the student will be amply repaid by a perusal of his "Excursus on the Basileia."

Obs. 12. The evidence in behalf of this postponement has already been given (e.g. Prop 58, 65, 66, 67, 70, etc.), but it may be instructive to notice *how* the passages affording it are treated by many. Thus e.g. consider what Jesus said to the Jews (Matt. 23 : 37–39; Luke 13 : 34, 35), respecting His leaving their house desolate until a certain period elapsed, viz.: until "the times of the Gentiles" were fulfilled, and until the predicted time (as e. g. Zech. 12 : 9–14; Joel 3 : etc.), of their repentance and willingness to receive the Messiah. This "*house*" receives singular treatment at the hands of those who overlook the postponement of the Kingdom. Forgetting how this word is used *in the* Davidic covenant and by the Prophets, we have a variety of significations given, which are not in accordance with the covenant, or the Prophets, or the facts as they existed when Jesus spoke. Grotius, Meyer, and others make "the house" to be the city of Jerusalem; De Wette and others, the city and temple; Theophylact, Calvin, Ewald, Barnes, and others, the temple; Lange, and others, the temple, city, and land. But *how* could those be "*left* desolate," i.e. remain in *continued* desolation; for history shows that the temple (as indicated Mark 13 : 1, 2, etc.), by the additions made by Herod, was a splendid edifice, while the city and land were far from being desolate. The same history, however, informs us what was desolate and remained desolate, viz.: *the Davidic Kingdom* which was overthrown,—*the Davidic tabernacle which was fallen down*,—for the Jewish nation, instead of having their former covenanted Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, were under the rulership of the Roman Emperors. This corresponds precisely with what David himself predicted, Psl. 89 : 38–45. Let the careful student but reflect: if Jesus came to fulfil the Prophets, He will use the word "*house*" as they employed it, and especially as it was given *in the covenant*. This He did, taking the word to denote *the fallen Davidic house or Kingdom*, which was indeed "*desolate*" for a long time, and, being *left* by Him in that state, *continues so* to the present day. Let the reader but notice how the word is employed in the covenant itself, how it is used by the Prophets, (as e.g. Jer. 22 : 5, "*this house* [Davidic] *shall become a desolation*"), that neither temple, nor city, nor land *were* desolate at the time the words were spoken, and he will see that *consistency* requires the interpretation that we have given. This might be abundantly confirmed by

quotations taken from the Prophets, but one or two references will be amply sufficient. Thus Amos 9 : 11 explicitly states that *the tabernacle of David itself,* fallen and made desolate, *shall be restored,* and no ingenuity can make this *fallen* throne and Kingdom or house the throne of the Father in the third heaven (to which the Davidic throne is likened by many writers). So likewise Hos. 3 : 4, 5. Christ, as our argument evinces, could not, owing to the nation's disobedience, restore this fallen, desolate tabernacle of David, and therefore tells the nation that this desolate "house" shall be *left thus until* another era, when the words of the Prophets shall *most assuredly* be verified.

The careful student will observe that, owing to this foreknown postponement, certain prophecies are framed to meet its foreseen condition, and others to correspond with it as an already determined fact. Thus e.g. Dan. 2 and 7, as connected with the ultimate re-establishment of Israel, does not refer in the slightest manner to the first Coming of the Christ. The subject-matter *is Gentile domination,* and as the Messiah's Kingdom, which is *to supersede* the same, was not then set up but postponed, the prophecies only, and in strict accordance with what has taken place, direct our attention to the Sec. Advent, when this will be accomplished. Thus also Jesus, after He announced the postponement, gives an epitome of Jewish destiny (Matt. 24, Mark 13, Luke 21), and only when the Sec. Advent arrives does Jewish tribulation cease. Thus again the Apoc. is so framed, that from beginning to end it directs the eye of faith to a Sec. Advent in power and glory, which shall overcome all enemies and bring in a realization of covenant promises. In none of these, extended as they are, is the slightest hint of a Messianic Kingdom *already* existing (as many teach), but the postponement being assumed as an accomplished fact, believers are spoken of as suffering, tried, tempted, persecuted, etc.—enduring things which never, never can be—as the prophets predict—associated with the Kingdom of the Christ.

Obs. 13. To Millenarians it may be observed, that a remarkable announcement of the postponement of this Kingdom, its ultimate establishment in the restoration of the tribes of Israel with the glory that shall follow, is found in Isa. 49 : 1–23 (Comp. Alexander's version), in Micah 5 : 2, 3, 4 ("*give them up until,*" etc.), in Zech. 13 : 7–9, etc. This feature, the postponement, will be corroborated by many succeeding Propositions,—forming a regular series of connected reasons *confirmatory* of this important characteristic of the Divine Plan.

Obs. 14. Neander (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 36) sees clearly that to preserve unity, it is requisite to advocate a restoration of the Theocracy, but, unfortunately, overlooking this postponement and wedded to a church-Kingdom theory, he connects such a restoration with the First Advent instead of placing it, *where the Scriptures do, at the Sec. Advent.* No Theocracy has been established, *as covenanted,* from the First Advent down to the present, for that which is the kernel or life of the Theocratic idea is lacking, viz.: God condescending to rule over man *in the capacity of an earthly Ruler.*

Obs. 15. This doctrine of the postponement rebuts the unbelieving attacks against the Messianic Kingdom and the attempted explanations concerning it.

As e.g. that Jesus having failed to realize the Kingdom "by political means," and seeing "the folly of military Messianism," He then "relied implicitly on the establishment of His Messianic throne by the miraculous display of the divine power;" but this finally gave place to "the idea of spiritual supremacy, through the religious reformation of His people." (So Abbot, p. 243, *Freedom and Fellowship,* being a reiteration of Renan

and others.) This is a complete ignoring of the Record, and a reversing of that which is plainly written, being pure assumption without *a particle* of historical proof to sustain it. Where e.g. is the least evidence that Jesus changed the popular idea (admitted to have been at one time entertained by Himself), of the Messiah into "the sublime idea of a spiritual Christ ruling by love," etc.? Aside from no such a change being expressed in the New Test., it is also refuted by the Primitive Church being utterly unacquainted with such an alleged transmutation.

Obs. 16. The postponement indicates that a very large Judaistic element remains yet to be realized in fulfilment.

Neander (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 339) and others assert that Christianity is "the fulfilment of Judaism." This is true, but only in a limited sense (as e.g. relating to the sacrificial and ceremonial law) for in the higher sense (viz.: *the Theocratic*) there is still lacking the fulfilment of the covenanted Kingdom with all that pertains to it. In the very nature of the case, if God's promises are ever fulfilled in their plain, unmistakable grammatical sense, much that is "*Jewish*" must eventually be incorporated. Our argument will necessarily develop this feature as we proceed.

Obs. 17. This view also shows how ungrounded is the insidious (and to the philosophic mind, fascinating) theory, so prevalent, of distinguishing between the Gospels, making them different types or stages of expression.[1] The simple fact is (comp. Prop. 9 and 10), that the Gospels are a unit in representing the leading subject of the Kingdom and of the King, and all of them have the same Jewish covenanted position presented.

[1] As e.g. Bernard (Bampton Lectures, Lec. 2, *The Progress of Doctrine*), making Matthew a Gospel from the Hebrew standpoint; Mark, a Gospel more disengaged from the Jewish connection, adapted to Gentiles, with a "habit of mind colored by contact with Judaism;" Luke, a Gospel passing from Jewish associations to those "adapted to a Greek mind, then, in some sense, the mind of the world;" John, a Gospel still more removed from Judaism, and planted upon universal principles, etc. The objectionable feature (admitting characteristics and peculiarities belonging to each Gospel) in such unwarranted distinctions, is the total ignoring of "the Jewish conceptions" (necessarily) of each, the fundamental Jewish covenanted position of each, and that none of them show any progress in the direction of Gentilism, but the reverse, viz.: striving to bring Gentiles to the acknowledgment of the Jewish covenanted Seed as the Messiah (which is sustained by the Acts and Epistles, showing that Gentiles are urged by the acceptance of this Messiah to become "*the seed of Abraham*," etc.).

Obs. 18. Unbelief,—rejecting the Messianic position, its rejection by the nation and the resultant postponement,—endeavors to deteriorate the actions of Jesus by ascribing to mere human passion what evidently was caused by *the legitimacy* of His station and His *treatment* by the nation.

Thus e.g. unbelievers assert that at the beginning of His ministry, Jesus was most amiable and mild, but that a change of disposition took place, owing to opposition and His expectations not being realized, so that He sternly rebuked and denounced His opponents. This is artfully represented as a deterioration of character—an indication of human frailty. The reader will observe, however, that the unity of character was preserved to the end, as witnessed e.g. in His weeping over Jerusalem and lamenting its doom, and in the utterances at His apprehension, trial, and crucifixion, when grossly insulted and deeply suffering. The alleged sternness and reproof was based on the rejection of the Kingdom by the representative men of the nation, who refused the condition of repentance and delighted in their sins. He, therefore, *as was requisite* to His position and tender, portrays their corruption and unfitness for the Kingdom. The Theocratic ordering perversely refused by non-repentance, exposed their own King—seeing their secret machinations for His death—to a righteous indignation, mingled with bursts of compassion. In the very nature of the case, such an indignation is not only just, but it is the very thing needed to complete the chain of evidence, since it is not merely enforo-

ing holiness as a prerequisite, but it harmonizes with His claims of Messiahship. It is the *rejected* King speaking to His *despisers*, and His language, denunciatory and stern, adds force to *the validity* of His claims upon them, when He points out to them their moral unfitness for entrance into His Kingdom. He speaks *as the Messiah*, with authority, and His enemies felt the same. This whole subject of the postponement, also, proves how untenable are the theories of a late origin of the Gospels, for such a delicate and consistent presentation of the same could not have been the result of the periods alleged.

PROPOSITION 95. *If the church is the Kingdom, then the terms "church" and "kingdom" should be synonymous.*

Those terms ought, if such is the fact, to be convertible or interchangeable *without vitiating* the sense. That they are *not* synonymous can be readily tested by every one. The numerous definitions and conflicting opinions of those who entertain this view already sufficiently indicates that they are not to be substituted, the one for the other. .

Obs. 1. It may be proper to illustrate the application of the test. A few examples will suffice, as the subject is too momentous to be triflingly touched, being forced to it by the argumentation of our opponents. The word church is used for (1) an individual congregation. This usage of the word, of course, will not bear the test, for then there would be as many kingdoms as there are congregations. (2) For the general body of believers. Passing by the passages which would then make believers to inherit the church, and which would teach that the church itself shall inherit the church, we select such as Eph. 5 : 23–30, in which the church (i.e. Kingdom) was once so lost that Christ "gave Himself for it" (comp. Eph. 1 : 7 ; Gal. 2 : 20, etc.), that it needed special sanctifying and cleansing "with the washing of water by the word," etc. Or, Acts 20 : 28, where the church (i.e. Kingdom) is to be fed, "which He has purchased with His own blood," phraseology applicable to believers and not to the predicted Kingdom. Take every place where the word church occurs, and either in the passage itself, or in the context, or by a parallel passage, the notion of believers in their associated capacity is understood. But let us take the word kingdom and substitute for it that of church, and the result is seen e.g. in Mark 11 : 10 ; Luke 12 : 32 ; 22 : 29 ; 21 : 43 ; Mark 9 : 47; Acts 14 : 22, etc.

If the Church is synonymous with the Kingdom, then what becomes of the notion held by many that the Kingdom is invisible, seeing that the Church is spoken of as something visible, externally manifested, as e.g. Matt. 18 : 16, 17 ; Acts 8 : 1, etc., being used in the same sense so far as visibility is concerned, as that in Acts 19 : 32 (Greek : where it is employed in a secular sense).

Obs. 2. But the absurdity of making such terms synonymous will be more clearly seen if we take the definitions given of this Kingdom, and observing their intimate connection with this church notion. Selecting the example afforded by Dr. Thompson (see preceding Prop., Obs. 8), we are told that this Kingdom consists in "the presence and power of God felt and acknowledged in the hearts of those that trusted in Him and did His commandments," etc. Put this "spiritual conception" *in place* of the Kingdom or church, and sad work will be made *of God's oath-bound covenanted promises.* If this is all that is meant, *then* the most solemn

pledges given by God will be set aside and remain unfulfilled. It is strange that men of ability are so wedded to this mystical conception of the Kingdom that they cannot see how, with their own theory of Christ's delivering up the Kingdom (1 Cor. 15 : 24), if the Kingdom be such as above, or "God's reign in the heart," etc., *then* such "a presence," etc., or "reign" once "felt and acknowledged" will also *be given up*. Or, select any one of those definitions, and substitute them for "Kingdom," in Matt. 8 : 12; 16 : 19; Mark 11 : 12, etc., and it will be found that they directly introduce *a confusion of ideas*, making the Scriptures inconsistent and contradictory.

Take for example Dr. Neander's (given in detail under Prop. 106) definition and apply it to the first New Test. text where the Kingdom is mentioned (Matt. 3 : 2), and it then reads as follows : "Repent ye : for the whole of a series of historical developments, or a great assemblage of coexistent spiritual creations is at hand." Or, take Dr. M'Cosh's favorite, and then we have : "Repent ye : for God's reign in the heart is at hand." Comp. Prof. Lummis's Essay "The Kingdom and the Church" (read before "The Proph. Confer." at N. York), in which the inconsistency of making Church and Kingdom synonymous, the absurdity of men talking of advancing and building up this Kingdom, the inability of making a Methodist Kingdom, Lutheran Kingdom, etc., and of saying that the Church (if Kingdom) is "within you," is shown. This synonymous nature is so much taken far granted, and so confidently held, that the titles of books indicate it, as e.g. Maurice's "Kingdom of Christ," Jarvis's "His. of the Mediatorial Kingdom," Gray's "Mediatorial Reign," Symington's "Mediatorial Dominion of Jesus Christ," Uhden's "New England Theocracy," Wilson's "Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ," an Anon. work, "The Inner Kingdom."

Obs. 3. Such substitutions are *unwarranted and dangerous*, although presented by most able men. Neander (*Life of Christ*, S. 82) informs us that while the name kingdom is "borrowed from an earthly kingdom," "was immediately taken from the form in which the idea of the Divine community was represented by the Jewish nation," yet this idea is to be discarded and a "*symbolical*" one is to be substituted. This exchange of ideas is, however, *unproven, and merely assumed* to sustain the theory that the church, in some aspect, is the Kingdom. If this is so, that the first preachers of the Kingdom presented the leading subject (i.e. Kingdom) of their discourses in symbolical language, we may well ask, If the Kingdom was symbolical, why not then repentance, faith, and everything else connected with this Kingdom? For, if the main subject is such, *why not* the subsidiary? This leads us where some have, from a false premise, logically landed, making the whole teaching of Jesus and the apostles a symbolical or typical one of that religion of humanity which is now arising.

PROPOSITION 96. *The differences visible in the Church are evidences that it is not the predicted Kingdom of the Messiah.*

Having alluded to this, it may be well to particularize. The Kingdom, as promised from the details of prophecy, is to exhibit *a visible outward unity.* So much is this admitted by our opponents, that they are seeking for and advocating such a unity. The feeling is almost universal that prediction demands it; and hence all, not finding it yet existing, anticipate it in the future. Isaiah, chs. 60, 61, 62, 65, etc., are conclusive. But, on the other hand, such a state or condition *has never been realized* in the church after eighteen hundred years of trial, and therefore we conclude that the church, not exhibiting the characteristics predicted of the Kingdom and connected with its establishment, is something different from that Kingdom.

Obs. 1. Let the unbiassed student contemplate how *schisms*, etc., are foretold in the church (Acts 20 : 29, 30; 1 Cor. 11 : 19; 2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4; Rom. 16 : 17, etc.); how it was organized amidst *dissensions and antagonism* even among its leaders (on the subject of circumcision and observance of the law); how it affected *compromises* concerning the law and the ritual; how it arose without *a direct* verbal abrogation of Mosaic institutions, so that some followed the latter and others annoyed the Gentiles who refused the same. Christ Himself, Paul tells us, was preached *a contention.* These and other marks of weakness, infirmity, etc., certainly prevent us from accepting the church as *the predicted* Kingdom, seeing that the latter is to come in *a very different manner.* Its beginning (i.e. church's) is not that assigned by the Prophets to the Kingdom of promise.

Even the Apostolic Church evidenced great infirmities, as noticed in Ch. Histories by Schaff, Kurtz, Neander, etc. As illustrative, we only quote Conybeare and Howson's (1 c. 1, p. 488) statement: "It is painful to be compelled to acknowledge among the Christians of the Apostolic Age, the existence of so many forms of error and sin. It was a pleasing dream which presented the Primitive Church as a society of angels; it is not without a struggle that we bring ourselves to open our eyes and behold the reality. But yet it is a higher feeling which bids us thankfully to recognize the truth, that 'there is no partiality with God,' that He has never supernaturally coerced any generation of mankind into virtue, nor rendered schism and heresy impossible in any age of the Church." This feature has never been lessened, but has increased until e.g. in England alone, according to "Whitaker's Almanack" (1879), there are 174 distinct denominations and sects. The notion of a Kingdom is utterly opposed to the predictions relating to the Church, viz.: its militant nature, a fighting and struggling Church, which shall ultimately, by apostatizing (2 Thess. 2) and by lack of faith (Luke 18 : 1-8), fall under the power, as a punishment, of a culminated Antichrist, and endure a fearful persecution (e.g. Rev. 14, Dan. 7, etc.).

Obs. 2. The progress of the church teaches the same. Surely a Kingdom established by Jesus in fulfilment of the prophecies could not possibly

have *the conflicting elements* that the church has so lavishly shown. Antagonism in belief, compulsion in requirements, dogmatism in teaching, religious warring, persecution, error, false doctrine, etc., are incorporated with her history. Corruption not merely external, but imbedded in the very framework of her organization, and transmitted for centuries (diversity of Ch. government, belief, and practice); antagonism even in relation to the most important things (sacerdotalism, baptism, Lord's supper, etc.); exhibition of a spirit hostile to Messiah's Kingdom, even in the most noble of Christian men [as e.g. Luther's treatment of Zwingli, Zwingli's resort to the sword, Calvin's treatment of Servetus (Mosheim's His. of Servetus), Melanchthon's epistle to Calvin, Oct. 14, 1544, commending Servetus's execution (Calv. Epis. No. 187, p. 341,) etc.]—these are landmarks, not of Christ's Kingdom but of *a preparatory stage* subject to infirmity, characteristic of all, even of true and noble believers. While here and there enlightened piety exists, willing to fellowship with and acknowledge as brethren in Christ all who repent and believe in Him, yet multitudes, organized bodies, counting their ministry by hundreds and their laity by hundreds of thousands, stand forth in doctrinal exclusiveness, even in the same denomination (as e.g. some of the symbolical Lutherans, High-Church Episcopalians, Close Com. Baptists, etc.), condemning all others, denouncing all others, sitting in Christ's seat and claiming Christ's prerogatives of judging, excluding all others of a diverse faith from the Kingdom of heaven, here and hereafter.

This is done too by those whom, in spite of their weakness and dogmatism, we must recognize as *conscientious* brethren in Christ. While the absurdity of such a position, claiming that outside of its own special communion there is no true Church, but only reprobation and damnation, has been ably set forth by numerous writers, yet it is a sad fact that multitudes still slavishly cling to it with tenacity and zeal. Does such a Church, thus divided, etc., bear *the imprint* of Messiah's Kingdom? No! never ought such a portraiture as history but too faithfully gives, be *mistaken* for the divine one presented by the inspired prophets. Blindness voluntarily assumed alone can make such a mistake. The divisions and controversies are not merely between different denominations, but between branches of the same Church, as e.g. between Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Moravians, Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Reformed, etc. The lack of union and intercommunion is sometimes most painfully manifested, as e.g. in an exclusive spirit of clericalism or sacramentarianism, which refuses acknowledgment and fellowship with others, and even with each other. All Churches are, more or less, thus leavened. The Roman Catholics, complacently overlooking their past bitter divisions and contests, point to the differences, etc., of Protestantism; Protestantism, overlooking the design intended by the Church, meets the charge by endeavoring to make out an invisible unity, which is truly so "invisible" that no one has yet been able to discern it. Two extremes are to be avoided, both suggested by the Church-Kingdom theory, in contemplating the strange and painful pages of Ecclesiastical History; on the one hand Goethe's declaration: "Mischmash von Irrthum und von Gewalt," which looks only at the evidences of infirmity and wickedness; and on the other, Chateaubriand's painting a beautiful ideal of the past and present, which *ignores* the corruptions, errors, and sinfulness manifested. Truth suffers by either method; and the Church cannot be utterly condemned or unduly exalted without doing violence to it. Neither blackening nor whitewashing, neither defaming nor extravagantly praising, meets *the divine portraiture* as given in the Scriptures.

Obs. 3. These differences, division into sects, etc. are not given under the impression that the church has not, in a measure, carried on *the design intended* by its organization. When the object for which the church has been established is duly estimated, we find that amidst all its weakness and imperfection, prosperity and adversity, fightings within and without,

it has *been forwarding and accomplishing* the same. Hence, we give place to no one in a high appreciation of the church ; and yet, in relation to her the truth must be told—indeed has already been recorded—lest we *exaggerate* her position, and *dishonor* the truth itself. Ecclesiastical History, Dogmatics, such works as Dorner's *His. of Prot. Theology*, etc., give painful evidence that controversies, bitter and unrelenting, have been waged between portions of the church, between good and great men. Passing by the lack of charity, the self-exaltation, the narrowness and bigotry, the confessionalistic zeal, the personal contentions, defamations, etc., we find that in important points, both theoretical and practical, devoted men of God were *in direct opposition* to each other. Were it not for *a few things* held in common, such as faith in Christ, the antagonism would be complete. Such a state of things, deplorable as it is, does not *vitiate the design* to be accompliished by the church, which is, as James asserted in the Apostle's Council, to gather out a people for His name. *This*, notwithstanding the hindrances and obstacles mentioned, has been carried on down to the present day. These evils may to some extent have retarded and hindered the work, but still it has been going on toward completion. No age, no century, no year, with its encompassing infirmities, but has brought forth, through the church, the called and adopted. But *to convert* this design *into* the Kingdom itself requires an imagination and a faith strong enough to plant—against the direct testimony of holy men of old—these evils, these conflicting elements *into* the Kingdom of the Son of Man. Whilst this diversity, etc., cannot be charged to the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles (for they warned us against it) ; whilst it is evidence of the probationary and not kingly condition of the church which could not be avoided without destroying man's free moral agency, yet they have come to pass, and the church grievously erred in giving place to them. Explanations and apologies do not lessen the naked facts, and cannot break their force. Unbelief may foolishly level them against Christianity, when Christianity itself in the New Test. pointedly condemns it ; piety, on the other hand, just as foolishly endeavors to palliate the same by claiming it as a necessity, a requisite historical growth, etc.; still the facts remain, and can only be explained by placing them where the Bible does, viz.: in the depravity and weakness of man.

To a considerate mind, the very condition of the Church, instead of reflecting in the slightest degree upon the Divine Truth, most abundantly *confirms* it ; for, without unduly exalting the Church into a Kingdom bearing on its bosom a mass of corruption, he sees that amidst all this diversity, error, hostility, etc., *the one great, grand design has never been lost sight of, i. e. to save them that believe.* If it be said that these evils are not inherent, but foreign outgrowths, we may even admit this without weakening our argument, seeing that we proceed on the ground that such a picture as the Church has presented is not the one drawn by the prophets. Whether produced legitimately or not, whether necessary developments or not, they resulted in the Church, and as firm believers in divine inspiration, we *cannot, dare not* receive the Church as the Kingdom predicted by inspired men ; for if we do, to that extent do we make those men untruthful and their record of the Kingdom an impossibility to be realized as presented by them (i.e. in the grammatical sense). We cannot e.g. reconcile with the prophetic record of the increased and constantly expanding power of Messiah's Kingdom, the losses which the Church has sustained in the past in Asia, Africa, Greece, etc. The prophets, instead of losses, give us glorious permanent and eternal retention. Hence, while discarding the notion of the Kingdom, we cling to the observable gracious design of the Church as promised and developed in her history. This gives the proper antidote to a class of books ably written, which artfully, and in many respects most truthfully, represent the weakness, positive evil, incorporated with and extended by the Church, and from this

deduce that the prophecies, being unfulfilled, the predictions are merely human opinions. We believe with Lord Bacon, who long ago observed, in answer to the Papal argument of unity, "that the Church of God hath been in all ages subject to contentions and schisms; the tares were not sown but when the wheat was sown before. Our Saviour Christ delivered it for an ill-note to have outward peace. And reason teacheth us that in ignorance and implied belief it is easy to agree, as colors agree in the dark; or if any country decline into Atheism, the controversies wax dainty, because men do not think religion scarce worth falling out for; so as it is weak divinity to account controversies an ill sign in the Church." So long as tares and wheat continue mixed—which is down to the Sec. Advent—so long will this state continue.

Obs. 4. This leads to a brief consideration of the unity of the church. The notion of a Kingdom attached to it, involves that of unity. To carry out the design of the church does *not necessarily* require unity; unity indeed would facilitate its execution, and for various reasons it is desirable, and hence is enjoined, but really is not essential, as the history of the church conclusively proves. "Them that believe" are found *in all* denominations; those that are savingly united to Christ *are found* in Roman Catholic and Protestant churches; admixture of error, difference in Ch. government, etc., *has not prevented*, in the opposing camps, persons to become justified by faith, adopted by grace, and engrafted as the elect. The prayer of Christ, so often quoted, for union has special reference to *the ultimate end* of the church, and is identified with the manifestation of His glory (see Prop. 184). Many contend that union now is essential, or at least necessary. Keeping in view *the object intended* by this dispensation, we may concede its desirableness to expedite the gathering of the elect, but it is *not absolutely requisite* for this purpose. At the very commencement of the Christian Church, as every historian concedes, even in the Apostolic age, there was a tendency (even among the Apostles), to diversity, which has continued down to our day, and we are assured by the Word *will continue until* Christ ushers in the Mill. Kingdom. Just as God has used the peculiar temperament, disposition, style, etc., of men in giving His Word, so He also employs the various temperaments, dispositions, talents, etc., of men in gathering out; but whilst in the former diversity exists without breaking the unity of that Word being under *the restraining* influence of inspiration, the latter amidst its diversity has no such restraining medium, saving that Word which is already given. Therefore, the unity is not to be sought in the utterances of the church as such, not in its outward external form, not even in its inward experience and feeling, but only in three things: (1) in working out, consciously or unconsciously, a common design, i.e. the salvation of believers; (2) that every member savingly united to Christ, whether recognized or not, whether agreeing in all things with us or not, sustains the relation of brother and joint heir with those who also thus believe; (3) the common relation that all believers sustain to Christ even now, and which is finally to be openly manifested. Therefore, the efforts of those who urge for unity among brethren, without the exclusion of a diversity which is inseparable from a probationary state, are to be commended.

Such as the labors of Dr. Schmucker, the Christian Alliance, and others. The Augsburg Confession, Art. 7, pointedly says: "That subordinate differences do not abolish the unity of the church." This unity, as the reader sees, does not bear the marks of the covenanted and predicted Kingdom, being more of a spiritual and invisible nature, and preparative to the unity that shall be manifested when the Christ and His members are revealed.

PROPOSITION 97. *The various forms of Church government indicate that the Church is not the promised Kingdom.*

Taking the prophetic record, which gives the Messianic Kingdom a uniform government with a uniform faith, it is impossible to accept of the church, with its diversified forms of government, as an *intended exhibit* of the Kingdom.

Obs. 1. While men differ in their interpretation of the church, yet it is generally admitted, excepting by the Roman Catholics and a High-Church party, that Christ did not found His church with *an accurately defined and fixed form of government* for its associated capacity, but left the forms it should assume in society, and among nations, to the development made by Providence and human agency. This view, perhaps slightly but not materially modified, is the belief of multitudes. If we accept of it, then it refutes the notion of the church being a Kingdom, for it admits at once that the church at its commencement lacked one of the essentials of a Kingdom, viz.: a regularly constituted form of government. With our doctrine of the church and Kingdom this omission remarkably harmonizes; so much, indeed, that *it is requisite.* If the Roman Catholic doctrine is correct, that such a Kingdom under a regularly constituted government is found in the church, *then* an important and serious objection would be raised up against us. Millenarianism has ever resisted her doctrine as *an invasion* of the Messiah's rights and privileges, and as hostile to the early church view; for her doctrine cannot be maintained, being merely the result of the hierarchical growth of centuries, and lacks a Scriptural foundation. The very design of the church does not require such a government, it being fully met by the simple organization, few rites, sacraments, worship, and rules which are given.

It is remarkable how guarded prophecy is, not to allow the Church-Kingdom theory to find encouragement in its portrayals of the future. Thus e.g. Dan. 2 and 7 (comp. Props. 104, 121, and 160), in which we find that the nominal conversion of the Roman Empire under Constantine and the resultant form of church government patterned after the civil, *is unacknowledged.* The transformation formed no Kingdom of God (as multitudes vainly dream) for the Empire still remains symbolized *as a beast* down to the end. Its Christianity, nominal and hierarchical, pregnant with bitter evils and future persecutions, properly remains unrecognized. The simple fact, Scripturally attested, is this, that during these "times of the Gentiles," believers, instead of inheriting a Kingdom, are members of civil government, and are taught to render civil obedience, acknowledging earthly kings and rulers to be such over them. Let the student refer to Props. 3, 58, etc., and see the diversity existing respecting the time when this alleged Kingdom was inaugurated, and he will find additional reason for rejecting the prevailing view, because a Kingdom, to be such, must, of necessity, have some form of government allied with it, but this vagueness, indistinctness, lack of form, is opposed to the notion of such having been founded.

Obs. 2. Some hold that by virtue of the church being a Kingdom, Christ rules over it by a vicegerent (i.e. the Pope); others, by a divinely appointed and regularly descended Episcopacy; some, by the rules of the

State, forming State religions; others, by the ministry and officers of the congregation; some, by individual congregations who in the aggregate form the Kingdom; others, by General Councils, Conferences, Assemblies, or Synods; and others, by the associated union of the civil power with the church either as primary or subordinate. There is *a variety* to suit all inclinations. Again, some tell us that the church is a Kingdom, but that no one form of government is prescribed, it being left optional with the church to organize that form best adapted to contingencies; others, that the government of the church must be so shaped as to accommodate itself to the civil; others, that the New Test. leaves the whole matter discretionary with every individual congregation to assume one; and still others inform us that the church, whilst a Kingdom, is not one in the strict sense of the word, only symbolically, but is a society of believers governed by the moral law and the institutions of the New Test., its members being still subject to the civil power, etc. History is filled with the bitter contests arising between the advocates of these opinions, and every party nearly can enroll its martyrs who fell in defence of its peculiar tenet of church government. Is such a sad diversity *consistent* with the idea of Christ's *covenanted* Kingdom? The idea of a stable, well-ordered, acknowledged, and duly enforced government *is connected by all the prophets* with the Messianic Kingdom, but if the church is it, what party can rightfully claim it? So little is this the predicted Kingdom that there is no one here (excepting we take the infallible Pope, or Young, or others, who claim to speak by inspiration) to decide when believers differ among themselves respecting the government itself. Is it not strange that *intelligent men* continue to insist upon having *such* a Kingdom present, when they *differ so essentially* among themselves concerning such a weighty matter as *the form* of the Kingdom? Can we imagine that when Christ's Kingdom *as covenanted and predicted* is once truly set up, that it will be in a shape so undecisive and peculiar, that men *will contend* with each other as to its nature and form? *No! never!* In the day that the Lord is King over all the earth (Zech. 14), and His majesty and power is seen in giving and enforcing law, in restoring and upbuilding with Godlike energy and force the Davidic throne and Kingdom, men will not find it so insignificantly or enigmatically expressed that its organization, etc., can become *a question* like the preceding.

Singular episodes are to be found in this diversity. We mention a few as illustrations of the inability of man to preserve a consistency when violating the Divine order relating to the Church. Some German divines, thinking that the Church as a Kingdom, to be truly such, must have some point of external unity, insist (as e.g. Rothe and Thierschs—see Pressense's review of them, *Early Years of Christianity*, p. 411-412), that the apostles must have held a second Council at Jerusalem, in which they instituted the Episcopate! Savonarola, under the influence of this Kingdom notion, claimed that Christ had condescended to become the peculiar Monarch of the Florentines (Roscoe's *Life of Lorenzo de Medicis*, p. 345). The Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, Mormons, etc., with this Church idea have claimed a special Kingdom of God as existing among themselves. Fanatics have duly taken advantage of the notion, and carefully incorporated it into their schemes. Eccl. History (especially English and Scotch) contains numerous instances where national establishments of religion were discarded on the ground that they were opposed to the nature of Christ's Kingdom, while the very men who made such an objection made themselves liable, on the same ground precisely, of rejection, because they too set up the Church separated from the State as the Kingdom. Edward Irving, in his work *Church and State*, overlooking, even while expounding prophecy, the design of this dispensation in gathering out a people for a future divinely constituted Church and State, makes in his argument a divinely constituted State practical

and as, in a measure at least, existing. This plunged him into opinions intolerant, etc. The notion of "The Divine Right" is indeed ideally correct, but we must not forget the period when God Himself shall practically and really manifest it in a chosen King and His associated selected kings. This view of the Church and the State was one cause of Irving's troubles, leading him to endeavor to realize *the impossible*, that which was in the future and in God's own performance. Such allusions as these could be multiplied, which are given not for the sake of showing an abuse (for the abuse of a doctrine does not disprove the doctrine itself), but rather how variously men are influenced by the notion that in some way or other the Kingdom of Christ is to be now witnessed.

While thus employing the diversity existing as evidence that the Church is not the Kingdom, we must not be understood as opposed to a form of Church government as a necessity for its growth, etc. Hence we are compelled to dissent from the exceeding lax views of the "Plymouth Brethren" respecting Church government. It has been the universal opinion of the Church, following the Apostolic age, that the Holy Spirit, in and through the Church, called the Ministry, such a call being confirmed by a mediate act of the Church. The Church, in its official capacity, is the instrument to determine, by examination, the validity of the call, in order to avoid imposition, etc. This has been the universal rule, founded on Scripture, however disputes, etc., arose respecting the grades of the ministry. We cannot, therefore, sympathize with the "Brethren's" tirade against "Clericism," simply because, if followed, it would result in disintegration and perversion. Hence, to make baptism an ordinance *not in, but outside of* the Church dependent on the individual and the teacher, is unscriptural (leaving out an ordinance of the Church); and to make the ministry dependent on the will, or vagaries, or supposed inspired influence, of individuals, is also unscriptural (making the Church virtually dependent upon influences outside of it, and over which it has no control). The authority—if any is claimed—depends not upon any official voice of the Church, but upon the *ipse dixit* of this or that one claiming to be directed by the Spirit of God. The door is thus opened to claims and pretensions that pride, love of notoriety, etc., will speedily avail themselves of, owing to human depravity. Alas! extremes in the Church have already borne a mass of deadly fruit; even with the greatest care and utmost watchfulness, unqualified and uncalled men have been foisted on the Church, but human weakness, with no proper checks, untrammelled, and with power to claim a ministerial position, will be sure to manifest itself. Studying such passages as 2 Tim. 2 : 2, and those referring to the appointment of Elders, as well as the intimations of a continued ministry in the Church, and then linking with these the universal custom of the early Church, as testified to by history, that a ministry, no matter in what forms (for that is another question, touching the Hierarchy, etc.), was perpetuated in and mediately by the Church, it seems to us strange that men, evidently sincere and pious, will set themselves up at this late day as alone right in discarding all "Clericalism," and the whole Church from the days of the apostles in the wrong. The result is, that however honest in their views, they are only injuring the truth by associating such demoralizing opinions, unnecessarily disquieting others in their Church relationships, and increasing the number of sects by forming, with special and extraordinary high spiritual claims, another. The effort to make the eldership an exceptional and mere introductory office is unsuccessful and unhistorical. So the effort to overthrow the view, that men in the Church, and by virtue of their position in the Church as teachers, are not to perpetuate a ministry (as exemplified in Timothy, Titus, and Barnabas) by some act of setting them apart (thus giving them an official recognition), is both unscriptural and unhistorical. To leave the distribution of the Lord's Supper to *a direct* intimation of the Holy Ghost is fanatical and substituting human imaginings for divine inspiration. To leave the Holy Ghost, on an occasion of discipline, to designate who shall be, for the occasion, the Elders or rulers, is, to say the least, dangerous, and may cause personal feeling or prejudice to triumph. To allow special and specific claims to eldership or rulership, etc., under the specious plea of being directed by the Holy Spirit, is the visionary notion of a mystical enthusiasm, and tends to bring us under the subjection of false claims and pretenses. The entire theory (as illustrated e g. Holden's *Ministry of the Word*, and *Corinth and Sects*) is calculated to lead astray and impair the usefulness of its upholder. For it raises up an antagonism to other Churches, which, to say the least, is uncharitable and unchristian. Thus Holden (*Corinth and Sects*) declares emphatically that a man who has the truth, and is conscientious, cannot go to any of the Churches (saving that of the "Believers") to worship, for in doing so he virtually connives at schism, sectarianism, etc. It will be well indeed for these "Brethren" if they have the piety, usefulness, etc. that many in these Churches manifest. This intense bigotry (and there are others who just as freely condemn the "Brethren") is the natural, logical outgrowth of their system, and evidences that it is based on error.

PROPOSITION 98. *That the church is not the Kingdom promised to David's Son was the belief of the early church.*

This has already been distinctly shown under Props. 69–75, but some additional remarks to enforce the same can be readily given.

Obs. 1. If the church is the predicted Kingdom of God, we certainly ought to find some *direct* passage teaching this, either in the writings of the Apostles or their immediate successors. But such an one *cannot be found.* For two reasons it ought to be contained in the Epistles. (1) If the Apostles at one time in their ministry misapprehended (as learned men tell us on Acts 1 : 6, but which we deny), the nature of the Kingdom, then surely at a later period when, as we are again told, they understood that the church was meant, we should reasonably expect that on so vital a matter some *decisive* utterance should be given, explanatory of the mistake made in their previous preaching and confirmatory of *a change of view.* Simple justice to the truth and to themselves *required this* at their hands, in view of their peculiar position. (2) The Jews held that the predicted, covenanted Kingdom was an external, visible reign of the Messiah on the restored Davidic throne, etc. Now in consequence of having continually to meet such prejudices, it is peculiarly significant that they employ no reasoning so prevalent at the present day, viz.: that the church is the Kingdom, etc., when such would have been *in place and eminently proper* if the Jews were in error. If the reader says that other errors of the Jews were not noticed, we reply, that all that were of importance in their relation to the Christian dispensation the Apostles met and refuted. And this one, if really an error, is of such magnitude and weight, had such a direct influence, sustained such a relation to the very thing they were taught to proclaim, viz.: "the Gospel of the Kingdom," that *it is impossible* to believe that they would have passed it by without a distinct rejection and a substitution of the truth. *A whole nation* under a mistake respecting the Messiah's Kingdom which the Apostles were *specially* commissioned to preach ; and yet an error so fundamental is not directly corrected, but must be *inferred or implied!* Is it *reasonable* or *credible?* The truth is, that *no such repudiation of error was needed.*

Obs. 2. At the risk of repetition, it may again be said, that the declarations of the Apostles concerning the nearness of the Advent (Prop. 74) prevented them from entertaining the view that the church is the promised Kingdom of Christ. *How* could they believe the church to be such as the glorious Kingdom predicted, e.g. by Daniel, whose dominion was to be world-wide and everlasting, when they were constantly looking *for the consummation?* We confess no sympathy with Dr. Neander's method of reconciliation when, referring to this point, he exonerates the Apostles by showing that they were still *under Jewish forms of thought,* but that the seeds of truth then sown by them would, by a foreordained development,

finally be stripped from this apostolic shell or husk: *We dare not take such liberties with apostolic men,* and admit that they were mistaken in so *consequential* a matter; for if we do, what assurance have we that they did not also misconceive other truths, enshrouding them also in "husks"? Did the Spirit which promised to lead them into truth, which was specially given to them to impart, conduct them to a lower plane of knowledge, and contradict the inspiration given to Daniel? Were the Apostles, claiming inspiration, more fallible than, say, Origen or Augustine, or Jerome, or Eusebius, etc. Receiving the admissions of a host of writers (as e.g. Watts, *Essay* prefixed to *World to Come*) that "the Christians of the first age did generally expect the Second Coming of Christ to judgment and the resurrection of the dead in that very age wherein it was foretold;" that "the primitive Christians imagined the day of resurrection and judgment was near," etc., it follows that they could not possibly admit the Origenistic view of the Kingdom. (Comp. Neander, Mosheim, Kurtz, etc.)

Obs. 3. The strongest possible argument that the Apostle Paul could have used to convince the Thessalonians that they were mistaken as to the imminency of the Advent, would have been the modern one concerning the church, i.e. that Christ's Kingdom was established in the church, and that according to Daniel and the prophets a long career of honor and dominion was before it, for it would be *folly* to suppose that a Kingdom just newly set up should so speedily come to an end without fulfilling the prophecies. Let the student reflect on the situation, on the abundant predictions concerning the Kingdom, and then let him consider that if the church was really intended to meet the prophecies of the Kingdom, surely such an appeal, so simple, consistent, and convincing, would have been spoken. Inspiration, however, to be consonant with itself, *could not* thus give it. Instead of designating the church a Kingdom they (the Apostles) teach that it is *a probationary and preparatory stage* to the Kingdom. In the very Epistle (Hebrews) that above all others was designed for the Jews, and where, if anywhere, the church should be specifically (if such) elevated to the position of Messiah's Kingdom, we have, instead of this, language employed which is eminently calculated to confirm the Jews in their idea of a Kingdom *still future.* Taking e.g. the phrase "*the world to come,*" knowing the notions that the Jews (Prop. 137) attributed to it, and representing Jesus as the One to whom it would be subject; speaking of "the rest" as future and that it is "a keeping of the Sabbath" without explaining that it was very different from that anticipated by the Jews (Prop. 143) under David's Son; declaring that the covenant promises are realized only in Christ when He "should come the second time unto salvation,"—these, and the whole drift of the Epistle, are to the effect that the church *must wait for* "*the appearing and Kingdom.*"

Obs. 4. Neander (*His. of Plant. Ch. Church,* vol. 2, p. 176) thus gives Paul's view: "Such an universal sovereignty in reserve for the Kingdom of God, Paul certainly acknowledged; but the thought was then, and must have continued to be, not familiar to his mind, that such a supremacy of the Kingdom of God was to be formed by that developing process which Christ compares to the leaven, through the natural connection of causes and effects under the Divine guidance." Neander argues that by this developing process the Kingdom of God would by degrees assume a suprem-

acy "brought about under other conditions than those of earthly existence by the Second Advent of Christ." It is *but too true*, that such a theory built upon the parable of the leaven, *was unfamiliar* to Paul; it cannot be found in his writings, and yet he was also (more so than Neander) familiar with the parable. This theory, which its advocates so learnedly prefer, and which is claimed to have been developed through "the life of the church" (rather through Hegelian philosophy), was unknown to the early church. For the sake of the truth, "the simplicity and ignorance" of Paul is *vastly to be preferred* to the philosophical "leaven theory," which overrides the most solemnly given promises, and oath-confirmed Davidic throne and Kingdom,—and which assumes that Apostles, to whom the parables were explained by Christ, who conversed much with Jesus respecting the Kingdom, and who were specially guided by the Spirit, knew less about the parables than uninspired men following centuries after.

Obs. 5. So little, indeed, did the first Christians hold the notion that the church is the Kingdom, that they refused even to allow the saints after death to have ascended into the third heaven (see Brooks' *El. Proph. Inter.*, Bickersteth's *Guide*, etc.), and be in the enjoyment of it, placing them in an intermediate state, awaiting in Hades the coming of the Kingdom (so, e.g., Justin Martyr explicitly declares). And even down to Tertullian, who is willing to make an exception in behalf of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Martyrs, this intermediate state or Paradise "is not, properly speaking, the Kingdom of heaven, into which they will not enter until after Christ's Advent." (So Neander, *His. of Dogmas*, p. 252, vol. 1.) *How then* if even unwilling to admit this, as Justin informs us, could they constitute the church a Kingdom? Hence, in the earliest writings, there is not a decisive passage which teaches the prevailing modern view. While the Fathers insisted on the universal government of God, the Headship of Christ over the church, yet they do not designate the church the Kingdom of God, or profess to be in the Kingdom, but represent themselves as looking for it still future. Barnabas, Irenæus, Justin, and others freely give us their opinions, and they fully correspond with our doctrinal position. This fact alone is strongly corroborative of our belief.

Let the reader refer e.g. to Prop. 93, Obs. 10, and observe how Tertullian explains the Lord's Prayer. "Thy Kingdom come" cannot be prayed for by those who already possess it. The disciples (as we have shown, Props. 43, 44, 54, 55, 68, 70, etc.), who prayed it, had *no idea* of the modern notion engrafted on the prayer. They prayed it, looking for a Kingdom to come visibly in the future under David's Son. We may well ask, *How* could the Divine Master give them such a prayer, with such a clause in it, which, as the facts evidence, was eminently calculated to confirm them in expecting the covenant to be realized in its plain grammatical sense? Would Jesus give them that in prayer which He foreknew would be (if the modern notion is correct) grossly misunderstood and perverted? No! consistency, the covenants and prophecy, require us to understand the Kingdom prayed for *as not then* in existence, but as future and certain to come. The prayer is given, without explanation, in view of a well-known covenanted Kingdom, generally anticipated. (The delicacy, exquisite, expressed in the word "Thy," in its Theocratic ordering, relating to David's Son, is seen e.g. under Props. 83, 200, etc.) The clause "Thy will be done on earth," etc., is not now verified even in the Church (e.g. Props. 96 and 97), and, so long as it remains in its present mixed character, cannot be. The "will" of God respecting the earth is easily seen if the eye of faith is directed either to the past or to the future; in the past, it is reflected before the fall, and in the future it shines forth in the renewed earth. To make it manifested now as originally intended, as covenanted and predicted, is to cover it over with the passions, frailties, etc., of poor humanity. (Comp. Prop. 105.)

PROPOSITION 99. *The opinion that the church is the predicted Kingdom of Christ was of later origin than the first and second centuries.*

In the first centuries Millenarianism was prevalent and generally held, Props. 72–76. It was entertained *in the form* that we now advocate, and, in the very nature of the case, *could not* receive the opinion stated in the Proposition. The Fathers all looked and longed for a speedy appearance of the Kingdom under the personal reign of Jesus. The opposers of Chiliasm in the third century first gave a different interpretation to the church, by which it was transformed into the Kingdom of Christ.

Obs. 1. The opposers mentioned designed such an exchange to offset the idea of a coming Kingdom of Christ here on earth. If they could point to an already existing Kingdom over which Christ then reigned as predicted, it would go far to demolish *the Chiliastic doctrine* of the future Kingdom. The Origenistic interpretation was admirably adapted to bring about so desirable a substitution, and through its flexible and mystical manipulations the work was accomplished. Origen was about, if not, the first one who introduced "the novelty."

Obs. 2. In justice, however, to Origen himself, we must add, that while paving the way for others, and expressing himself somewhat like many moderns, yet even he frequently writes guardedly, perhaps undecidedly. Thus e.g. in his "*De Principiis*" when making a Kingdom to exist here on earth in the church, he speaks of the church (B. 1, ch. 6) "*which is the form of that Kingdom which is to come,*" and (in B. 3, ch. 6), he goes on to show that "*the form*" of a Kingdom does not include the reign of Christ, but only that of Christ's agents, for speaking of "the consummation and restoration of all things" when "those better institutions" will be introduced, he adds: "For, *after* his Agents and servants, the Lord Christ, who is King of all, will *Himself assume* the Kingdom." As we cannot tell whether Rufinus added to this or not, we are content to receive it as also Origenistic, and proof that he himself could not entirely rid himself of *the early* church doctrine of a Kingdom still future belonging pre-eminently to Jesus Christ.

Obs. 3. After the Roman Empire nominally became Christian, *then, indeed, a host* of writers sprang up, who lavished the Kingdom upon the church with so liberal a hand, that the union of state and church under Constantine and his successors was pronounced to be *not only* the Kingdom of Christ, but the Kingdom *in Millennial bloom*, even to a New Jerusalem condition. (See Eusebius and Jerome.) When the Papacy was unfolded

and in power, it was impossible, with its idea of vicegerency, etc., to expect *any other* than an anti-chiliastic view of the church. This brief synopsis, with Props. 76, 77, 78, and what follows, is amply sufficient for the present.

The Popish Church is called "the Kingdom of Christ" in the Dogmatic Decrees of the recent Vatican Council, thus only confirming the ten thousand previous utterances. Out of a multitude of illustrations, it is sufficient to give Bh. Vaughan (Gladstone's *Vaticanism*, p. 55), who says that the Church has been created "a perfect Society or Kingdom," "with full authority in the triple order, as needful for *a perfect Kingdom*, legislative, judicial, and coercive." (Comp. Arch. Manning's *Vatican Decrees*, p. 43, and as illustrative of this "perfect Kingdom" read the lives of the Popes.)

Obs. 4. The history of the doctrine of the church should not influence any one to reject the truth itself. The Scriptures, in the cautions and warnings given, teach us to *anticipate the result* witnessed. No doctrine of the Bible, however important, but has been perverted and abused by men, and has been allied with error and even extravagance. The doctrine of the Kingdom has *not escaped* the withering touch of depravity; and as we read, again and again the testimony comes how enthusiasm, mysticism, fanaticism have sought to engraft upon it the most outrageous and blasphemous *assumptions*, even to the extent that persons have given themselves out to be the king of such a Kingdom. Reflection, however, enables us to perceive that such abuse and perversion are only, in the light of prophecy, corroborative evidence of the truthfulness of Scripture.

This notion of the church being the covenanted Kingdom of Christ (instead of being, what it really is, a preparatory stage for the future introduction of the Kingdom) is deeply rooted in prevailing Theology, and even in literature. It is an idea long held in veneration, fortified by great names, embellished by eloquence, supported by philosophy, strengthened by policy, power, and age, enriched by the cumulative reasoning of many centuries and the concessions of piety, so that, in view of its position, dimensions, and intrenchments, the person who ventures to meet it is almost placed like one in "a forlorn hope." Ideas, consecrated and cemented by the expressed opinions, attachment, and submission of multitudes, embracing men of the highest ability, piety, and learning, are not to be eradicated, saving by a higher hand, when fulfilling His own counsels and covenanted promise. The notion, as we have abundantly shown, is variously presented, and is so general that it is even adopted in the titles of books, as e.g. a history of Congregationalism in New England is designated by its author, H. F. Uhden, "The New England Theocracy"; a history of the church is called by the writer, Dr. Jarvis, "The History of the Mediatorial Kingdom," etc. Under its influence the most extravagant claims have been enforced, not only by the Papacy but by Protestanism. Sects have taken advantage of the opening, and pretended that their several organizations were the predicted Kingdom. The Mormons (Seward's *Travels*, p. 19) declare, "that, according to divine promise, the Kingdom of God came upon the earth immediately after the departure of the Saviour; that this Kingdom has a key; that the church early lost it, and that the Latter Day Saints have found it," etc., being the Kingdom. Enthusiasts have pressed it to an extreme.

Obs. 5. With infidel writers no view of the church is satisfactory. Thus e.g. the Duke of Somerset boldly informs us, that the early church doctrine, once entertained, but properly rejected by the church, does not satisfy modern thought and wants, being too "*deeply colored by the popular traditions and poetical imagery of the Hebrew race.*" On the other hand, the doctrine substituted by the church in the place of the one rejected is contrasted with the early one, and being found *so diverse*, the deduction is drawn, that the Word itself is unreliable, erroneous, etc. Or, contrasting

the modern church views with the prophecies, they claim that one or the other is incorrect, etc. The Kingdom not existing, as predicted, in the church at present, causes them to refuse the Biblical account; the Kingdom professedly in the church is obnoxious to them, and leads to the same refusal on the ground that it does not correspond either with the early church or the record.

PROPOSITION 100. *The visible church is not the predicted Kingdom of Jesus Christ.*

The covenant forbids the idea to be entertained, for the Davidic covenant and the promises based on it, as we have shown, *remain unfulfilled, unrealized* in the church. This Proposition is advanced in this form only to direct attention to the fact, that many writers affirm that the visible church itself is the kingdom. The arguments already advanced refute this notion, but leaving these to speak for themselves, we give some additional observations.

Obs. 1. Aside from Roman Catholic and Protestant divines, who declare in the most positive manner (as e.g. Bellarmine—Fisher's *His. of Refor.*, p. 465—Romanist, says that the church-Kingdom is as tangible as the Republic of Venice, and Gresley—in his *True Churchman*—a Protestant, who takes the same ground), that the visible church is the Kingdom, it is painful to follow the inconsistent and half-way utterances of a large class of writers, who on one page affirm the same and on another page, confronted by its mixed state, conclude the contrary, or else concede a kind (lower) of Kingdom to the external ("a shadowing forth") but the true notion to the internal or invisible church. In the latter, a distinct and uniform theory is lacking; whilst in the former, claim can be made, at least, to a unity, etc., for it contains a form of government, having its rulers, subjects, etc.

An illustration of these two opinions may be in place. Thus e.g. whatever may be the Scriptural and historical value of presbytery itself, under the idea, taken for granted, that the visible church is the Kingdom, Rev. Porteus gives us a *Prize Essay* with preface by Dr. Bonar, bearing the significant and far-reaching title. "*The Government of the Kingdom of Christ:* An Inquiry as to the Scriptural, Invincible, and Historical Position of Presbytery." Again, e.g. Schmid (*Bib. Theol. of the New Test.*, p. 250) clearly sees the difficulty of making the visible church in its present state the Kingdom of God, and yet forced by this theory to find an outward development of the Kingdom of God here on earth, and such a church being the only thing present to which it can be attached, he gives us this paradoxical assertion: "It may be said that the church *is not in any respect identical with the Kingdom of God; but yet the actual Kingdom of God on earth coincides with the church*" To prove this we are led into mystical and philosophical reasoning, based solely on assumption, and which is afterward contradicted by his own showing, that the church is the Kingdom because baptism, the Lord's Supper, Christ's Word, are "the groundwork of God's Kingdom on earth," etc. The efforts to soften and tone this down to a spiritual nature does not deliver him from palpable contradictions, as e.g. in one place telling us that these ordinances thus related to the Kingdom are external and outward, then in another that the Kingdom upon which these external ordinances are based is inward, and then still in another that the Kingdom is also outward, working from external ordinances, and from within outwardly. A theory that needs such *a confused bolstering* requires no special comment, although some of the most able men, *forced by a preconceived notion*, tenaciously cling to it. And it is a matter of amazement that many men, like Neander, who insist so strongly that the invisible church is the Kingdom predicted, finally, by a series of mystical transfusions, have this same invisible Church-Kingdom made an outward visible Church-Kingdom here on earth, *thus*

violating the fundamental principles of the very theory which causes them in the first place to adopt the invisible ; for, if correct, the church should always in this dispensation possess *the same characteristics*, undergoing as it does *the same leavening process* described by him. Fuller (*Strictures on Robinson's Sentiments*, Let. 3), to indicate that the church is a Kingdom, says : " The church of God is represented as a city," etc., and quotes as confirmatory Isa. 26 : 1, 2. But this passage does not refer to the church as *now* constituted, as is apparent from the context, following as it does the resurrection of the saints, the complete overthrow of all enemies, and the restoration of the Jewish nation. Passages which refer exclusively to a still future dispensation are thus constantly applied to this one, without the least attempt to show that they are properly used. This is only a continuation of the Papal view. Thus e.g. a recent Romanist, Dr. Alzog (*Univ. Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 153), says : " Christ, therefore, recognized the necessity of such an institution, founded a visible church, which He calls indifferently the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Kingdom of Christ." It is this idea that infused such a spirit (see *Spiritual Exercises*) into Loyola and others, and is the basis of the infallibility doctrine (as also exemplified in the Metropolitan, Arch., Macariur, teaching the infallibility of the Czar—the Greek Church being leavened with the Church-Kingdom idea), as brought out in the recent *Sermons*, *Lectures*, etc. of Rev. Burke and others.

Obs. 2. The reader will notice, that *the visibility* of the Kingdom in the church is a matter fully admitted by a host of our opponents. Even those who cleave to the invisibility of it (i.e. under the invisible church), as at first and now constructed, in some way bring *ultimately* out of this invisible a visible Kingdom. They, notwithstanding the inconsistency involved, are simply compelled to this by the testimony of prophecy, which (as e.g. Dan., chs. 2 and 7), *unmistakably predicts such an outward, visible dominion.* The singular feature in this is the following : in the construction of such a visible Kingdom either as now existing or as it shall ultimately in the future, they find *no difficulty* in the declaration " my Kingdom is not of this world," in making out *the church to possess a world dominion*, having church and state united, etc., but the same passage is persistently paraded, and false inferences drawn from it, against the visible Kingdom, the world dominion *when presented* by Millenarians. Another fact is to be observed in this controversy, that all divines, who oppose our view, agree that either now or at some future time when the church has this *external* development predicted by the prophets, the phrases Kingdom of heaven and Kingdom of God are applicable to *a visible* state here on the earth. This feature is then yielded to us by the large majority of our opponents ; if not universal, it is generally held. If so, it should certainly aid in removing *prejudice* against us.

The works on the Church, Church and State, Ecclesiastical Polity, Church Government, etc., evidence this widespread notion, derived from the prophecies. Many of the ideas advanced are fundamentally correct, but the mistake which vitiates the whole is the transference of the fulfilment from the period *after* the Sec. Advent to the " times of the Gentiles," between the First and Second Advent. A multitude of able writers advocate a present visibility of the Kingdom, a present realization of the prophecies, and a Theocracy already established, as can be seen e.g. in Jewell's *Apol. for the Church of England*, Hooker's *Eccl. Polity*, Buckle's *His. of Civ.*, vol. 2, p. 271, Gladstone's *State in Relation to the Church*, and Macaulay's *Essay* on same, Warburton's *Alliance of Church and State*, Paley's *Defence of the Church*, etc., etc.

Obs. 3. The prophecies so decisive of a visible manifestation of Christ's Kingdom, it being something that all men can see and realize in its organized and exerted power, drives some to a singular classification and division of the church, such as that the Kingdom is (1) the church, (2) the church

in the Millennial age, and (3) the church in heaven ; or, as a commentator has it, (1) the church an internal Kingdom, (2) the church an external Kingdom, (3) the church as a future Kingdom, and (4) the church in heaven. A Kingdom is often formed (as e.g. Olshausen, *Com.*, vol. 2, p. 172) at the will of the writer *to suit* the occasion. The Kingdom instead of being one (Prop. 35), is really made into several. And in some instances, if we understand the authors correctly, one *within* the other. This, in the light of prophecy, is evidently incorrect. Dr. Neander (*Life of Christ*, Sec. 52) feels that there is a difficulty in making the church a Kingdom *to accord* with prophecy without an external, outward manifestation of governing power ; therefore, he mystically distinguishes two stages of the Kingdom ; first, a hidden or inward condition, and then the second stage was by means of the first " to establish His (Christ's) Kingdom as *a real one*, more and more widely among men, and subdue the world to his dominion." And this reality is to be witnessed in " *a real world dominion*," " *a perfect world dominion*," *an* " *universal empire.*" Now aside from this theory being flatly contradicted by the parable of the tares and wheat, etc., it certainly looks, with his " leaven theory" to alone accomplish it, suspicious and accommodating to make the Kingdom (1) unreal or ideal, and then (2) real or the ideal realized. Multitudes embrace the notion, that in some way the church must be the Kingdom, because they suppose that it will ultimately in this dispensation become universal and exhibit outwardly, more and more, the form essential to a Kingdom. We request the reader to notice the important concession made by it, viz.: it admits an outward, visible form *requisite to fulfil* prophecy, and that the church has *not yet attained* to the period when this is to be manifested. Such admissions, *as far as they go*, materially confirm our own doctrinal position.

Probably one of the most vigorous efforts to make the church the promised Kingdom of Christ is that found in the Scottish Church in its struggles with Popery and Prelacy. (See the Epitome given by D'Aubigne in his *Germany, England, and Scotland*, chs. 4, 5, and 6.) Opposing the pretensions of others, the assumption is taken that such a Kingdom is to be inferred from the headship and kingship of Christ. During the entire discussion there is no discrimination made between the Divine Sovereignty and the Kingdom promised to the Son of David ; the covenants, which underlie the whole subject, are totally ignored (in grammatical sense), and issue is made on isolated passages of Scripture torn from their connection and unity. It is supposed that the church is the Davidic Kingdom (spiritualized) ; it is taken for granted that Jesus now sits on David's throne (but how the Father's throne is thus substituted does not appear) ; and Luke 1 : 32, 33 is often quoted, without any attempt at explanation, as if applicable to the present. The holding of His Kingdom in abeyance for purposes of mercy and love (to gather out a people) ; the postponement of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent (clearly taught) ; in brief, those characteristics which evidence the preparatory nature of the church and its non-identity with the Kingdom—are left out of sight, and the greatest stress is laid on visible sacraments, a visible ministry, a visible government, etc., without excluding the invisible. A writer (anon., but withal Protestant) builds his entire argument that the church is the Kingdom upon " Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," etc., laying special stress on the words " And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven" (for which comp. Prop. 64, etc.). Indeed, the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*, or *Covenanters* (see an Art. on, by Rev. Hutcheson, in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*), makes not only the church the covenanted Messianic Kingdom, but even includes the State : " They consider the church and the State as the two leading departments of Christ's visible Kingdom on earth." This is done by ignoring the grammatical sense of the covenants, spiritualizing the predictions, applying to the present what belongs to the future, and misapprehending the " times of the Gentiles" and the design of this dispensation. But it is a legitimate following out of the principles of Calvin (from which others swerve), for Calvin's rule in Geneva resulted from the misconception that " the Kingdom of God " was to be realized in the lives and

society of the people (comp. Fisher's *His. Refor.*, p. 217, etc.; D'Aubigne's *His. of Refor.*, etc.). He so framed the State that the Church through a consistory had the controlling influence, and the State was only co-operative in enforcing a code, which was the resultant of the opinion that God's Kingdom was established in the Church, and that a sort of Mosaic legislation under an alleged existing Theocratic organization was in place, by which all—even such as were not predestined unto salvation—were forced, by penalties, upon their good behavior and obedience. History records the sad conflict, and infidelity, overlooking the conscientiousness (however mistaken) of "the venerable company," makes itself merry at the expense of the trivial and bloody stringency (repeated again in Puritanism) of its laws, without considering that men who sincerely entertained such views of the Kingdom of Christ could not, if *really honest* in their convictions, act otherwise. This mistaken doctrine affords an apology for a code which advocated coercion in matters of religion, and made the State, as in the Papacy, the executioner. Neal (*His. of the Puritans*), when summing up the differences between the Puritans and the High-Church party, adds finally that both insisted upon a uniformity of worship and of "calling in the sword of the magistrate for the support and the defence of their several principles." The spirit of the Papacy is by some most strenuously enforced, as e.g. illustrated in Cartwright (Disraeli's *Cal. of Authors*, vol. 1, p. 365, note), who made out a Republic of Presbyters to be superior to all sovereigns, for the latter "were to be as subjects; they were to vail their sceptres, and to offer their crowns as the prophet speaketh, to lick the dust off the feet of the church" (misapplying the prophet). He says: "The monarchs of the world should give up their sceptres and crowns unto Him (Jesus Christ), who is represented by the officers of the church." Alas! by a perversion of Scripture, honestly and most tenaciously held, what disastrous results, what crimes, what persecution and death, have resulted. Those who desire this Church-Kingdom theory "run to seed" may refer to the dying testimony of Alex. Campbell, as given in the *London Quarterly Review*, 1851, p. 165.

Obs. 4. A number of authors, who declare that "the church on the earth, or the body of the faithful, is a true and visible representation of Christ's Kingdom, the Kingdom of Grace, the mediatorial Kingdom," also say, "the Patriarchal Church, the Jewish Church, and the Christian Church are but different names for the same church—they are all the Church of Christ." Identifying the two, making one and all the same Kingdom, i.e. Christ's, they involve themselves in the absurdity that the Kingdom *specially promised to* David's Son, said David's Son held in possession *before David's Son was ever born!* The most fatal objections, as preceding Propositions show, beset this theory *on all sides.* Even the simple matter of John's preaching sets it aside; for, if correct, then John's preaching of the Kingdom was equivalent to his saying, "Repent, for the church is at hand." But how could such a declaration be made, if the church, as Christ's Kingdom, existed previously and at that time? One writer, however, thinks that he finds the solution in saying that the church had previously to John's time existed "under types, in a typical state." This only involves the subject in still *greater absurdity.* For, while all admit that types existed that were to be superseded, nearly all also retain *the reality* of the church itself; but this theory makes the church itself *unreal,* simply "*a shadow of good things to come,*" thus constituting it in itself a mere typical establishment or Kingdom, instead of its being, what it really was, a real, organized, visible establishment having and observing some typical ordinances.

Obs. 5. Men of the greatest reflection, such as Rothe, Coleridge, Arnold, and others, seeing the past and present condition of the church, and frankly acknowledging that it does not in its visible aspect *correspond with the conditions imposed by prophecy,* and yet hampered by a theory which

requires them to regard the church as a sort of embryotic Kingdom or state, they contend that the church will not be complete, i.e. assume the predicted aspect, until it is absorbed in the state, or the state is identified with the church—ecclesiastical perfection being civil perfection, the state constituting the church—the present separate condition of the church being *only provisional.* Thus deep thinkers have of their own accord adopted the early church view, that the present state of the church is *only provisional,* but they *certainly mistake* when they (i.e. some of them) attribute the ultimate result, i.e. the development into a visible Kingdom such as prophecy demands, to the progress of the human race through religious, moral, mental, social, scientific, etc., influences, instead of, where prophecy places it, to *the personal intervention and power of Christ.* This will be examined in detail hereafter, and it is sufficient now to say, that the covenant itself, descriptive of the Kingdom, *forbids* our acceptance of such a theory. The line of argument adopted by them makes, however, valuable concessions, equivalent to what we contend for in this future Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, as e.g. the perfect union of church and state. The Millenarian view is not specially concerned in adopting any of their ideas; only it insists, that with such opinions certainly *no serious objection* can be alleged against the visibility, etc. of the covenanted Kingdom as entertained by us. Their statements even go farther than we have seen in Millenarian writings. Thus e.g. according to Rothe, the state is finally to absorb the church, taking up Christianity in itself and becoming the Kingdom of God (consummated, Dr. Lange adds); and according to Bluntschli the church will yield up its specifically Christian character, thus paving the way for the culture of Mohammedans, Japanese, etc. In all this, the admission is constantly made that the visible church, as now constituted, does not yet present the predicted appearance of the Kingdom. In pressing their theory to make it correspond with prophetic announcements, they, without the guidance of the description of the Kingdom *already solemnly covenanted,* go to unnecessary lengths; on the one hand, making an enslavement or subjugation of the church under the state; or, on the other, such a radical change of the church that in this dispensation it loses its specific character. We, however, show that in the future Kingdom there is a perfect union of church and state under one Head *without absorption or prejudice* to either one or the other.

Again, we caution the student that able Pre-Millenarians hold to the idea that the Church is a provisional or introductory Kingdom, or as some call it, "an embryotic Kingdom" or "a Kingdom in mystery." But not one holds that *this* is the proper covenanted and predicted Kingdom, for they all teach that the Sec. Advent can *alone* introduce it. The few passages which cause such Pre-Millenarians to retain this view, will come up hereafter for detailed examination. We vastly prefer the simple, plain grammatical sense to guide us in connection with the general analogy of the Word, which, as we have already seen, reveals to us only one distinctive Messianic Kingdom. To such who may read this, the writer simply points to Luke 17 : 22, and reminds them that this period of time, during the absence of the Son of man, cannot possibly—aside from the Divine Sovereignty and the headship of Jesus over the church—bring us into the enjoyment of a Kingdom, although it brings us the faith, hope, and joy of "heirs." Taking the view advocated by us, it introduces a consistent logical position. As illustrative of the vague and inconsistent interpretations which the other involves, we select an esteemed writer. Dr. Nast (*Com. on Matt.* 16 : 19) makes the church the Kingdom of heaven, but not satisfied, and evidently realizing a discrepancy, he adds: "Yet the visible church and the Kingdom of heaven are not, in every respect, identical." But he fails to tell us in what respect they are identical—a task which no one has yet undertaken. Such a statement at once vitiates his own application. But in an Art. in

The West. Ch. Advocate, Aug. 6, 1879, opposing Bh. Merrill's view that the sending of the Comforter was the coming of "the Son of man," he justly adds: "The 'ecclesia' (church) is not the 'basileia' (Kingdom) in the Biblical sense of the term, and therefore the establishment of the Ch. Church on the day of Pentecost was not the coming of the Kingdom Christ had referred to in the promise, Matt. 16 : 28."

Obs. 6. The unsatisfactory correspondence of the present condition of the church with the condition of the Kingdom of God as delineated by prophecy, has led sincere and ardent Christians, with most honorable motives, to agitate and press for constitutional amendments, by which states and nations, civil governments, are to become identified with the church as a sort of allies or guardians of Christianity. This is done under the supposition that in this way the Kingdom of Christ will be established and extended to meet the requirements of prophecy; and much *laudation* is expended in this direction. As our entire argument in all its phases is opposed to such a theory, we may very briefly say, that this is to be rejected, (1) as opposed *to the covenanted* Kingdom; (2) *to the design* of this dispensation and of the church itself; (3) to the *time when* (under last trumpet), and *the order under* which (Second Advent) this is to be accomplished; (4) *to the representations* of the church in this dispensation as separate and distinct; (5) *to the predicted overthrow and destruction* of states and kingdoms at the end of this dispensation. Indeed, we have no prediction that the church in this age can accomplish it; for a comparison of prophecy teaches us *that down* to the very Advent of Jesus the church, instead of being in the condition represented by such writers, is more or less oppressed by the state, and at the very ending of the age endures a terrible persecution. Moreover, the Bible, when alluding to such unions, represents them as unsatisfactory and oppressive, even going so far as to represent states and governments identified with such a union (e.g. Roman Empire) as beasts, a whore, and mother of harlots. Whatever may be thought of the last assertion, whether conclusive or not, one fact confirms such a Biblical representation, viz.: that history teaches that the union of church and state has almost always resulted in *a positive injury* to the church—the state imposing its confessions, fettering by its symbolical deductions, lording it over believers, and frequently wielding the sword of persecution. Experience has shown that it is impolitic and dangerous to lodge a controlling power over the church in the state, and any movement in this direction ought to be avoided. Let us be content with our "stranger and pilgrim" allotted condition until the time comes *when God and His Son shall unite church and state*, not under rulers liable to corruption, etc., *but under tried and immortal ones.*

Obs. 7. Many of the last class also profess to guard their view against some objections by upholding the unchanged condition and supremacy of the church, making the state a very subordinate part in the future programme. But in doing this *they sacrifice* in a great measure the prophetic announcements of the greatness and extent of the world-dominion of the Kingdom. It conduces to a vagueness which proves very unsatisfactory, and it produces in abundance glittering generalities, which in themselves establish nothing.

Obs. 8. It is a truth, that a vast number of works are published in the interest of controversy and of doctrine respecting the church, in which the

most important of all the questions concerning the church is either taken for granted or else entirely ignored. The leading, fundamental question, whether the church *is truly* the covenanted Kingdom of God, is, in many instances, entirely untouched. Under *the assumption* that it is such, we are treated to an immense array of learning and disquisition entirely based on an alleged and arrogated doctrine. *No proof is even attempted; just as if the assumption had never been questioned.* This itself is evidence of great weakness.

Obs. 9. Just in proportion as the notion that the visible church is the Kingdom of God is entertained and extended, in the same proportion will there also be an extravagant idea of superiority and supremacy over others. This is true from the earliest period when this was asserted, down to the recent establishment of Mormonism, which also claims "a visible Kingdom of God," "the Latter Day Kingdom," the stone of Dan., ch. 2, which is to be converted into the mountain (so Elder Pratt, etc.). This opinion, arbitrarily received, has had *a most powerful influence* among the nations, and it has proven *a most fruitful source* of aggrandizement, contention, and oppression. Out of it has sprung those hierarchical tendencies accepted by Roman Catholics and Protestants, and to it even the most liberal of Reformers have made sundry concessions which has hampered Reformation itself.

Arrogance, animosity, and even bloodshed have been some of its bitter fruits as witnessed in the Latin, Greek, English, and other churches; and down to the present day its claims are characteristic of various antagonistic parties. It has urged popes, kings, queens, bishops, etc., to enact and enforce arbitrary and cruel penal laws; and it has proven the root from which has proceeded a growth of misery, persecution, and martyrdom. It is a sad truth, that if we once admit that the visible church, in any one of its forms, is the Kingdom of Christ on earth, we close the doors to the exclusion of freedom of investigation and of private judgment, elevating said church into the position of a dispenser and arbiter of God's Word in the form (confession) it then may possess. This is abundantly made manifest by the pleas of Popery and of national establishments in the past. And we do not blame these for pressing very logical claims; for, if the premise be once conceded, i.e. that the visible church is such a Kingdom, then the rest *legitimately* follows. Consistency then demands an outward unity, and, in the efforts to secure such unity, force must be employed, and as a result, violence is done *both to religion and man.* The edicts of the first Christian Emperors become a model of church authority; the fulminations of certain Councils are cherished as the lawful exhibitions of authorized dominion; the canons and work of fallible man are elevated to tests of allegiance, resulting in crimination, excommunication, and anathema. The fountain itself being impure, the stream flowing from it, whatever pure and refreshing springs alongside of it may commingle with it, will carry on this impurity.

Obs. 10. This claim of making the visible church the Kingdom of God has been *conducive to infidelity.* Arrogating to itself such pre-eminence, the imperfection so palpably existing (e.g. its contentions, retrogressions, lapses, diversity of faith, conflicting creeds, various systems of interpretation, church government, etc.) has vitiated in the eyes of such not only the claim itself, but unfortunately Christianity along with it. The device of making an invisible Kingdom to meet their objection did not materially alter the case; for they observed that even the purest and truest of believers retained imperfection and antagonism in belief even as to the nature of this Kingdom, etc.

The Encyclopædists rejected, and in more recent times numbers have arisen who repudiate the church because of its attempting to occupy such a position. Sneeringly

but truthfully they point to the prophecies and then to history, telling us that the church, if a Kingdom, does not correspond with the description given by prophecy; sarcastically but fairly they refer to the early preaching and faith of the church in this Kingdom, and laughingly contrast it with the preaching and faith now extant on the same point; and from these infer that either the prophets, or the disciples or the apostles, or the church, or all together, were mistaken. Others, however, pretending great friendship for the church, more soberly point out the same, and discard divine revelation, retaining a belief in a religion of humanity. These endeavor to show that such claims that the church put forth were probably necessary in the march of human development, but that now they must give place to another new Kingdom of heaven, predicted by themselves, as a result of a new development of progressive humanity. If you reply to these also, that the Kingdom must be conceived of as purely spiritual and invisible, they answer that what pertains to humanity, its amelioration, and elevation, must, if it professes organization, form, etc., be also exhibited externally, and that growth, extension, etc., as predicted, can only be predicated of such. In looking over this controversy, the fact remains that the church has set its claim *so high* that it cannot be *successfully* sustained. Even the efforts of Neander and others to set this claim in a philosophical light has by no means retarded the progress of infidelity, for it is widening and extending in all countries, probably in many cases, with this change, that it now, under the garb of professed regard, accepts of the church as a Kingdom, not in the light, however, of Roman Catholicism, or Protestantism, but of a part of the natural, inevitable development of the races of men, placing this church and Kingdom, with ill-disguised contempt and a flourish of learning, among the Oriental and other religions of the world. Without pretending that our doctrine would have met with a better fate at their hands (for the root of infidelity is in the heart and not in the head), yet it is true that the simple design which we hold that the church was to accomplish, and the position which she was to occupy while carrying it out, being so widely different from this pompous claim, and being more consonant with history and Scripture, if entertained in place of the other, would have rendered many of the arguments now arrayed against the church so irrelevant and worthless that they never would have been broached. In the first centuries of the church infidelity could and did not, in view of the faith generally entertained, employ them.

Obs. 11. The simple predicted facts, that the visible church is to *be overcome* by the Antichrist (comp. Props. 123, 162, 160, 161, etc.), and that the church *is saved by the personal Advent* of Jesus when under the most terrible of persecutions in the future—are sufficient in themselves to show that the nature of a Kingdom, as covenanted and predicted, does not appertain to the church. For, when the Kingdom is once established, all prophecy declares that, instead of being overwhelmed by its foes, it obtains dominion over the nations and ever afterward retains the same. No Antichrist can then give the option of worship or death.

If it be alleged that "the gates of Hades shall not prevail" against the church, we fully agree by saying that while the saints are persecuted and under its death-dealing blows enter Hades, Jesus, who has the keys of Hades, will deliver them at the first resurrection (Prop. 125-129). The church, however persecuted, is safe; our argument only insists upon it that persecution and a low, oppressed condition of the church is incompatible with the predictions relating to Christ's Kingdom, and that, in consequence, the church is only a preparative stage for the incoming Kingdom.

PROPOSITION 101. *The invisible Church is not the covenanted Kingdom of Christ.*

Whatever of truth we may concede to the theological division of the church into the invisible and visible, neither of them meets the conditions imposed by the covenant. Instead of an invisible Kingdom, the covenant and the prophecies relating to it *unmistakably point out a visible Kingdom*, outward and universal in a world dominion. So plainly is this stated, that even those who advocate that the invisible church is the predicted Kingdom of Jesus, in some way, either by development or by copious outpourings of the Spirit, etc., make this invisible Kingdom assume *ultimately* the form of a visible one.

Let the student but consider the Kingdom *covenanted* to David's Son, *a real, visible, external Theocracy* here on the earth, and he will see at once that to transmute this into an invisible, indefinite Kingdom is to take *undue* liberty with the Divine Record, and to introduce an element perverting the proper application of much Scripture.

Obs. 1. This division of the church into the visible and invisible is of comparative recent origin. Dr. Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 471) traces the use of these terms, saying: "These are, indeed, *new*, and have come into use since the Reformation." Many able Divines have since then employed them, whilst others reject them. So far as our argument is concerned, it is immaterial whether they be received or not; for the church may indeed be invisible, if by that is only meant the body of real and true believers who are saved, and also visible, if by this is denoted a mixed body containing believers and professing believers, without, however, constituting either of them a Kingdom. Reference is therefore only made to the use of the terms to indicate that they were never thus employed in the early history of the Christian Church.

Oosterzee's (*Ch. Dogm.*, vol. 2, p. 700, etc.) reasoning is unsatisfactory, inconclusive, and contradictory. The key-note of his argument is found in the sentence: "As Christ was the fulfilling of prophecy, so in a certain sense is the church the fulfilling of the Theocracy, though under an entirely different form." But Christ fulfilled prophecy only to a certain extent: much remains yet to be fulfilled at His Sec. Advent. The reference to "the Church" being "a fulfilling of the Theocracy in a different form" is pure *conjecture* to help out a preconceived Church-Kingdom theory; and the whole finds its proof in the parable of the leaven applied to the church and the world, instead of to the individual believer. The contradictory part is found (p. 702) when, speaking of the church as "an independent society of a moral, religious nature," he says: "Its members are, as such, *not yet* citizens of the Kingdom of God, but must be regenerated and trained up within its bosom," and yet insists that, as a spiritual, mystical body, its members are citizens of the Kingdom of God, which spiritual, invisible Kingdom will finally be visibly realized. That is, he seeks refuge for his theory in the invisible church for the present, and ultimately in the visible. He admits that this distinction of visible and invisible church "was not made, or was scarcely made, by the oldest teachers and fathers of the church," but that it "slowly reached the desired development."

Strange that believers for centuries lived in the church utterly unaware, unconscious, that they were in the predicted Kingdom of God. Admitting the spirituality of the church, its union by faith with the Head, the interest and power of Christ exerted in behalf of the church, its preciousness in its means of grace, etc., yet all this by no means elevates it to the position of a Messianic Kingdom. Covenant and promise, entirely unrealized in it, forbids the idea, and forces us to receive the Word, which teaches that it is *introductory, preparatory* in its nature—the means introduced to secure a desired end. Simple consistency demands this view of the church and Kingdom. Litton (*The Church of Christ*) quotes the Romanist theologian Moehler as defining, "that the difference between the Protestant and the Romanist view of the church may be briefly stated as follows: The Romanist teaches that the visible church is first in the order of time, afterward the invisible; the relation of the former to the latter being that of cause and effect. The Lutherans (Protestants), on the contrary, affirm that the visible church owes its existence to the invisible, the latter being the true basis of the former." The student will appreciate Litton's remark: "He adds, very justly, that this apparent unimportant difference of view is pregnant with important results." Our line of reasoning does not require a consideration of these, and we only add that many eminent Protestant divines have rejected the view of an invisible church, as a theory introduced to combat the Romanist objection of a succession, etc. Thus e.g. we instance Rothe (*Beginnings of the Ch. Church and its Constitution*, p. 109), who expressly declares that the church is alone visible, and tracing the rise of the idea of "the invisible church," pronounces it "a mere hypothesis, a pure fiction, a notion involving a contradiction," and presents (Introd.) a series of reasons why it should be rejected. It is very sad to find in many, otherwise excellent, writers the two ideas combined and appropriated to the Kingdom of God, for the invisible Kingdom offers an easy application of passages which cannot be made to fit a visible Kingdom, although both do violence to covenant and prophecy. Of course, such writers as Bunsen (comp. Art. *Bunsen's Church of the Future*, in *North Brit. Review*, Nov., 1847), in their ideal of a national church, are, as a logical sequence, hostile to an invisible church (comp. Litton's *Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry*).

Obs. 2. To illustrate how men write on this point, we select several examples, which, whilst confirming our previous Proposition, also affirm the contrary to our present one. Van Oosterzee (*Theol. of N. T.*, Sec. 41), explicitly says: "The church or congregation of the Lord is by no means *the same* as the Kingdom of God and of Christ. This latter is *a perfectly spiritual* society whose ideal will be fully realized in the future; the former is the union of those who *are already* here on earth, through faith and love, members of the Kingdom." Again, Dr. Luthardt, (*Apol. Lec.*—see *Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1873) makes "the church now in the form of a servant over against the Romish view, which makes the church in 'her outward reality the Kingdom of God,' whilst in the Reformed view 'the eternal Kingdom of God has its home in that *inner nature* of the church; this temporal form of the church, on the contrary, is only *the external covering* in which the treasure of the Kingdom is deposited.' These are *very mystical* conceptions of the Kingdom, and they originate from an effort to observe a consistency which the mixed condition of the church does not outwardly allow. Thinking that from the captions attached to the parables, the phrase 'the Kingdom of God within you,' etc., that a Kingdom *must* in some way be found, this one *that cannot be seen*, being spiritual, beyond our perception, is thus presented for our acceptance. The simple truth is, that it is *even more inconsistent* than the opinion entertained that the visible church is the Kingdom, for the latter, at least, corresponds with *the visibility and external manifestation insisted on by the covenant and prophets.* But its inconsistency is still more apparent by its being *flatly contradicted* by—adopting *their mode* of interpretation—the parables, upon which they rely. Thus, e.g. if the church is the Kingdom of heaven in some form, then the parable of the Virgins includes the

whole ten, not merely the five wise (i.e. spiritual), but the five foolish (i.e. not spiritual). So also the parable of the tares and wheat, on the same principle, being prefaced by "the Kingdom of heaven," includes in the same church the tares (i.e. those not possessed of "the inner nature") and the wheat (i. e. those having "the inner nature"). Admit the church as the Kingdom, and there is no escape from this dilemma, provided the parables are (*on their own theory*) *consistently* applied (comp. Prop. 108). This application of the Kingdom to an invisible church to avoid one difficulty is *too one-sided;* and it only plunges them into a still greater one. Such a refined view of the Kingdom ignores and disbelieves *the oath* that God made to David, that in and through his Son a Kingdom, even David's then visible and outward, should be set up, that all men would recognize and obey, owing to its distinguished external exertion and manifestation of power. It is *strange* and *sad*, that some of the most eminent and talented men of the church, *blinded by a subtle theory*, cannot and will not see how antagonistic such a theory *is* to God's faithful promises. No wonder that we are so carefully cautioned to beware of mere human wisdom.

We again refer to some eminent Pre-Millenarians, who hold, evidently, to some kind of a Kingdom connected with this *invisible* theory, for they designate a present existing Kingdom as "the Kingdom *in mystery*." Unable to comprehend exactly their meaning, I will quote the definition given to this "Kingdom in mystery" by Rev. Dr. Brookes, in *The Truth*, vol. 4, No. 3, p. 101: "It is *not* equivalent to the Church, but it indicates the peculiar sphere here below in which the ascended Christ is carrying on His work, or, in other words, it refers to what is called *Christendom.*' This is entirely too vague and indefinite to meet with acceptance, and really is not needed in the interpretation and application of Scripture. Such a view, however, is not in conflict with Pre-Millenarianism, because the covenanted and predicted Messianic Kingdom is *not* placed in this dispensation, *but* in the one following the Sec. Advent; but we object to it, on the ground that it is not required by the Word, and that it only burdens the doctrine with a Kingdom-theory which tends to confuse the student and mars the simplicity of inspired statements. Others introduce a confusion of ideas, evincing an imperfect knowledge of the covenanted Kingdom, as e.g. Swormstedt (*The End of the World Near*, p. 114) makes "Christ's Kingdom represented in the world by the visible church;" then he has "the gospel net or invisible Kingdom" drawn up to heaven, and when this earth is purified, "then this invisible Kingdom is to be let down again in the midst of this new Eden," and with Christ becomes "a visible and temporal power." Such representations require no reply. Some Pre-Millenarians mistake the Divine Sovereignty (comp. Props. 79 and 80) for this present Kingdom. Even Lange (*Bremen Lectures*, sec. 8) falls into this error, and, therefore, speaks (p. 221) of "the still conceded Kingdom of God, which is finally to be openly manifested at the Sec. Advent. Fausset (*Com. Rev.* 20 : 6) more guardedly says: "As the church began at Christ's ascension, so the Kingdom shall begin at His Sec. Advent. Auberlen in his *Biblical Doctrine of the Kingdom of God* (a brief epitome is given by Nast in his *Com. on Matt.* 6 : 10) maintains our doctrinal position, but in connection has the church also a Kingdom, for in *The Prophet Daniel* (p. 372) he correctly portrays the future Kingdom as not merely internal but also external, outward, "Israelitish, but by no means carnal, a Kingdom of glory, precisely as the prophets have pictured it, and whom Jesus contradicts in no part," etc., but confuses the whole subject and ignores the covenanted conditions *requisite for* a Messianic Kingdom, when in the connection he says: "Thus the Kingdom of God has different periods. It has appeared in Christ, Matt. 12 : 28; it spreads in the world by inward, hidden spiritual processes, Matt. 13 : 33; but *properly* as a Kingdom in royal glory, it comes only at the Parousia, Luke 19 : 11, 12, 15, even as the Lord Himself has taught us to pray, day by day, 'Thy Kingdom come,' Matt. 6 : 10." (The passages referred to we examine in another place.) So Schmid in *Bibl. Theol. of the New Test.* advocates Chiliasm, but holds to a number of Kingdoms, or stages, or developments, as e.g. "As the Kingdom of God on earth, it is, in the first place, in fellowship of men. It also embraces humanity as a whole, without limitation to any particular part thereof, in contrast to the choice of the Jewish people. The Gospel will be preached to the whole

world. It also comprises heaven and earth, and likewise the coming periods of the world, both before and after the judgment." The reader can see from this brief extract that the writer has no *distinct conception* of the one covenanted Kingdom, but mixes the Divine Sovereignty, church, person of the king, dispensations, etc., all together in a bewildering manner. So Theurer (*Das Reich Gottes*, p. 36–9) affirms the Millenarian doctrine as held by us, but has a present existing Kingdom which finally gives place to a higher. Thus compare Ebrard (*Ch. Dogm.*, p. 747–9, vol. 2), Shenkel (*Ch. Dogm.*, 2 Ab., p. 1195–6), and many others whom we esteem as able defenders of Chiliasm. One of the most consistent articles on "the Kingdom of God" is that given by a writer with initials "M. A.," in the *Proph. Times*, July, 1873. A proper conception of the Kingdom is also presented by "Senex" in some articles in the *Luth. Observer* of 1880. The same is true of others, a tendency being observable to return to the Primitive Church view. This is especially observable in the *Excursus on the Kingdom* by Dr. Craven, p. 93, etc., Lange's *Com. Rev.*, a perusal of which will amply repay the reader.

Obs. 3. The doctrine that the invisible church is the Kingdom of God was unknown to the early church. Even amidst the controversies which shortly raged between antagonistic parties respecting the church, no one, —although in churches planted shortly before by inspired men who ought to have known it—broached such an idea. Neander (*His. of Dogmas*) acknowledges this, and says that they *overlooked* this distinction. Such an acknowledgment, coming from such a source, is the more valuable, since it is a favorite theory of Neander's that the invisible church is the Kingdom (although he has it finally merged into a visible Kingdom). But the manner in which he accounts for this distinction being overlooked is *highly objectionable.* His theory, as shown in his different works, is the progressive development, one by which the truths given by the Apostles were only "germs" to be developed by the future growth of the church. We have already protested against this germ principle when applied to doctrine, Props. 4, 9, 10.

For while we freely admit growth in numbers and even in knowledge, etc., we admit none in Biblical doctrine. The doctrinal truths enunciated by the apostles were not merely germinal truths leading to engrafting of others or enlargement to another form, as from the seed to the stalk, and then to the flower and fruit. No! it was, as a distinctly announced doctrine, *the whole* doctrine. By this we do not mean that it would not be suggestive of thought and even, by comparison, lead to other truths, but we mean that, as far as the apostles revealed doctrine or truth, it is so complete in itself—i.e. no seed to sprout into something unlike itself—that no part of it can be safely omitted or transmuted without making it in so far imperfect. Hence to say that the invisible Kingdom doctrine is the result of a growth of knowledge in the church is to do it at the expense of the truth itself (that is to say, the Kingdom idea was imperfect), and at the risk of the reputation and veracity of the first teachers of Christianity. Neander even, in some places (as e.g. p. 5, *His. of Dogmas*), throws a guard around this developing process *conformable* to our position and *hostile* to some of his own deductions, viz.: "not that we obtain anything absolutely *new*, but we have *a deeper insight* of its contents." Such a deeper insight is obtainable, however, not by a growth of the doctrine itself, but by a comparison and study of the Scriptures containing it. In order that the critical reader may see how an able writer transmutes the Church-Kingdom theory, we refer again to Dr. Neander (*Plant. and Train. Ch. Ch.*, p. 499, etc.). The Church is "the particular idea," related to the Kingdom of God "as the more general and comprehensive one." Hence: "The idea of the church is *subordinate* to that of the Kingdom of God, because by the latter is denoted either "*the whole of a series of historical developments, or a great assemblage of coexistent spiritual creations.*" (The student can readily test this mystical conception—that overrides covenant and amalgamates the Divine Sovereignty—by employing it as synonymous for the Kingdom.) He then makes the Jewish Theocracy *a type* of this Kingdom. (We have proven, in detail, that it was no type, and the predictions of its ultimate restoration prove it be none.) Then, in opposition to some of our opponents, he says: "The Kingdom of God was not first founded by Christianity as something entirely new," but was grafted on to the old,

extended to all people, transformed, and made "spiritual and internal." And the proof of such transformation is, Eph. 2 : 19, 20, Rom. 11 : 18, the unity of God's people founded on the apostles and Jesus Christ. (A unity that we most heartily adopt, but which says nothing of the Kingdom.) Then he admits that Christianity at first allied itself with the Jewish view of the restoration of the Theocracy (thus confirming our past propositions) in a glorious outward form under the Messiah, and placed this in the future "as the perfected form of the Theocracy;" "but in accordance *with a change* in the idea of the Kingdom of God, a different construction was put on this opposition of Christianity; it was transformed from the external to the internal, and withdrawn from the future to the present." (This *change*, he informs us in various places, was brought out in "the consciousness of the church"—whatever this may mean—but we have traced it directly to the Origenistic and Alexandrian influence, and is in direct conflict with the Word.) He then defines *the change* thus: "By faith in the Redeemer, the Kingdom of God, or of the Messiah, is *already* founded in *the hearts* of men, and thence developing outward, is destined to bring under its control all that belongs to man," so that "the Kingdom of Christ *coincides* with the idea of the Church existing in the hearts of men, the invisible church, the totality of the operations of Christianity on mankind." (Thus *a principle* actuating men is elevated into the covenanted Kingdom, lacking every covenanted characteristic. For the heart-Kingdom, see e.g. Props. 110, 84, 85; and for the unscriptural statement of its working outward until it *conquers all*, see e.g. Prop. 175.) But then to reconcile the passages which locate a Kingdom of Christ in the future, he admits that this Kingdom now present is only the germ of the future, and that this future Kingdom "Paul represents not as something which will spontaneously arise from the natural development of the church, but as produced, like the founding of the Kingdom of Christ, by an immediate intervention of Christ." Hence he divides the Kingdom into an inward (1 Cor. 4 : 20), an inward in connection with the future (1 Thess. 2 : 12), and a consummated Kingdom (2 Thess. 1 : 5). Mistaking the Divine Sovereignty for the Kingdom, he appeals to it as confirmatory, and also to the headship of Jesus, the victory of the church, etc. (This mixture and floundering under several Kingdoms are fully met in our Propositions.)

Obs. 4. It is remarkable to notice how, in the advocacy of the invisible church as a Kingdom, its advocates involve themselves in a sophistry *inconsistent* with their own development theory of a growth of this invisible Kingdom until finally at some time in the future it shall become visible as a world dominion, etc. Taking the same able writer as an exponent of this view, we find him (*Life of Christ*, sec. 213) explaining the phrase "the Kingdom cometh not with outward show" to mean "*cannot be outwardly seen by human eyes*," and in a foot-note adds: "The antithesis is, that it reveals itself *invisibly*, so as to be seen only by the eye of faith." Now if it is only the object of faith, something not tangible, how comes it that its nature is *so changed* by growth that it is *converted* from the unseen, excepting as viewed by faith, into the *real, tangible, visible* Empire here on earth? If in the region of invisibility, it ought in consistency remain therein according to its mode of propagation. No wonder that we find *so many contradictions* in its advocates, even so gross as the following: in sec. 52, at the consummation, Neander has this world renewed and all converted, "*a real world dominion*," and then again, sec. 214, at the same time it is "a corrupt world;" in one place it is invisible and in another visible, etc. The theory is not sufficiently plastic to cover every Scriptural passage and description, and hence refuge is taken in what another of its adherents calls "*varied forms*."

A more systematic effort is found in Rev. Miller's *Mercersburg and Mod. Theol.* (p. 41), in which a "new Kingdom" is advocated as arising from a partaking of the divine-human life of Jesus Christ, so that a new Organism is constituted. This mystical conception, however plausibly presented, ignores the covenanted position of the humanity of Jesus, the covenanted Kingdom, the postponement of the Kingdom, etc., and is

based on the development theory (incorporating the continued development of Christ's humanity in believers), already sufficiently noticed. Like all other theories of the kind, it largely rejects the grammatical sense, and is addicted to spiritualizing. Its positions are amply met in various Propositions.

Obs. 5. This adhesion to an invisible Kingdom is based on the supposed ground, that according to some passages we are taught that Christ will not have an earthly Kingdom. These passages we will examine hereafter, and now only allude to the fact, that when these same writers come to describe the *Millennial era* of the church, this ground of objection *no longer* exists, and they have *to all intents and purposes* an earthly Kingdom, i.e. a Kingdom visible and extending over all the earth. The Kingdom then, once held to be "*hidden*" or "*concealed*" *in* the church, "to be *in* but not *of* the church," is manifested openly to all the world, holding all under its direct influence and dominion. Surely the advocates of such a system should not object to our doctrine, which observes a consistency in the manifestation of the Kingdom by fully explaining *how* and *when* this occurs, without resorting to *an unexplained and mystical* growth, which, in the very nature of the case, *cannot produce the transformation* claimed. If the Kingdom is unseen and at the same time unchangeable as claimed; if it is as a writer (*Proph. Times*, vol. 2, p. 97) declares, "the Kingdom of God is simply where God reigns—this Kingdom is within—it is spiritual," and ever remains, as contended for, the same, we ask, *How* can it then become the seen, the outward Kingdom of the Prophets? Here among these writers we find the most *hopeless floundering*, and every reader can for himself see *the utter antagonism* of their spiritual theories by comparing their utterances on the texts "my Kingdom is not of this world" (John 18 : 36), "the Kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17 : 21), *with those* derived from Dan. 2 : 34, 35, 44, 45; Dan. 7 : 14, 27, and Rev. 11 : 15. In the former we have *an invisible Kingdom in* the church, and in the latter the same church becomes *a visible Kingdom*. It is scarcely necessary to refer to even a greater diversity existing among such writers: e.g. extending this covenanted Kingdom from the heart of the believer to an extent commensurate with the universe itself, etc.

Obs. 6. To indicate the vagueness of argument employed in this direction, reference is made to a leading and excellent writer. Olshausen (*Com.*, vol. 1, p. 264), to prove the existence of a spiritual Kingdom in opposition to the Jewish idea of the Kingdom, says: "As the carnal man makes his God for himself, so he makes the Kingdom of God for himself. The spiritual man has *a spiritual God and a spiritual Kingdom* of God." This, however, proves too much, for on the same principle we can prove that the Saviour is wholly spiritual and is not the Son of Man; we can deny the bodily resurrection, the renovation of the earth, or anything that is outward or external. Just *such unfounded premises* lay the foundation for an immense amount of deduced reasoning on this subject.

Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol.*, p. 150), in order to prove the spirituality or invisibility of the Kingdom, quotes John 18 : 36, Matt. 22 : 21, Luke 12 : 13, and the temptation of Christ. Such is the slender foundation upon which to rest so important a doctrine. Literally, multitudes follow such guidance, excepting those who have it already outwardly manifested, or such who deny any future visible revelation (comp. for such proof, Props. 108, 109, and 110).

Obs. 7. It is certainly curious to notice how even unbelievers avail themselves of this invisible Kingdom theory. Thus e.g. Renan, with great complacency, and perhaps lurking sarcasm, claims that if the church repels him, and others of like faith, "let us console ourselves by reflecting *on that invisible church*, which includes excommunicated saints and the noblest souls of every age."

Perhaps the earliest advocates who carried the invisible church or Kingdom theory to an extreme were the Petrobrusians (Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 456), who rejected an outward or visible church, and only received one as in the hearts of believers. Some recent sects are largely reproducing the same features.

PROPOSITION 102. *Neither the visible nor the invisible church is the covenanted Kingdom.*

This has been shown by preceding Propositions, as e. g. Props. 75, 90, 91, 93, 68, 94, 96, 98–100.

Obs. 1. Some make the visible church the Kingdom, others the invisible; some unite *both* in the same Kingdom, and others that *both* are the same Kingdom, but in two different, a higher and a lower, aspects. Having shown that neither one nor the other is the predicted Kingdom, it follows, from the reasons given, that a combination of both *cannot transform* them into such a Kingdom.

Obs. 2. It is not surprising that the Papacy should so tenaciously hold to the doctrine that the church is the Kingdom, since everything so distinctively Popish, as Bellarmine (quoted by Bowers, *Pref. to His. of Popes*) assures us, depends upon it. For out of it proceeds the Pope's supremacy, the vicegerent rule, the entire papal governmental machinery. It is *the foundation* upon which the superstructural pretensions are built. If this is removed, the whole falls. It is also consistent for those who hold to what the Germans call *Cæsero-papismus*, or for those who advocate *hierarchical* tendencies in any form, to adhere to such a doctrine. But it is not necessary for *pure* Protestantism, as is evinced in the history of the early church, for which see the candid confession of Neander under Props. 49 and 101. Our view admits of nearly all that is said by a host of esteemed writers concerning the church, excepting that of its being already constituted a Kingdom. The latter theory is not only of *no practical use* in the working of the church, but is *really dangerous* in its tendencies, as is seen from the use made of it by various parties. Thus, e.g. on the one hand, by those just alluded to; and on the other by Free Religionists, Humanitarians, etc., who build the most extensive of Kingdoms on the foundations laid by the orthodox, expressing the same in the most eloquent terms. Here and there, indeed, we find a writer who holds to the early church doctrine of the church, that it is no Kingdom, and occasionally attention is called to it in church papers (as e.g. *Luth. Observer*, April 25th, 1873), but thus far with so little logical connection and argument that it has scarcely aroused attention. Then we also find many writers (Millenarians), who, conceding that the church is a Kingdom in some way, yet distinctly announce that it is *not* the covenanted and predicted Kingdom of Jesus, which they assert is still in the future. Then, again, we have another class (as e.g. Prof. Seelye, *Bib. Sacra*, Ap., 1866, pp. 228–234), which, whilst indorsing the prevailing view of the church being the predicted Kingdom, confesses that the doctrine of the church—i.e. what the church really is and its relations—is *not yet* understood, having hitherto been considered only as involved in other doctrines and not as a promi-

nent theme standing alone—vital, it is true, but yet imperfectly comprehended, and which they regard as the great question of our time, etc.

Such confessions indicate that the prevailing doctrine is far from being satisfactory, and accords with one made to the author by a professor in one of our colleges, who acknowledged that he preached on the subject until he himself felt that his deductions, drawn from the general view, were inconsistent. Indeed, is it not time to discard a doctrine which causes some of the ablest defenders of Christianity to fall into palpable contradictions? Thus e.g. Dr. McCosh (*Christ. and Positiv.*, p. 245) makes the Kingdom "a mixed Kingdom," admitting both good and bad, and on the same page he has it, "the reign of God in men's hearts," which can only apply to the good. In one place he asserts from Christ's language to Nicodemus that only those who have realized "the new birth" are in the Kingdom of God, and then in another place he deduces from the parables of tares and wheat, and drag net, that "the tares" and "bad fish," who, of course, have not experienced such a birth, are also in the Kingdom of heaven. The only way to rid themselves of such contradictions is to erect several Kingdoms, one within the other, or to establish *several* existing phases of the same Kingdom, but such procedures do not logically help the matter, seeing that they are in opposition *to covenant and prophecy*. Again, an excellent writer who attempts to avoid Dr. McCosh's "mixed Kingdom," gives us the following arrangement. Van Oosterzee (*Theol. of New Test.*, p. 70) says: "Even with the idea of the Christian Church, that of the Kingdom of God *must not* be confounded. The church is only *the inadequate* outward form of the Kingdom of God—the Kingdom of God itself is *a spiritual* communion." In a foot-note he adds: "the Kingdom of God, on the other hand, until its glorious manifestation *includes* the outward church, which is *in* but not necessarily *of* it, comp. Matt. 13 : 41." Here we have: it is, and it is not; it is in, but not of it; it includes it, and it does not include it as part of it, etc. Alas for the Kingdom, if such nice mystical distinctions are *needed* to ascertain *what* the Kingdom of God *is as proclaimed by covenant and prophet*. Why not discard a theory which produces from the same fountain both sweet and bitter waters, from the same tree sweet and sour fruit?

Obs. 3. The very idea of the Christian Church, as given by these same writers, forbids the notion of a Kingdom, viz.: that "it is a religious, moral institution," or "a society of exclusively religious interest, independent of and distinct from political relations and duties;" or as some have it, the same "disconnected from the state or civil compact;" or "an organization of believers for religious purposes, which does not interfere with their civil and other rights;" or even Schlegel's opinion, that it is "a free, peculiar, independent corporation." Such, and many other definitions of like spirit, might be adopted without bringing in the idea of a Kingdom. They do more, they *prevent* its adoption. Let the reader turn back to our argument, by which, under the Theocracy and the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, *God Himself gives us His idea of what constitutes the Kingdom of God*, and we find this distinctive element of a Kingdom, lacking in the Christian Church, and in these definitions of the same. In the Theocracy, which gave outward form and prominency to the Kingdom, the religious and political commonwealth, the church and the state were, by Divine constitution, *identical, one*. A separation was never made which allowed a distinction between citizen and worshipper. It was this feature which gave force and validity to the idea of a Kingdom, and just so soon as the separation was effected by the overthrow of the Jewish state, *the distinctive idea* of a Kingdom then existing, *also*, as the nature of the case demanded in consistency, *vanished*. This arrangement, this *fundamental union* we have already proven was *God's own expressed definition* of a Kingdom, and when this was lacking all the holy men deplored *the overthrow of the Kingdom and predicted its restoration*. This feature, without which the Kingdom is *impracticable as God has*

covenanted, was tendered to the Jews at the Advent of Jesus, conditional on repentance. It was rejected. The Christian Church followed, but this church *also lacks the Theocratic peculiarity* which exalts to the position of the Kingdom of God. The question is, Will it *always* be lacking? Will God's efforts at restoration always prove *a failure?* Is God's Kingdom, which requires, *as essential* to its very existence, *the union of church and state, never* to be re-established? Multitudes assert this, and cling to an organization *wanting* God's requisite order to constitute it His Kingdom, and pronounce it *against precedent, covenant, and promise*, the Kingdom. God's promises will be verified *in their appointed time;* present failure does not imply continued; the Divine Purpose, delayed by depravity, is even merciful in this period of detention, manifesting grace toward us Gentiles. When the time of "the appearing and Kingdom" comes, *then* will the appointed Son of Man, the covenanted David's Son, *restore that Theocratic feature which elevates to the position and dignity of the Kingdom of God*, a Kingdom in which, as formerly, worshipper and citizen, church and state, are one. Since, then, no such union as *precedent makes necessary to God's idea of the Kingdom*, called and appropriated as His, is to be found in those definitions, or in the church itself as organized by the Apostles, we ask, *Is it proper* to give it this designation?

Can it be possible that David's Son has *a real* Kingdom here on earth, when David's throne and Kingdom *are overthrown?* When Jerusalem is downtrodden? When Jesus declared (Matt. 23 : 39, Luke 13 : 34) that He would be absent from it, leaving it desolate, until a certain return? Alas! men by ignoring the express language of the covenant, and by an unwarranted substitution, set up another as the Messianic Kingdom, overlooking the simple fact that no Kingdom (so called) can possibly be acknowledged unless it restores (as e.g. Isa. 1 : 26, 27, etc.) *the identical Theocracy withdrawn.* It is *self-evident*—as we have shown in detail—that the twelve and the seventy, who were preachers of the Kingdom, had not the remotest idea of such extraordinary transmutations as have appeared engrafted, by human reason, on the doctrine of the Kingdom.

Obs. 4. If the church is the Kingdom of God, then the student, if candid, and allowing the prophecies their plain grammatical sense, must see that the condition of the one is not like the predicted condition of the other. Hence the result follows, as in Schleiermacher, Arnold (see Fairbairn *On Proph.*, p. 96), and others, that the prophecies must be regarded in another light than that of a *predictive* one. Then the prophecies as given remain *unrealized*, and they must be received only as the *longings* of humanity, the expressed *desires* of man respecting the destinies of the world. An important and fundamental element of prophecy is frittered away, until an *unreliable* human one alone remains. The God-derived power is left out, and a man-derived substituted. Why this result in the minds of so many scholars? Simply because of the attempt to fit, by the wholesale, prophecy concerning the Kingdom into something which it is *not designed* to embrace; these men, finding no just and reliable fulfilment, are driven to the opposite extreme so injurious to the Word itself.

If the prophecies are taken in their plain connection and meaning (and not simply a verse here and a verse there), it is simply impossible to predicate a fulfilment in the church. Thus e.g. take Daniel's four monarchies (Props. 104, 121, 160), and we find that the church existed at the side of them without being recognized as a Kingdom, that the church was oppressed by them until the Kingdom came, and that the Kingdom was given after them in a regular succession, at which time and afterward the dominion of the saints is represented as supreme, etc. This feature will be urged under several Propositions.

Obs. 5. The question back of that of the Kingdom itself, which must be decided, is that referring to the literal, grammatical sense of the Word, Prop. 4. If it is assumed that a higher and more spiritual meaning is attached to the recognized grammatical one, *then* the Kingdom is *at the pleasure* of the interpreter; if the grammatical sense is alone *firmly retained, then* it is *impossible* to construct out of the church the predicted Kingdom. Awarding to the church her *just* position and mission, we are forced logically to accept *of the covenanted Kingdom in the form delineated by covenant and prophecy.*

This objection to the plain grammatical sense as held by the early church is common ground for the infidel and the spiritualizing believer. Renan employs it as a reason to set aside the literal notion of a Kingdom, and thus to show that the first teachers were mistaken (in this way attacking their credibility and inspiration); Neander argues from it that they only presented "the husk," which contained "the kernel" that uninspired men afterward developed. The author of *Ecce Homo* on the one side, and the writer of *Ecce Deus* on the other, are both agreed to relinquish the idea of a Kingdom as found in the plain, unvarnished grammatical sense of covenant and prophecy. Thus, unbeliever and believer stand shoulder to shoulder, mutually supporting each other, in attacking the Kingdom *as originally* preached and believed. Having assumed that some ideal, or the Church, is intended, they either assume that the language itself is a mistake, or that in and under it is concealed a conception which, in some way, must fit the estimate they have formed. The more ultra, indeed, seeing the Church, and believing it to be the only result that shall ever be witnessed in confirmation of covenant and prophecy, declare that Christ and the apostles misapprehended its nature, and hence reject both the Church and the Kingdom. One eminent writer in his apologetics and eagerness to vindicate the Church as a Kingdom, even ventures to the unwarranted length to assert that if the Kingdom had been established as preached by John the Baptist and the disciples (Acts 1 : 6), it would have been "*a sinful measure.*" What lack of knowledge this evinces of God's *oath-bound* Davidic covenant and the precious, ennobling *Theocratic* ordering (comp. e.g. Props. 81, 82, 200, 203). And what sinfulness to sneer at and ridicule a Kingdom postponed to the Second Advent, when such is God's own arrangement. Ignorance can alone tender an apology for such conduct.

Obs. 6. Take any history of dogmas, and if impartial, it will enable us readily to trace in the doctrine of the church that the present mixed interpretation and confounding of it with the Kingdom of God is the growth of centuries. In the first and second centuries the church was simply a community of believers, who, as is evidenced by the action of the Apostles in reference to the Jewish and Gentile Christians, were united by a common faith in Christ, without basing unity in a complete outward uniformity. Fellowship with Christ in the use of the ordinances appointed, and in obedience to the Word, was *the test* of union, and no one arrogated to himself precedence in the way of authority. The church was nowhere called the Kingdom; for the church, instead of admitting itself to be the Kingdom, *was looking for* the speedy coming of the Kingdom. Admit that it was, as one remarks, "a sensuous interpretation," it is sufficient for our purpose to receive the admission that the Apostolic Fathers had *no other than* this "sensuous" conception of the church. It may indicate weakness, but we confess that "a sensuous interpretation" of so important a doctrine, having the advantage of nearness to apostolic times, and remaining for so long uncontradicted, is *far more credible* than the later refined and spiritualized ones, because of its *accord with Holy Writ.*

Carefully tracing the doctrine, we soon see the entering wedge which mars the simplicity of the early church view. Dr. Neander has well and candidly pointed this out, in his various writings, as taking place in the history of the Gnostics. The notion,

founded on that of a Kingdom, of an outward unity gradually obtained the possession of men's minds and resolved itself in endeavors to manifest the idea by definite form in the visible Church. Antagonism to Millenarianism also contributed to the entertainment of such views. It exhibited itself in claims of authority in sacred things, in planting the germs and fostering the growth of a hierarchy, until finally the suggested and fostered ideal presented itself, practically exemplified in the Papacy. Here was indeed a Kingdom, with subjects, laws, rulers, and a central power, visible, and exerting extensive dominions. It was the predicted Kingdom of heaven! It would surpass our limits to show how the unguarded language of really sincere and good men were made subservient to this development, or to indicate how during this growth protests here and there were pronounced against this theory and its resultant effects. For centuries it remained the controlling and enforced view; taught by a Church in which both laity and clergy were compelled to follow its teaching with unquestioning obedience. It is not surprising that the meaning of the Kingdom should be *almost eradicated*, when for ages the Bible was scarcely read, and was only interpreted by persons wedded and subservient to the Hierarchy itself. To evince how imbedded this notion, that the Church was the Kingdom, had become, it is only necessary to refer to Chancellor Gerson. In the fifteenth century, when the reaction took place in the University of Paris respecting the relation of the Papacy to church and state, Chancellor Gerson, the leader in the controversy, hampered by the prominently retained idea that the Church was the Kingdom of God, and that as such it needed an outward expression of unity and power, conceded "the whole Hierarchical Order as necessary for the organism of the Church." Conceding the premise from whence the conclusions naturally flowed, retaining the foundation upon which the system is built, his opposition was consequently very one-sided and lacked in radical force.

Coming to the Reformation, two antagonistic Churches are arrayed the one against the other. The Roman Catholic vested all authority in the Church simply because it was, *per se*, the Kingdom of God, as tangible, Bellarmine informs us, as the Republic of Venice. The Reformation, unable altogether to rid itself of the insidious and life-interwoven notion of the Church-Kingdom, endeavors to check the hierarchical Church position by advocating the authority of the Word of God, the universal priesthood of believers, etc., and by turning to the early Church view respecting the Church. The latter was in a great measure attained; the fundamental maxim was laid down that the Church is a community of believers in Christ, and embraces all such; the utterances were almost entirely scriptural, and were only marred in the efforts *to conciliate* the Roman Catholics, or *to favor* civil government. To some extent there was a departure from the primitive simplicity, which need not be wondered at, considering the age and *the influences* surrounding the Reformers. Indeed, at times, as Neander, Mosheim, and recently Fisher, in his *His. of the Reformation*, show, Luther advocated precisely the government adopted and practised by the early churches, but regarded it, in view of the condition and training of the Germans, *impracticable* in his time. It would be interesting to note how on various occasions the entire truth seemed on the point of enunciation. We have only place for the following exhibit of doctrine in remarkable correspondence with the early one. In *the Augsburg Confession* (Art. 7) "the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments are properly administered." Provision is made against the Catholic external unity by asserting that "for the true unity of the Church nothing more is required than agreement concerning the doctrines of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments." But lest this Article be misconstrued to mean that all in the Church are saints, and thus pave the way for the shafts of the enemy, Art. 8 is added: "Although the Church is properly *a congregation* of believers, yet in the present life, many hypocrites and wicked men are mingled with them." The Reformers advocated an outward Church, embracing good and bad, although admitting also, that to the pious alone, in view of the demarkation in the future life, the name properly belonged. So that while, as Dr. Knapp and others state, Luther first employed the term "invisible" in his reply to the Roman Catholic party in answer to the question, "Where, then, was the true Church before him," yet Neander (*His. of Dogmas*, p. 687) shows that "the idea of the invisible Church was for a time held to be doubtful" by both Melanchthon and Luther. "Melanchthon himself says: 'These passages treat *not of a Platonic idea, but of a visible Church.*'" "And Luther says: 'They say the Spirit must do it. The merciful God preserve us from that Christian Church in which there are only saints.'" From these and other expressions, and from the Confession itself, it seems that in all probability they used the term invisible to denote true believers in a sense very different from the later engrafted ideas. They endeavored to avoid, on the one hand, the Donatist idea

that the Church ceased to exist when unworthy members were attached to it, and, on the other, that it can exist exclusively of wicked, unregenerated men. Hence Neander (p. 685, vol. 2) remarks: "The distinction was therefore made between *the proper and improper* Church." This, in response to attacks of Romish theologians, was taken up and enlarged by their successors, until an inner and outward Church, the inner exclusively confined to the good, was advocated, the inner especially forming "the Kingdom of Christ," "a spiritual Kingdom," also in a manner outwardly manifested. Zwingli (Neander, *His. of Dogmas*, p. 686, vol. 2) has two churches, one of all who profess Christ, embracing good and evil; the other, in the true sense, composed of all believers. Calvin also (*Insti.*, B. 4) has the external composed of professors; the internal or true Church of the elect of God. The same division characterizes nearly all Reformers and divines; and with it nearly all included the Kingdom of Christ, either related to the one or to the other, or to both; and in this last respect departing from the original simplicity of the doctrinal position of the Church. Among these, however, as we have already stated, there were many who professed the belief that the present Kingdom appertaining to the Church was *only a prelude* to a future and still more magnificent manifestation of the Kingdom, such as the prophets describe, and which was in a higher and more significant sense the promised Kingdom. The history of the doctrine, regarded in its connection with apostolic times, has nothing in it of sufficient weight to deteriorate our view; rather the indications of departure from the early one, the manner in which it was produced, the fruit that it bore, the varied definitions it gave rise to, etc., are decidedly favorable to our line of argument. The fact is, that in view of the predicted blindness and lack of faith in Christ's coming and Kingdom, characteristic of the world and the Church before the Sec. Advent, the prevailing view so deeply intrenched in the Church—the departure from the Primitive belief so widely extended—is open to the gravest suspicion (comp. Prop. 174). The Augustinian view of the Church is the one largely adopted, and the influence of *The City of God* is widely felt. Comparatively few theologians but feel the preponderating tendency, and give way to it. This is the position of the multitude—just as the Word predicts.

PROPOSITION 103. *This Kingdom is not a Kingdom in the third heaven.*

Some writers, especially in answering Millenarians, inform us that the Kingdom of Christ, of God, or of heaven, *is now in heaven*, where the redeemed now dwell, and that it will continue to remain there after the resurrection. Aside from its *direct conflict* with covenant and promise, it is easily rebutted by Dan. 2 and 7, Rev. 14, etc., which describe the Kingdom as one existing *here on earth* over the whole world.

Obs. 1. Whatever the authority and power of Christ in the third heaven in His Divine and human natures (Props. 80, 79, 83, etc.), the same does *not meet* the conditions either of prophecy (Prop. 35, etc.), or, especially, of covenant, Prop. 49.

Simply to illustrate the conflicting views, we give Gregory (*Four Gospels*), who, hampered by a preconceived notion, finds a difficulty to define the Kingdom; for on p. 126 he makes it, God reigning in the hearts of men; on p. 146, influenced by the expression "Kingdom of heaven," he makes it a Kingdom in heaven above; and on the following page he makes the Church a manifestation of the Kingdom, etc. Many writers have two co-existing Kingdoms, one on earth and the other in heaven, and some call the one "the militant Kingdom," and the other "the triumphant Kingdom." Any absurdity, under the specious language of pious phraseology, is eagerly received, and, without examination, reiterated. To indicate how men flatly contradict themselves when leaving the scriptural basis of the early Church, we give another illustration from Lange's *Com. Acts* 14 : 22. In the doctrinal part (1) Lechler declares that "the Kingdom of God," here mentioned, is "something that lies beyond the bounds of this world," etc. He affirms that believers, "as long as they are passing through tribulations or afflictions, have not yet entered into the Kingdom of God," and concludes: "'The Church' and 'The Kingdom of God' are not equivalent terms: the former is the court; the latter, the sanctuary, or rather the holiest of all (Heb. 9 : 2, 3)." Now let the reader turn e.g. in the same Com. to Acts 3 : 19-21, Doctrinal (6), and here on earth after the Sec. Advent a complete restoration to blessedness, etc., is presented in accord with our views (comp. Prop. 144, where the language is quoted).

Obs. 2. The Kingdom is not, as held by some, e.g. Dr. Lange and others, the church in heaven before the Second Advent in a triumphant state called "the Kingdom of glory." This theory is derived from mistaking the Divine Sovereignty for *the specially promised Kingdom to the Son of man*, and probably from a desire to cover up what defects may exist in several lower grades or phases of Kingdoms simultaneously in operation. But this is *exceedingly unscriptural;* and the theory can be traced directly to the Origenistic interpretation. It is utterly unreliable, from the simple fact, already abundantly proven, that this Messianic Kingdom is *based exclusively* on the covenant and the prophecies elucidative of the covenant, and neither of these promise a Kingdom *in* the third heaven, or any other part of the universe; but explicitly predict its establishment

here on the earth, with a world-wide dominion, etc. If believers are to be heirs with Abraham, according to promise, *then* to behold our inheritance with faith it becomes us *to confine ourselves to these promises.* If so, then it is *impossible* to find any one given to Abraham that has not a direct reference *to this earth,* or to his seed *here on earth.* Not one refers to the third heaven, or to any place outside of the earth itself. What we are to understand by the words "heaven," "heavenly," etc., will be duly considered under Prop. 107, and what relationship the earth under Messiah's rule will sustain to the third heaven has already been intimated and will again receive consideration. Having also shown that the saints have *not yet* received the promises, *not yet* inherited, etc. (Prop. 85, 90, 91, etc.), it follows, that they have *not received* the Kingdom. This Romish view, which has a leaning toward Paganism, is indeed popular and deeply rooted, so that the poet writes, and many devoutly sing:

> "With thee we'll reign, with thee we'll rise,
> And kingdoms gain beyond the skies;"

but it is *in direct antagonism* to the Kingdom promised to David's Son and to His brethren.

Lindsay's Art. Millennium in *Encyclop. Brit.*, by exalting and pressing the intermediate state *beyond* its scriptural representation, forms an objection against us. Thus: saints are happy in heaven; it is inconsistent to bring them to this earth *from a higher to a lower stage* of enjoyment. But this is *begging the question,* for (1) it takes for granted what remains unproven, viz.: a present inheriting of the Kingdom and forfeited blessings; and (2) that our doctrine brings the saints from a higher to a lower stage, seeing that we expressly teach the contrary. Lindsay then adds something, which we have seen advocated by no Millenarian author, viz.: that the saints "then return to heaven to permit their enemies *for a season to reign in their stead.*" He may have found some crude writer to express this view, but it is opposed to the universally expressed views of ancient and modern Millenarians, and cannot, therefore, without injustice, be charged to us.

Obs. 3. Another theory concerning this Kingdom being in the third heaven during the thousand years or Millennial age, will be noticed under a following Proposition.

"The Perfectionists'" (Nordhoff's *Com. Societies,* p. 268) also say that at the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, "the final Kingdom of God then began in the heavens; that the manifestation of that Kingdom in the visible world is now approaching; that its approach is ushering in the second and final resurrection and judgment; that a Church on earth is now rising to meet the approaching Kingdom in the heavens, and to become its duplicate and representative," etc. This theory ignores the covenant, etc., and substitutes the Divine Sovereignty for the Davidic throne and Kingdom, spiritualizing the Theocratic idea.

Obs. 4. The early church had no idea that this Kingdom was received *at or after* death (see Prop. 98, 136). Whatever the view concerning the intermediate state, whatever the condition allotted to the pious, one thing is *certainly affirmed,* that they looked for the Kingdom, the inheriting, crowning *at the Second Advent* of Christ and *not* at death. The departed were also represented as *waiting for* the Kingdom, and the whole period during which the bodies of the saints were not restored was characterized as one of expectation, waiting for redemption, Rom. 8:23. The non-crowning of Paul, during the intermediate period, the reception of the

Kingdom at the time of "regeneration" or "restitution," etc., was decisive.

This most conclusively rebuts the amazing declaration of Archb. Whately (*Corruptions of Christianity*, p. 131), when he actually makes, after the ascension of Jesus, the apostles to "establish the Kingdom of God, over which He had placed them, saying: 'I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me,'" and this in fulfilment of "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." Surprising that he did not notice the period of fulfilment at the restitution of all things, the disclaimer that Paul made of now reigning, the period of crowning, inheriting, etc., at the Sec. Advent.

PROPOSITION 104. *The Christian Church is not denoted by the predicted Kingdom of the Prophets.*

Having already shown what the Kingdom is according to the covenants, it may be well to briefly direct attention to the prophets. In the nature of the case, both (i. e. covenanted and prophetic) announcements coming from the same source, they must correspond, or else *unity*, and with it *credibility*, is destroyed. The Proposition is amply sustained, as the observations following indicate, and also the various corroborating proofs taken from the Prophets under a large number of Propositions (comp. e. g. Props. 121, 132, 133, and 159).

Obs. 1. Taking the establishment of the Kingdom for granted, and overlooking the postponement, has led to a wholesale appropriation by the church of predictions relating *exclusively* to the Kingdom still future. We select of those thus applied, Dan. 2 : 31–45 ; Dan. 7 : 1–28 ; Isa. 25 : 6–9 ; Isa. 2 : 1–5 ; comp. with Micah 4 : 1–8, and then one or two that, while also partially arrogated, our opponents would rather not quote very liberally, viz.: Zech. 14 : 1–21 ; Isa. 63 : 1–6.

We remind the reader of one fact as fully presented in past Propositions, and demonstrated *both* historically and scripturally, viz. : That the view we take of the prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom accords in every respect with those entertained by the Church in the first centuries. It is passing strange, to say the least, that the early believers, east and west, north and south, should, under the leadership of men who organized and perpetuated the Church, place, as we do, the fulfilment of those predictions *at the Sec. Advent of Jesus*, and not, as many now do, at the founding of the Ch. Church. These prophecies, too, are so prominent, so magnificent in proportions, such landmarks in the Divine Redemptive plan, that they must have largely occupied the attention of the apostolic and succeeding age.

Obs. 2. Taking Dan. 2 : 31–45 and 7 : 1–28 as descriptive of the same Kingdom (so admitted by all our opposers, as e.g. Barnes, Brown, Stuart, etc.), we save space by considering them together, seeing that the one is an amplification of the other. For the same reason we avoid a description of the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman Empires, denoted by the image and the beasts, for this has been done by many able writers, as e.g. Mede, Bh. Newton, Sir Isaac Newton, Faber, etc., and recently by Auberlen, Delitzsch, etc.; and the same is fully accepted by leading writers opposed to our doctrine, as e.g. Barnes *Com.*, Pres. Edwards *His. Redempt.*, Brown *Ch. Sec. Coming*, etc. The student will find by a fair comparison of these Scriptures with each other, and then with history, that no other position in reference to them can be maintained. Hence the almost general agreement existing between Millenarians and Anti-Millenarians thus far concerning them. But as soon as we come to the Kingdom set

up by God and given to the Son of Man, the Church-Kingdom theory applies the same to the Christian Church, affirming, as e.g. Barnes, that it was set up at the First Advent or day of Pentecost, or as e.g. Bush, at *a supposed* Second Coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, or, as others, at some intermediate period, at the birth, baptism, death, resurrection, or ascension of Christ. At least, whether the establishment be as notable for its conspicuity as the prophecy intimates or not, the Kingdom is represented to be equivalent to the Christian Church. Now in opposition to this view, the following reasons, drawn from the predictions, appear conclusive.[1]

1. The Kingdom is set up "*in the days of these kings.*" It is supposed that this means in the days or time when one of these empires exists, and the inference is drawn that the church, being established under the fourth Kingdom, it is certainly the undivided Empire that is meant. But against such an inference we allege (*a*) the simple fact that the phrase "*these kings,*" following the description of the divided form of the Roman Empire, most naturally refers to the kings or kingdoms existing *in such a divided* state, and which fact is corroborated by other prophecies; that this Kingdom is set up *after* the ten horns (Dan. 7; Rev. 18 : 12–17, comp. with Rev. 19 : 11–21, etc.), or ten kingdoms are in existence. The expression in Dan. 2 thus accurately corresponds with other predictions, and forbids our receiving the Christian Church as denoted, because it was established *long before* the Roman Empire was thus divided. (*b*) One Kingdom follows the next *chronologically*, and we are not at liberty to make a change to the contrary unless *expressly* specified. Accepting of this, "these kings" refer to the later ones, those in the divided form, or else we have the fourth and fifth Kingdoms contemporaneous.[2]

2. The smiting, whatever it may mean, does *not occur* in the undivided form of the Roman Empire, and yet the smiting is *contemporaneous* with the establishment of the Kingdom. In Dan. 2 : 34 it is explicitly stated that "*the stone*" "*smote the image upon the feet.*" Therefore not only the legs (Eastern and Western divisions), but the feet and toes appear *before* the smiting process. This *is significant* of the period, and the reference *cannot* be made to the church, because that appeared *long before* the division into legs and feet. The church came during the consolidated period of the Empire, and therefore it is not intended, seeing that the entire image is presented *before* the stone enters upon its work of demolition.[3]

3. Taking for granted their own theory respecting Dan. 7, they have the Son of man receiving this Kingdom, as the prophecy plainly contradicts, *before* the ten horns have arisen. The church was for several centuries in existence, according to their own interpretation, *before* they arose. Hence, the church *cannot* be meant by the Kingdom, for the prophecy locates the appearance of the Ancient of Days and the bestowment of the Kingdom *after* the horns have appeared.[4]

4. Not only this, but the location of the Kingdom is placed not only *after* the appearance of the ten horns, but *after* three have fallen, and *after* the rise and extended progress of another horn called the "little horn," which is in correspondence with what precedes the Advent in Rev. 19. The church, therefore, *cannot possibly* be this Kingdom, as the time of its establishment *so widely differs* from that of the prophecy.[5]

5. The smiting of the stone, the overthrow of the image and beast, the entire action of setting up the Kingdom, is in such accord with what John

states in the Apocalypse, that the outlines are conceded by nearly all of our opponents to be the same. If so, the whole matter *still appertains* to the future, and again is indicative that the church is not meant. This argument is only available with those who concede, as e.g. Barnes *Com loci*, that the Beasts of Dan. and John are identical, etc.[6]

6. The stone comes, the Son of man comes, at the time when the Kingdoms are to be destroyed, and the prophecy proclaims this to be *one* of the objects contemplated by the Coming. The fact that the church, instead of destroying earthly Kingdoms, has herself been in danger, been persecuted and terribly smitten by such Kingdoms, again shows that the church is *not* intended.[7]

7. The testimony of Jesus Himself, when at His First Advent He refers to or quotes these prophecies, is in favor of locating them still in the future, at least so Barnes and others. Thus, e.g. Matt. 21 : 44 has reference, according to Barnes, to the judgment-day, and Matt. 26 : 64 relates also to the future Advent and not to the First. The latter passage is fully appropriated by Jesus as Messianic, just as the Jews understood it, from whence the charge of blasphemy. This Kingdom is only given to the Son of man at this Coming, referred by Jesus not to *the first but a future one*, and therefore it is *not* the church. (Comp. Prop. 121).[8]

8. The horns and the little horn are represented as existing down *to this* Coming, and during their presence and exertion of power, the saints, just as has occurred in the church but will not in the Kingdom, have been oppressed and persecuted. Such a condition of the saints is not *in accord* with their condition in the Kingdom, and hence the church and the Kingdom are *not* the same.[9]

9. At the Coming of the Son of Man, etc., as here predicted, there can be *no* reference to His First Advent, because that was a Coming *in humiliation* to suffer and die, whilst this is a Coming *in triumph* to rescue saints *after* they have endured a period of trial, etc. Hence this is not the Coming which preceded the Ch. Church, but must be the same alluded to in Rev. as preceding the Mill. age. From this Paul evidently obtains "*His appearing and Kingdom*," admitted by all to be future.[10]

10. The declaration of the prophecy is, that the church was in a struggling condition "*until*" "*the time came that the saints possessed the Kingdom.*" This language clearly implies that during the period when this oppressing hostile power existed, the saints did *not possess* the Kingdom.[11]

11. The setting up (as Tregelles, Fairbairn, etc.) of thrones (not casting down), "*the judgment set* and *the books opened*," etc., locates the coming of the Ancient of Days and that of the Son of man, just where John locates the judgment *under the last trumpet*—Rev. 11 : 15–19 ; Rev. 15 : 15 –19 ; Rev. 20 : 4—still in the future. Therefore, these are not descriptions of events preceding the establishment of the Christian Church. (Comp. Props. 121, 132, 133, 134, etc.)

12. The giving of the Kingdom, dominion, etc., implies at once a rulership, power, exaltation, etc., a fulfilment of which is thus far *contradicted* by the history of the church. It embraces *actual* dominion over nations, their subjection, etc., which has *never* been realized.[12]

13. When the power of this Kingdom is once exerted, it includes *a continued, unremitted exertion and manifestation of the same*, which does not correspond with the wavering, often weakened condition, relapses, losses, etc., of the church. (Comp. Prop. 159.)

14. This judgment, bestowment of a Kingdom, possessing a Kingdom, all imply in the saints *actual personal* rulership, something which is promised in *inheriting* a Kingdom still future, and in *a reign* of the saints also still future. Seeing such a correspondence, and knowing that instead of reigning the saints have been suffering more or less, we cannot apply this to the Christian Church past or present. (Comp. Prop. 154.)

15. The time when this Kingdom is set up is a time of *dire vengeance*, as the slaying of the beast, giving his body to the burning flame indicates; this *agrees* with the vengeance to be inflicted at a future coming recorded in Rev. 19, etc. Hence, a Kingdom before this period of retribution is not described. (Comp. Props. 115, 123, 147, 161, etc.)[13]

16. The smiting of the stone is also a representation of vengeance. It demolishes, breaks into pieces, makes like chaff or dust, and utterly roots out. This teaches *violence*, not conversion, etc., as some contend to support a theory, but the *utter removal* of hostile powers, as our argument demands, and as illustrated in the closing portions of the Apocalypse. Kingdoms antagonistic to the truth, wars resultant from them, etc., exist down to the Second Advent; but that period, as Paul tells the Thessalonians, is a time of terrible smiting or vengeance. The church has exhibited *no such power*, and therefore is not denoted.[14]

17. The entire narration of the prophecy makes the natural impression that this Kingdom is not set up *beside* the image or beasts to be *contemporaneous* with them, and to be engaged in a continued series of smiting processes, but that at a certain period (as Rev. 11 : 15) it will be manifested, and that in connection with their removal.[15]

18. That the operation of the church is not meant is evident from the predictions relating to the same, which do not correspond with the prophecy. Thus, e.g. instead of these Kingdoms being spiritually consumed or absorbed, as men confidently tell us, we find (Rev. 19, etc.) them arrayed against Christ and making war. The condition of the world at the Sec. Advent *does not coincide* with the proposed conquest of the world attributed by interpreters to the church.[16]

19. The Coming of the Son of man is *personal*, seeing that symbolical representation is laid aside, and it is characterized as a Coming of *the Son of man*. Leaving the discussion of the personal Advent to another Prop. (131), we now adhere to the view of the Jews of such an Advent (i.e. personal) here delineated, and which Neander and others concede the inspired Apostles and early church held to, in looking for the Advent itself as not very remote. All that we now suggest is, that the very structure of the prophecy is calculated to make such an *impression*, viz.: that the Messiah would personally come, and a Kingdom, etc., would be given to Him. *Inspired men* and their immediate successors could not see a fulfilment of the prophecy in the First Advent, and have located its realization *at the Second*. We are content to accept of their opinion, if it is "Jewish," etc., in its cast."

20. The Kingdom, dominion, etc., is to be in the territorial limits, *the very place* occupied by the image and beasts, but if the church is meant, how comes it, unless we indorse the assumptions of the Romish and Greek Churches, which do *not meet* the conditions of the prophecy, that the church *after* so long a trial has *never* exercised such dominion within those limits? In place of it, those Kingdoms have existed often to the detriment and persecution of the church, and instead of being subdued or absorbed

are either independent of, or exercise a lordship over, the church. If it be said, that this will yet occur, the reply is, that according to the prediction (if the church is meant), something of the kind ought to have already taken place and to have manifested its continuance. For, as our opponents admit (Barnes, *loci Com.*, p. 155), the language affirms that power, etc., *once obtained shall never diminish or decrease.*[18]

21. A *real, visible, outward* Kingdom is to be witnessed. This is the clear announcement of the prophecy, if it has *any meaning whatever*, seeing that it is to occupy the very position, place, territory, etc., previously taken by the image and beasts. It is a mere quibble to pronounce against this on account of the prophecy being symbolical. Let it be such, yet the image and the beasts symbolize real, literal, visible Kingdoms, and the last Kingdom, being portrayed with symbol and then without, must, in the very nature of the case, *be the same*, unless we *violate* the propriety of language. Hence, the language *cannot* be spiritualized away into an invisible or spiritual Kingdom. So decided is the language, that many who oppose us concede that at some time still future, the church will assume this very characteristic.[19]

22. The prophecy implies forcibly that when this Kingdom is set up it will be done *so conspicuously* that all will *know* definitely the period of its setting up. The action of the stone and of the Ancient of Days, the judgment set, the vengeance inflicted, etc., *all* indicate *such stupendous events*, that, taken in connection with the description of the Kingdom itself, it forbids that hesitancy, vacillation, etc., characteristic of the theories of the Church-Kingdom already examined. The latter cannot even precisely define its commencement, sometimes having several.

23. When this Kingdom is established, it is not only *continuously*, with triumphant power, *perpetuated*, but is in itself, just as established, pronounced a *perpetual or everlasting* Kingdom. It is not susceptible of change in form. This is clearly taught. But the Church-Kingdom theory, according to its idea of 1 Cor. 15 : 24 (see Prop. 159) merges this Kingdom into quite another one, changes it into one that materially differs, some even removing it, transformed, from earth to heaven, making this dispensation, called the Kingdom, to end, etc.

From these considerations, and especially from that arising in *a preservation of covenanted promise, of Divine Unity of Purpose, of consistency* between earlier and later prediction, we are forced to the conclusion that the church *by no means meets the conditions* imposed by the prophecy. Keeping constantly before us the covenanted Kingdom, we fail to see any of the *distinctive marks* of the same in the church, and we dare not *substitute* another in its place. Prophecy does not *contradict* covenant promise. Therefore the assumptions of Popish doctors, who make the Papal dominion the Fifth Monarchy down to the more recent ones of Swedenborg and the Mormons, who specially claim (as Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, Shakers, etc.), in their respective cases a fulfilment of Dan. 2 and 7, etc., are *to be rejected* as not only extravagant but arrogant, because in *direct conflict with covenant, prediction, and fact.* At the same time it may be proper to notice, in the briefest manner, the objections that are presented against our view. They are given by a writer (*Kingd. of Grace*) as follows : (1) "*The stone cut out of a mountain*" indicates that the Kingdom "has a small beginning," etc., equivalent to the church's. Much depends on what is meant by the Stone. Writers differ regarding its meaning. Our

opponents generally explain it to mean the church, and some have ingeniously raised up a Kingdom of the Stone (Regnum lapidis), and a Kingdom of the mountain (Regnum montis), as if two Kingdoms or stages were predicted.[20] Amidst the diversity of meaning attached, we must keep in view the parallel passages which aid to explain it; and thus we find, that by the Stone is symbolized *Christ Himself*. The reasons for this opinion are these: (*a*) Christ is predicted as the Stone, Gen. 49 : 24; Ps. 118 : 22, 23, etc.; (*b*) Christ applies the image of the Stone to Himself, Matt. 21 : 44; (*c*) the term referred to Christ by the Apostles, Rom. 9 : 33; 1 Pet. 2 : 6–8, etc.; (*d*) the action performed by Christ at His Second Advent, as delineated in various prophecies, fully corresponds with that of the Stone; (*e*) the Stone, Son of Man and King of Kings, are identical in their relationship to the Kingdom; (*f*) the primitive Fathers, who had the advantage of nearness to the apostolic age, apply the Stone to Christ. Taking this for its meaning, we find that this Son of man, David's Son, the Stone, did come in humility, and that its smiting, grinding power (Matt. 21 : 44; Rev. 11 and 19, etc.) is held *in abeyance* until the end of the times of the Gentiles. The prophecy says nothing of growth while in action; the representation is that of *demolition*, and the result, i.e. the Kingdom, is stated as *following*, not as *accompanying* the same." (2) The expression "*without hands*" signifies "nothing else than that it was to be a spiritual and not a temporal Kingdom." But to this we reply: (*a*) The reference to the church is presumed not proven, whilst this supernatural characteristic is confirmatory of Christ being the Stone. According to the prevailing view, "cut out of a mountain" is not even symbolic; it is only added as an expressive figure. On the other hand, we find that "mountain" is a symbolical equivalent for "Kingdom;" we find Christ *directly sprung* from the royal line of David, and recognized, not merely from the past but the certainty of the future, as "cut out of a mountain," i.e. descended from the Kingdom or mountain belonging to God, and this too "*without hands*," i.e. *by Divine agency*, supernaturally, as the *miraculous conception of Jesus in the royal line of David* through God's Spirit confirms. (*b*) "Without hands," denoting such agency of God's is also to be exerted at the Second Advent, as e.g. Rev. 11, etc. Divine, supernatural power is to be manifested at Christ's "appearing and Kingdom." (*c*) Making this Kingdom only spiritual, and therefore invisible, violates the plain statement of the prophecy. (3) Becoming a "great mountain" means that, insignificant at first, it will spread until co-extensive with the whole earth, which can only be predicted of the church. To this we answer: The Stone appears, but we are taught *is rejected* by the very nation to whom the Kingdom appertains; but this same Stone *thus rejected* is the chosen one, held *in abeyance until* the period of its manifestation. The imagery of figurative language is preserved under what is related of the Stone, i.e. its becoming a great mountain; and the time when this is to be done must be obtained from other predictions. Christ being the representative of the Kingdom, the figure is appropriate, seeing that in the image the first kingdom is represented by Nebuchadnezzar personally, "Thou art this head of gold," in view of the sovereign power *invested* in him; so also with Christ, now indeed the rejected one, He is the Stone which *at the period of its future manifestation* will break in pieces and convert into chaff the Kingdoms opposed to Him. (4) But "this Kingdom was to be set up in the days of the four preceding kings,

or in the days of the Roman Monarchy," and "this can only be said of the church." Leaving the fact that this proves too much—for the same author has the church or this Kingdom existing long before the head of the image arose—and passing also the fact that we have already shown that the Kingdom is set up in *the divided* form of the Roman Empire, we concede that at some time during the divided existence of the beast or toes of the image, it must be set up. This implies, then, their present and future existence. Now the weakened and divided condition of the once united and formidable Empire is evident. Faber and others have conclusively proven from historical documents that there has been a continuous Roman power existing down to Francis II., reinstated by Napoleon I., claimed by others, and efforts made for its revival in Italy and elsewhere. The non-existence and revival are clearly taught in Revelation, and the identity of the beasts of Daniel and of John are fully admitted by many writers. (Comp. Prop. 160). We say nothing now of the admissions even of many, that the Roman power was perpetuated in the Papal power, which exists down to the present. But whatever opinion may be formed concerning these explanations, one thing *is certain*, that the Kingdom of Christ is to be erected *after* the Roman Empire has been *disrupted*, and from the description of the disruption itself, a long time after it has occurred. The time we are living in still proclaims that such is its condition, for the limits once occupied by the Empire are now the territory of a number of Kingdoms. Such, and such only, is the predicted posture of affairs when this Stone, this Son of man, shall come. Daniel, therefore, confirms our doctrinal position, which will be more decisive when we come to speak of the promise made to him personally under the Prop. of the resurrection.[22]

[1] The student will observe that we enter upon the consideration of these prophecies *prepared* by the powerful scriptural evidence afforded by the past history of *the Theocracy*, its fall and promised restoration, the Davidic covenant attested to by oath, the postponement of the Kingdom, etc., and that no interpretation which destroys the unity between these can be received as correct. Prophecy only predicts *one* Kingdom of God, in *the Theocratic form*, to exist here on earth, and we may rest assured that, if the Word is truly inspired, there will be no conflict between one and another portion of Holy Writ. In addition: several opinions, entertained by a few, respecting a portion of Daniel, are so utterly untenable and have been so ably answered by other writers and commentators, that they require no special attention. Such e.g. is the view of Amner and Grotius, that by the Fifth Kingdom is to be understood the Roman Empire having become Christian, which is to endure many ages, and the Son of man (which Jesus appropriates to Himself *personally*) symbolizes the Roman Republic contrasted with the monarchies, etc. (Lord's *Lit. Journal*, Jan., 1857, p. 499, note). Or, Prof. Stuart's (*Com. on Dan.*) idea, that the Fourth Kingdom refers to the dynasties of Syria and Egypt immediately succeeding the reign of Alexander the Great (comp. the reply of Barnes, *Com.*, and others). Black, in *Messiahs and Anti-Messiahs*, departing entirely from the ancient and continued interpretation, regards the four parts of the image as descriptive rather of races than of nations i.e. to the descendants of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, under the sway of Satan as Antichrist. The "Antiochus Epiphanes theory" is (Auberlen *on Dan.*) a favorite one with modern Rationalistic interpretation. Destructive criticism endeavors to revive and enforce the objections of Celsus and Porphyry, and, not satisfied with this, endeavors to break the continuity and force of the predictions by making the Medes and Persians two of the four Kingdoms, and urging that Alexander and his successors form two (comp. Birks's *Mod. Thought*, p. 192, etc.). Extravagances are fastened on these predictions on all sides. Thus e.g. a Pope can approvingly quote them (Littell's *Liv. Age*, Aug. 10th, 1872) as a threat against the German Empire, "that by and by there will fall from the Mountain a little stone which shall break the head of the Colossus;" the Jesuit Vieiri (Von Döllinger's *Essay on Proph. Spirit*) can interpret: "God will again raise up your King, and elevate his Portugal to be the heart and the centre of a new universal empire, the Fifth according to the prophet Daniel, since the

Fourth, the Roman-German, is already falling in pieces, and will be dissolved at the coming of Sebastian. In the time of this Fifth Empire all Jews and heathen will be converted; and thus the prophecy about one Shepherd and one fold will be fulfilled." Dr. Berg makes America the Fifth Empire, reproducing the opinion of Sir. Th. Browne (*Works*, Tr. 12), and which, as stated by Dr. Johnson, is in accordance with the interpretation and expectation of Dr. Berkeley, viz.: "that America will be the seat of the Fifth Empire" (comp. Prop. 168); Davis (*Seven Thunders*) insists that the stone is the American Republic, which is destined to demolish European despotism, and overthrow thrones, etc., commingling Christ and the Republic, and applying the army (Rev. 19) to the Republic; others confidently and exclusively refer the Fifth Kingdom to their peculiar and distinctive church or sect. Such vagaries can be dismissed; for as Fairbairn (*On Proph.*) says: the efforts to make the succession of Kingdoms different from that anciently, ordinarily, and generally entertained, have "palpably failed. They have been thoroughly refuted by Hofmann, Hengstenberg, and latterly by Auberlen" (to which may be added, Lord, Birks, Barnes, Newton, Mede, Elliott, Cumming, Frere, Bonar, Bickersteth, Brooks, and many others). The natural legitimate interpretation, according as it does with the plain language and the facts of history, cannot be set aside by those mentioned. Bh. Newton (*On Proph.*, vol. 1, p. 217) well remarks: "All ancient writers, both Jewish and Christian, agree with Jerome in explaining the Fourth Kingdom to be the Roman." The learned Mede (*Works*, quoted by Newton, p. 217) says: "The Roman Empire to be the Fourth Kingdom of Daniel, was believed by the Church of Israel, both before and in our Saviour's time; received by the disciples of the apostles and the whole Christian Church for the first three hundred years without any known contradiction. And I confess, having so good ground in Scripture, it is, with me *tantum non articulus fidei, little less than an article of faith.*" The interpretation therefore, really worthy of consideration, is that which consecutively leads down to the Roman as the Fourth Kingdom, and this we thus notice preparatory to the contemplation of the Fifth. The only point in the adverse criticisms and speculations deserving the least attention, is that of making it a question whether the divided portion of Alexander's Empire after his death is to be considered as part of the Third Kingdom, or whether they (for it was divided into four parts) are to be regarded as separate and distinct Kingdoms (so Davidson, etc.). That they are the former is evident: (1) that a portion of the body or a beast symbolizes as well a succession as an individual; (2) that the same symbolizes a succession, even when divided or undergoing changes; (3) that such a change is indicated in ch. 7, by the horns springing out of the same beast; (4) that the successors were Macedonians or Grecians; (5) that all ancient authors speak of Alexander's Kingdom and that of his successors as being the same; (6) the Empire was simply divided among successors, and each one acknowledged his portion to be a part of the same; (7) the Jews always spoke of these several portions as pertaining to one characteristic rule, calling them by one name, the Kingdom of the Grecians; (8) the next Empire was stronger than the brazen, which is not true of the divided Grecian Kingdom; (9) the Fourth reaches down to the end (comp. Prop. 160), whereas the divided form of the Grecian has long since disappeared; (10) that to make such a radical change destroys the unity of the prophecy and prevents a proper incorporation of the subject-matter that follows in its natural order.

[2] It is noticeable what influence a preconceived opinion will have in guiding writers in their interpretation of this passage. A recent one (Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 295), who comes to Daniel with the determination to find the Christian Church, as now existing, delineated by the Fifth Kingdom, gravely tells us: "It (the vision) does not indicate at what particular time, or even under which worldly dominion the Kingdom represented by the Stone should begin to develop itself on the theatre of the world," although he admits that it must be referred to the period of the last power as "*the natural inference obviously.*" So others evince a lack of candor, seeing that the action of the Stone (aside from its being *the last* in the order of time and place) is represented as taking place on the feet of the image, whereas Fairbairn and others, *in plain contradiction* of the language, will have the smiting process, or action of the Stone, to begin, *not* on the feet, but *on the body*, even before the legs and feet are in existence. They also forget that in ch. 7, the bestowal of the Kingdom (corresponding with ch. 2) is *after* the Fourth Kingdom has run its career, and is to be brought to its end. Where is the consistency of a criticism, so forced that it does violence to the express delineation given by the Spirit? It will not avail to say, as some do, that the Stone was in existence and "taking form," etc., before smiting the feet, for that is begging the point at issue by adding to the vision mere assumption. The latter proves too much, for if, as Fairbairn states, it took some time for the Stone to be organized and to put on "a form in which it could act extrane-

ously upon the affairs and destinies of the world," we are therefore to understand that for several centuries previous to the formation of the feet, it did not "act extraneously upon the affairs and destinies of the world" (for the distinctive stated work of the Stone begins when the feet are planted, and not before), which notion, pressed out by a Church-Kingdom theory, by no means agrees with his own presented idea of a Kingdom. In addition, a number of particulars that will be enumerated, as well as the general analogy of prediction on the subject, compels us to this location of "these kings." Tregelles (*On Dan.*, p. 19) justly says: "'These kings, cannot mean the four successional monarchies, because in that case the plural form could not be used, seeing that they do not *co-exist* as the holders of power," and therefore he refers the phrase to the divided form of the Roman Empire, when (as we shall show, Prop. 160) a number of kings exist contemporaneously, according with the fuller details of Rev. This is corroborated by the time of smiting. Hence Fausset (*Com. Dan. loci*) gives this note: "Rather 'in the days of these kings' answers to 'upon his feet' (v. 34) i.e. the ten toes (v. 42) or ten kings, the final state of the Roman Empire. For 'these kings' cannot mean the four successional monarchies, as they do not *co-exist* as the holders of power: if the fourth had been meant, the *singular* and not the *plural* would be used." Many other writers of ability take the same view, locating "these kings" in the future, because Gentile domination continues and the action of the Stone, as predicted, has not been witnessed. They are made to relate (as Dan. 7, Rev. 13 and 17, etc.) to the divided form of the Fourth Empire.

[3] Arguments might be derived from the admissions of our opponents, who, when commenting on the ten horns, Kingdom, etc., in Revelation, forgetting their own interpretations of Daniel as relating to the Church, make the divided form the period of smiting, etc. (Comp. e. g. Barnes *Dan. and Rev.*) The toes are by many supposed to designate exactly ten divisions or ten Kingdoms, and accordingly many Protestant and Roman Catholic writers have designated exactly ten Kingdoms, but they differ among themselves in producing the same Kingdoms. It seems more correct to suppose that the toes simply represent such divisions without being pressed to the exact number of ten. Division is intended, but whether the number is more or less than ten is of no material consequence. If it can be shown that such divisions took place, that is sufficient, otherwise, to be very exact, it must be shown (1) that one leg of the image is longer than the other, seeing that one portion of the Empire lasted longer than the other; and (2) that five divisions occurred in the eastern and five in the western portion, as five toes are on one foot, and five on the other; the legs, according to commentators, etc., represented the divided form of the Empire. This, like making a parable to have a definite meaning in the particulars required for filling up to complete the representation, would be pressing a symbol so closely as to endanger its unity. If it is, however, expressive of the ten horns of Dan. 7 (which may be the case), then we are not to seek for these divisions in the past, but in the future (comp. Prop. 160). In Dan. 2, a general chronological epitome of history is given without entering into details; in Dan. 7 more of the latter are given, and in view of the "little horn," the ten horns are specifically given as existing, but (just as in Revelation) existing previous to and at the Sec. Advent. But our line of argument does not require us to enter into particulars, or to discuss the divisions, the proof necessary for our purpose being independent of the same.

[4] This is so plain, and the chronological order of the prophecy so regular and consistent, that even Augustine, the great leader of the modern Church-Kingdom theory, *dare not* apply this Kingdom of Daniel to the Church, but to a period *after* the Second Advent. Thus (*City of God*, B. 20, c. 23) he locates this Kingdom *after* the still future Antichrist, *after* the Sec. Advent, and places it in the third heaven (comp. for reply to last, Prop. 103). But this reference to the third heaven is a palpable violation of the prophecy, which speaks of a Kingdom here on the earth, "*under the whole heaven*," where these previous Kingdoms existed. He enforces one feature thus: "He who reads this passage, *even half asleep*, cannot fail to see that the Kingdom of Antichrist shall fiercely, though for a short time, assail the Church before the last judgment of God shall introduce the eternal reign of the saints." He makes the number "ten" an indefinite number, and the times, three and a half years.

[5] This is even felt by the spiritualizing Jerome so forcibly that he, with Augustine, locates the fulfilment in the future. Thus (*On Daniel* 7) he remarks: "Therefore let us say what *all the ecclesiastical writers* have delivered, that at the end of the world, when the Kingdom of the Romans is to be destroyed, there will be ten kings, who will divide the Roman world among themselves, and an eleventh will arise, a little king, who will overcome three kings of the ten kings," etc. He makes Dan. 7 : 13 refer to the personal coming of Christ, and applies the whole, not to the present existing Church, but to the

future. The words "king" and "kingdom" he regards as convertible, as seen by comparing verse 17 with verse 23 in Dan. 7 (comp. Storrs's *Diss. on the Kingdom of Heaven*, who says: "The Hebrew term which commonly signifies king properly means kingdom," and refers to Dan. 8 : 21 and 7 : 17). The student will see at once that persons who lived before the division and breaking up of Roman unity could not possibly apply such prophecies—as now done—to an existing Church, because they were linked with events that had not transpired.

[6] Without indorsing the opinions or position of every writer, attention is directed to the following, who give much illustrative of our meaning: Auberlen's *Prophecies of Daniel and the Rev. of St. John*, Frere's *Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Esdras, and St. John*, Roos's *Exposition of Daniel, and Comparison of them with the Rev. of St. John*, Faber's *Diss. on the Prophecies* and *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, besides various works either on Daniel or on the Apocalypse which illustrate and enforce the one by reference to the other, such as Elliott's, Lord's, Schmucker's, Daubuz, Ebrard, Brightman, Bengel, and others.

[7] Writers who endeavor to soften the prophetic language and make it representative of moral and spiritual influences, still are forced to admit (as e.g. Barnes, *Com. loci*): "The language here would seem to imply some violent action, some positive crushing force, something like that which occurs in conquests when nations are subdued." Comp. the concessions of Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, pp. 449, 447, 465, etc., where he admits that the language embraces more than mere conversion, etc. Our position is corroborated (1) by the fact that the Primitive Church, instead of smiting, was so smitten that many churches were finally exterminated; (2) that the prophecy (Dan. 7 : 21) indicates the persecution of the saints; (3) that, as will be shown, at the Sec. Advent the powers arrayed against God's people will be terribly smitten, with which this prophecy accords.

[8] This indicates how erroneous is the view of Mede, Cotton Mather, and others, that Daniel describes a "twofold state of the Kingdom, viz.: a Kingdom of the Stone and a Kingdom of the Mountain—the Kingdom of the Stone from the resurrection of Jesus to His Sec. Advent, and the Kingdom of the Mountain from the revelation of Jesus when He comes to destroy His enemies. Dan. 2 and 7 describe the same order, and as Jesus referred the same to Himself at the Sec. Advent, as the action of the Stone is identical with what takes place at His Sec. Coming, and as the time of the display of the Stone's power, etc., is still in the future (cannot be attributed to the undivided form of the Roman Empire, etc.), it is impossible to receive the theory. To do so vitiates the regular order, and introduces an antagonism. The same is true of Lange's (and others) engrafting upon Matt. 26 : 64 a reference to the present as well as to future Advent. The express order enumerated of fulfilment forbids it, and it would not be attempted if there were no Church-Kingdom to be supported.

[9] Such considerations, besides those derived from the non-fulfilment of the covenant, largely influenced the early Church. In their oppressed, persecuted state under the Fourth Empire, it was simply impossible for believers to imagine themselves in that Kingdom of God which all the prophets predicted would afford an immediate and enduring release from Gentile domination and oppression. They never supposed themselves to be in a Kingdom which was to overcome those around, and then boasted as e.g. Romanists afterward. (Thus e.g. in the beginning of the twelfth century—Ranke's *His. of the Popes*, vol. 1, p. 22—the Provost Gerohus said: "It will at last come to this, that the golden image of the Empire shall be shaken to dust, every great monarchy shall be divided into tetrarchates, and then only will the Church stand free and untrammelled beneath the protection of her crowned high priest.") Their hope of the fulfilment of Daniel related to the future—to the personal Coming of the Messiah. They never could advocate (with their view of the overthrow of the Theocracy, the postponement of restoration to Sec. Advent, and the preparatory nature of the Church) the notions entertained e.g. by Jewel (*Apol. for Church of England*), or Hooker (*Eccl. Polity*) that a Theocracy was thus restored and must be exercised, or even by the Scottish Kirk Sessions (Buckle's *His. Civ.*, vol. 2, p. 271), or the Genevan Church Council (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*), enforcing government on the plea of a revived Theocratic order, giving the power into the hands of the saints. Ten thousand arrogant and unscriptural claims, offensively and one-sidely paraded by Buckle (*His. Civ.*), Lecky (*His. Morals*), and others, are set aside by retaining the simple, rational, logical interpretation of Daniel in reference to the Kingdom.

[10] Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho*) quotes Dan. 7, and refers its fulfilment to the future. In ch. 32 the Jew Trypho is represented as objecting to its applicability to Jesus Christ because His coming was in humiliation, and that He was crucified. If Daniel's prediction were to be confined to the First Advent and to the Church, *then* the exception

stated would be well taken, seeing that *nothing commensurate* with Daniel's prediction took place. Justin correctly meets the objection by showing that the prophecy will be fulfilled *at the Sec. Advent.* Now, this alone, aside from numerous other considerations, effectually disposes of Reuss's (*His. Chris. Theol.*, p. 349) theory, that "the fact of the veritable appearance of Christ implies the immediate setting up of His Kingdom," or Oosterzee's (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 528), that "the effect of His appearing plainly shows that He has in reality founded that Kingdom of God which was looked for by kings and prophets." We confess our utter inability, with the early Church, to see such a "reality" (comp. Props. 42–68), finding it opposed by covenant, prophecy, postponement, and history. So Ueberweg (*His. Philos.*, vol. 1, p. 266) wrongfully applies Dan. 7 : 13, 14, to the First Advent, and against the order of prediction and the plain facts of history, says that Jesus then "had the courage to found a Kingdom of God." Thompson (*Theol. of Christ*) quotes e.g. Dan. 7 : 27 as now fulfilled, because a believer with prayer becomes "a spiritual power," or "a co-worker with God in the realm of spiritual agencies," thus placing him among the "providential forces that rule the world." This only shows how hard pressed our opponents are to find a support for their theory.

[11] Several objects are evidently designed by the prophecies (1) to indicate the ambition of these four Kingdoms, to obtain, if possible, a universal lordship or dominion over the earth; (2) the fearful threatenings of God, given by Moses, etc., were to be realized under this Gentile domination; (3) the prosperous and triumphant career of these Kingdoms in contrast with the depressed condition of God's people; (4) the ample deliverance that would yet be brought through the Messiah after the predetermined course of these Kingdoms; (5) the full bestowal of the dominion that these sought but failed to realize but only in the covenanted line and manner; (6) and, hence, are designed to sustain the faith of believers under such trials, assuring them that such powers would come to a final end (comp. Prop. 164), and that God's promises would be verified. Lord (*Lit. and Theol. Journal*, 1860, p. 305) well suggests that in this Gentile ordering God allows an exemplification to take place, on a decisive scale, "of what fallen man is as a ruler of his fellow-men," as essential to show what is in man, what he will do when in power, and to demonstrate the necessity—in order to have a perfect government—of Christ's assuming the Theocratic rule.

[12] The sway of the Romish Church is no fulfilment of the prediction, lacking the extent, unity, continuance, etc., given by the prophecy. It is only a caricature of the promised Messianic Kingdom, a self-appropriation of the work of Jesus.

[13] The reader will observe that this vengeance is poured out upon these because (Dan. 7 : 9–11, Rev. 17 : 12–14, and 19 : 19, etc.) they are directly hostile to and make war against Christ. Prophecy corresponds as to the *time of* and *reason for* infliction. To see the difference between prophecy and some writers: Schlegel (*Phil. of His.*, Lect. 10) makes the Jewish Covenant and the old Revelation of the Hebrews the first corner stone, the Greek language the second foundation stone, and the Roman Empire the third foundation stone of the Christian religion or Church. The Church is not founded on that that perishes.

[14] Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 297, see preceding § 7, note 1), although admitting that such monarchies are "doomed to perpetual destruction," strives hard to make this smiting and destroying the work of the Church, as now existing, by means of moral and spiritual influences (so Barnes, Edwards, Brown, etc.). But where is the historical proof (aside from the tenor of the prophecy and the analogy of the Word), when all history asserts that the Church has been the best ally that earthly kingdoms have possessed in supporting their claims, pretensions, divine right of kings, etc. Take the Roman Kingdom, and is it not abundantly confirmed that when divided and weakened, it was upheld by the Church through its nominal conversion and ecclesiastical connection with the same? Gibbon and others plainly teach us how the Church, in many an emergency, supported and revived the sinking civil power. Even Grotius, with his singular view of the Fifth Kingdom, must acknowledge that the sublime sense is that Christ Himself, according to 1 Cor. 15 : 24, will put an end to all earthly empires. The question to be answered is, When? Tregelles (*On Dan.*, p. 20) properly discards, as untenable, the action of the Stone as representing the results of grace or the gospel, and indorses the view "that *destroying judgment* on Gentile power is here spoken of;" which power Jesus ascribes to himself personally, Matt. 21 : 42, 44. Fausset (*Com. Dan.* 2 : 4) says: "The falling of the Stone on the image must mean *destroying* judgment on the fourth Gentile power, not gradual evangelization of it by grace; and the destroying judgment cannot be dealt by Christians, for they are taught to submit to the powers that be, so that it must be dealt by Christ Himself at His coming again." The contrast

in the utter removal of these Kingdoms, and the substitution of this fifth dominion, fully sustains such a view. The fact that this Stone is not presented as a foundation stone (i.e. preservative), but as a judgment stone (i.e. destructive), confirms the same. So also the image is not presented as something transformed or changed by the action of the Stone, but a complete demolition of it is expressed. The regular succession of downfalls, and the Stone appearing (not when the Church was established and the Roman Empire was in its strength, but) when the image is completed (i.e. in the days of the feet) corroborates our position. And this is confirmed by the following: The "breaking to pieces" in Dan. 2 : 40 (comp. Dan. 7 : 7, 19, 23) is admitted by all to indicate violence, but *the same* phraseology is applied to the action of the Stone, and consistency demands a like interpretation. Therefore we need not be surprised at Fairbairn's concessions (*On Proph.*, pp. 449, 447, 465, etc.) that the language denotes more than simple conversion.

[15] This was the uniform opinion of the ancients, and is remarkably exhibited in the delicacy of Josephus (i.e. not to offend the Roman power, as noticed by Bh. Newton, *On Proph.*, p. 195—taken from Bh. Chandler's *Defence*) in refusing to explain the Kingdom of the Stone (*Antiq.*, B. 10, ch. 10, s. 4), the apology of Jerome (as presented by Newton, p. 192), the dread expressed by Tertullian and others. Sulpicius Severus (*Sacred His.*, B. 2) gives the general view previously held (but in his day beginning to be questioned), when he makes the Fourth Kingdom the Roman, and insists upon Christ's coming to reduce the same and "establish another everlasting Kingdom." If the reader desires to know how generally this was entertained, he need only notice how the previously prevailing Millenarian views (comp. Props. 73–78) necessarily embraced it as a distinguishing feature. This old interpretation was not flattering to Roman power nor to Papal pretensions, and it was coldly treated, as evidenced e.g. by Calmet (see Newton *On Proph.*, p. 206).

[16] For decisive proof the reader is referred to Props. 123, 147, 175, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 171. While God's purpose in reference to the establishment of the Church is fully carried out (viz. : to gather out the elect), it is also true that down to the very Advent organizations hostile to the truth shall exist and yet fearfully oppress the Church. Instead of being absorbed, conciliated, they shall persecute the saints. The culminated Antichrist must yet arise in his dreaded career of supposed triumph over the Church. What Irenæus (B. 5, c. 25, 26), Cyril (*Hier. Cat.* 15, c. 6), even Jerome (*Hier. Com. loci*) and Augustine (*City of God*, B. 10, c. 23—see these and others given by Newton, in *Diss.* 13 and 14) said respecting the then future Antichrist and the oppression of the Church can still be repeated, for these predictions relating to the great final catastrophe are far, very far from being exhausted. In the nature of the case, then, it is misleading and dangerous to attach to the Church a work which she is utterly unable to perform, and which will only be done in her behalf when overwhelmed in the depths of an awful persecution. The delineation given of the future of the Church by Paul, John, and others is directly opposed to the prosperous and triumphant state of this Kingdom, when established by Jesus.

[17] Compare Luther's opinion (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, v. 2, p. 166, and Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, v. 2, p. 133, etc.) on the personal coming of "the Son of man," as well as that of many others given by Taylor (*Voice of the Church*), Brooks (*El. Proph. Interp.*), A Congregationalist (*Time of the End*), etc. D'Aubigne (vol. 4, p. 123) also says: "The Reformer, dreading lest the end of the world should arrive before he had translated all the Bible, published the prophecies of Daniel separately—"a work," said he, "for these latter times." "Historians relate," added he, "that Alexander the Great always placed Homer under his pillow: the prophet Daniel is worthy not only that kings and princes should wear him under their heads, but in their hearts; for he will teach them that the government of nations proceeds from the power of God," etc. This indicates Luther's esteem (and what a rebuke to modern neglect!) for Daniel.

[18] Take the territorial limits, and see the fearful inroads that Gentile domination has made upon the Church. Thus e.g. take a map of the Roman Empire as it existed for some time after the Church was established, and to-day we find immense portions of the territory *without* a Christian Church, and large portions of it, which once boasted of such a Church in a flourishing condition, have fallen back into a state of unbelief and degradation. The facts of history are thus antagonistic to the prophetic portraiture.

[19] Out of a multitude of testimony on this point, we select Dr. J. G. Schmucker's (*Exp. of Rev.*, notes on ch. 20 : 6): "We are assured by Daniel that *after* the four universal Empires, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman, which are there symbolized by the parts of a human image and by four beasts (ch. 2 and 7),

the God of heaven shall set up *a Kingdom*, the dominion whereof shall be given to the *Son of man*, and all people, nations, and languages shall serve and obey Him. Now, as the preceding *four* are temporal monarchies, *homogeneity* compels us to consider the *Fifth Empire one of the same nature*; or otherwise these prophecies would appear an impenetrable riddle, and the words without a certain signification, of no use to the Church." He therefore advocates the visibility of the Kingdom, in the establishment of "a Theocracy among His people," etc., calling it "such a government as the personal Kingdom of Christ" will introduce.

[20] Reference has been made (Obs. 2, 7, note) to this twofold theory. Fausset even (*Com. Dan.* 2), hampered by the Church-Kingdom theory, makes "a Stone-Kingdom" now existing in this dispensation as preliminary to "the Mountain-Kingdom;" the one he designates "the Kingdom of the cross," and the other "the Kingdom of glory." But this is *utterly opposed* to the prophetic time given in the prediction when the Stone enters upon its mission, as evidenced e.g. in the simple announcement: "*Thou sawest*" (i.e. as the context shows, until the complete formation of the image down to his feet) "*till that a Stone was cut out without hands.*" This locates the period of manifestation precisely with that of "the Son of man" in ch. 7, long after the Church has been established, as already shown. So Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 2, ch. 3) labors to make the Stone the Church developing itself ultimately into the mountain stage. (The proof derived from the mustard seed and leaven will be examined under Prop. 108.) Our reasoning fully meets his view. We only add: the action of the Stone, instead of indicating a feebleness in beginning, etc., presents us with the exact reverse, viz.: that of a mighty power, which successfully overthrows earthly Kingdoms, it being the exerted power of Him who is the head of this "mountain" ("mountain" symbolizing the Kingdom and the "stone" the destructive agency). The action of the Stone and the work of Jesus at His Sec. Coming *are identical*, as the prophets describe, and we cannot be mistaken in the application. It is absurd to assert in behalf of the Church-Kingdom theory (as Brown, p. 344), that "this heavenly Kingdom appears in the first instance, simply as 'the saints of the Most High,' worn out and given into the hands of the little horn of the fourth beast," etc., for this is to locate the Kingdom, against the prediction, *before* and not *after* the tribulation of the saints.

[21] Lord (*Lit. and Theol. Journal*, Jan., 1854, and Oct., 1860) makes the Stone the symbol of risen and glorified saints—the kings who reign in the Fifth Empire and extend it over the earth—who obtain the government of the world, etc. Now, while this would correspond with the promises (Prop. 154), while believers are designated "stones" (1 Pet. 2 : 5, Eph. 2 : 21, etc.), yet as this work is specifically applied *to Christ Himself* (the co-operation of the saints being implied or taught in other passages), and the singular is employed, expressive by way of pre-eminence of "the Stone," we vastly prefer the early Church interpretation, which is expressed by Severus (*Sac. His.*, B. 2, p. 67), "But in the Stone, cut out without hands, which broke in pieces the gold, the silver, the brass, the iron, and the clay, *we have a figure of Christ.* For He shall reduce this world, in which are the Kingdoms of the earth, to nothing, and shall establish another everlasting Kingdom." Thus many others, some referring to 1 Cor. 15 : 24, Ps. 2 : 12, Isa. 63 : 1-6, etc. The only objection of force made against this view is the following: that the change from a Stone to a Mountain is unsuitable to Christ. But there is a beautiful application in this very change to David's Son, as the Son of man. For when He comes, He comes, *according to covenant promise*, to claim His right and heirship to the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, which, when restored, is necessarily—as infidels have ridiculed it in contrast with these four Empires—a small Kingdom (and mark—in the prophecy, as king and Kingdom are convertible, the figure of the Stone is dropped, v. 44, and that of a Kingdom substituted, as Christ is the Head, which performs this work and extends and perpetuates itself), but which under His auspices immediately advances to a world-wide dominion, overcoming all opposition. There is propriety in directing attention to the central figure, the great Agent and King, who, from His covenanted position on the weak (compared with earthly powers) Davidic throne, waxes great and mighty over all the earth. The work that He accomplishes requires time, and prophecy indicates this feature. The figure of the Stone (and not of another metal) may have reference to the weighing (judgment) of nations in God's scale of justice, a Stone being used as the medium (as e.g. Deut. 25 : 13 marg., Prov. 16 : 11 marg.). Gill (*Com. loci*) mentions Rab. Simeon Ben Jochai, Saadiah Gaon, Rab. Abraham Seba, and one of the ancient Midrashes or Expositions, as applying this Stone to the Messiah. This was a Jewish opinion, so that our opponent, Dr. Brown (*Ch. Sec. Com.*, p. 352), remarks: "Prebendary Lowth says, 'The Jews agree that by this Stone is here (Dan. 2) meant the Messiah.'" And (p. 352) he adds, to show how it was per-

petuated: "The fathers were fond of illustrating the miraculous generation of Christ by the Stone's being 'cut out of the mountain without hands,' and thus the application of the word to Christ seemed to have gained a footing." The early Church view is well illustrated by a brief sentence from Hippolytus (*Treat. on Christ and Antichrist*): "After a little space, the Stone will come from heaven, which smites the image," etc. While able to incorporate much that Wilson (*Proph. Times*, N. S., 1876, p. 166) says in relation to the Kingdom (it being inseparably associated with the Stone, which is its Head), yet we cannot make the Stone itself to be "the Kingdom of God," because of its being expressly appropriated, pre-eminently, to the Christ personally. It is true, however, that the Kingdom cannot be dissociated from Him, for the one embraces the other; still in the prediction special attention is directed to the Head as the powerful source of these judgments. Hence some, as Fausset (*Dan. loci*), unite the two together. Berg's theory (*The Stone and the Image*) that the Stone is the American Republic, destined to overthrow despotism, or that of some Spiritualists, of its being spiritualism extending itself, may be dismissed without comment. So also Wild's notion of England and America's supremacy. The *Luth. Obs.*, Oct. 26th, 1877, reports that a missionary of the American Sunday-School Union states that a zealous sectarian preacher "asserted his belief that David's Stone cut out of the mountain is the Methodist Episcopal Church." Indeed, those who hold that this Kingdom is the Church, and who are at the same time exclusive, may in their self-complacency think that their own exclusive Church is thus favored. But sober-minded men of all churches despise such a sectarian exclusive appropriation.

[2] The idea of forming a Fifth universal Empire, to be nominally Christian, was a favorite idea of Constantine, Charlemagne, Charles V., Napoleon I., and others, but according to Scripture it can never be realized under human auspices. It will only be fulfilled under the supernatural agency of "the Christ" at His Sec. Advent. This same dream of conquest and a universal Kingdom excited the imagination and fired the ambition of various Popes. It also is a favorite with a class of Protestants, as e.g. *The Sermonizer* (vol. 1, No. 2, p. 22) on "The Messiah's Kingdom," says, "This will only be brought about by human co-operation"—thus entirely overlooking the predicted condition of the Church, under Gentile domination, at the Sec. Advent.

Obs. 3. If we turn to Isa. 25 : 6–10, the reasons are convincing why this noble prophecy should *not* be applied to the church *in this* dispensation. (1) If we take the prediction to describe *one period* of time here on earth; if we are not at liberty *to separate* the prophecy, and apply part of a sentence to the church here and another to the church in heaven, part of it to the church now and part of it to the church in the distant future, etc., *then* the condition of the church has *never* been that described by the prophet; for instead of the grand deliverance and glorious blessings promised, the church's condition has been the reverse, and shall continue thus down to the Sec. Advent. (2) The church, v. 9, is represented as *waiting for* this period. (3) The context shows that this "mountain" or Kingdom is preceded by terrible judgments upon the nations of the earth, *corresponding* with the concluding portions of the Apoc. and the portrayals of the Sec. Advent. (4) The context shows that it is connected with *the deliverance* of the Jewish nation and with "the land of Judah." (5) The time *agrees* with the gathering of the nations (ch. 24 : 22; ch. 25 : 10–12; ch. 26 : 5–8 and 20, 21), and vengeance inflicted, Rev. 19, 15, and 11, etc. (6) The figurative language of context (Rev. and Matt. 24, comp. e.g. with verse 23, ch. 24); the reigning after the judgments in Jerusalem according to covenant promise; the destruction of a city (chs. 25 and 26), corresponding with that of Babylon in the Apoc.; the sparing of some people, after these judgments, who shall glorify God; the appearance of God in a critical, distressful period of time; the triumphant song sung at that day "in the land of Judah;" the obtaining at that time of a strong city; the removal of the wicked; the non-resurrection of the wicked dead

(ch. 26 : 14, comp. with Rev. 20 : 5)—these things *so accurately correspond* with what is to occur, still in the future at the Sec. Advent, that we *cannot* appropriate these to the church. (7) This Kingdom is established *on* the earth (not in heaven), and embraces *the removal* of the curse, of events that are *only linked* with the Sec. Coming. Thus the resurrection of the saints, which Paul in 1 Cor. 15 : 54 *expressly* quotes and applies to such a resurrection, and which must occur *before* the Kingdom comes, and the removal of tears, of rebuke, etc., which *exactly agrees* with what John and others apply to the future Kingdom. Indeed, if we leave the text and context speak, and be contrasted with the facts of history and with what is predicted in the future, it is *impossible* to find a fulfilment of them in the church or world. This feast undoubtedly corresponds with the predicted *future one* in the Apoc.

Obs. 4. The favorite prediction seems to be Isa. 2 : 1–5 and Micah 4 : 1, which, as all admit, describe the same Kingdom. But that these do not refer to the church as now constituted is *evident* from the context. The immediate connection, as in Micah, chs. 3 and 4 and in Isa. 2, demands a restoration of the *identical* Zion that was *ploughed*, the same Jerusalem that was made *heaps*, and the *same* mountain of the house that was *overthrown*. The downfall was *literally* accomplished, and the Prophet not only, without a change, necessarily advocates a complete and triumphant restoration (just as *the covenant* demands), but to avoid any mistake in the matter, *conjoins the one with the other*, specifies a supremacy (Mic. 2 : 8) to Jerusalem, and (11, 12, 13) points out the gathering of nations and their complete overthrow. Besides this, the blessings of this Kingdom, as in the cessation of war and the perfect safety of the citizen, has *never* been realized, and we are assured *will not* (for *express* passages teach war down to the Advent itself) *until* Christ comes again. The terrible overthrow of Isa. 2 : 10–22, etc. is in such agreement with the closing chapters of the Apocalypse, that we *must locate them both at the same period.*

So plain and decisive are these predictions that it is a matter of amazement that the Church has ever departed from the early Church belief, sustained as it is by the fair grammatical sense and analogy of the Word. Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho*), referring to Micah 4 : 1, etc., declares those as "*destitute of just reason* who did not understand that which *is clear* from all the Scriptures, that two comings of Christ are announced—one in which a suffering, inglorious, dishonored, and crucified Saviour is preached ; but another in which He shall come with glory from the heavens," etc. To show the contrast and evidence how the prophecies are appropriated in behalf of the Church, *without any regard* to their connection, etc., we quote from the father of the modern prevailing theory and mode of application. Origen (*Ag. Celsus*) thus interprets Isa. 2 : "Each one of us, then, is come 'in the last days' where one Jesus has invited us, to the 'visible mountain of the Lord,' the Word that is above every Word, and to the 'house of God,' which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth. And we notice how it is built upon 'the tops of the mountains' i.e. the predictions of all the prophets, which are its foundations. And this house is exalted above the hills, i.e. those individuals among men who make a profession of superior attainments in wisdom and truth," etc. Alas! that *such* a method of interpretation should *even yet* obscure most precious portions of Holy Writ! For some ruthlessly divide what God has joined together, applying part to the earth and part to heaven, part to the present and part to the future, etc.

Obs. 5. If we turn to Zech. 14, we have, as predicted in other places, the Jewish nation in a fearful position (not the one at the destruction of Jerusalem in the first century, but a still future one), by a gathering of

nations against it, a Divine interposition in its behalf, the Advent of Christ and of His saints, the triumph of the Jews, the Kingship of the Lord then over the earth manifested, the safety and peace of Jerusalem, the plague poured out on the enemies, the sparing of some people, the worship tendered to God, the service and holiness—*all these* things are *entirely consistent* with our argument concerning the Kingdom as covenanted and identified with the Jewish nation, as exhibiting a theocratic manifestation in the appointed manner hereafter, while they *cannot be applied* to the past history of the Jews or of the Church without *gross violation* of text. This chapter of Zech. gives such a remarkable order of the events, and insists so pointedly on the exaltation of the Jews, that our opponents find it *the most difficult* of all passages to spiritualize.

Obs. 6. In order to apply "the year of my redeemed" (the Jubilee), and the "salvation" (forgetting that Christ also comes the second time unto salvation) of Isa. 63 : 1–6 to the Church, the exact *reverse* of the prophecy is advocated. The coming of the King *in vengeance,* treading the people *in anger and fury,* is transposed into a gracious coming and converting power; and *the blood of the enemies* staining His raiment is changed into Christ's own blood on the cross! Surely when *such liberties* are required by a theory to preserve its consistency, is it not time to consider its validity?

It is a matter of surprise that so clear a thinker as Dr. Schaff (Lange's *Com. Matt.* p. 489) should apply this to the passion of Christ (comp. Props. 162 and 166). Numerous sermons by eminent men pervert this Scripture, and as Dr. Moore (Lange's *Com. Isa.*, p. 673, after such a given specimen) well says: "It is strange that an eminent modern preacher (Ziethe) should so misrepresent the teaching of this passage. If we wish to lead men to contemplate Christ as the Man of Sorrows, by whose blood we are redeemed, we should choose a passage of Scripture that exhibits Him in this character. But it is either culpable ignorance or something worse to affirm that the Scripture before us contains the lessons set forth in the above-mentioned heads of a sermon." This rebuke is merited by many who utterly pervert and misapply its meaning. Calvin justly calls this "a perversion of Scripture." No one, however, follows the extreme of Jerome, to make the bloodshed to be that of demons. Comp. the judicious remarks of Weber, quoted Lange's *Com. Isa.*, p. 673, who correctly locates its fulfilment to "the judgment that will befall the antichristian persecuting world in the last days."

Obs. 7. Thus we might present one prediction after the other, and in each case show, either by the context, text, or parallel passages, that the Kingdom described by them is still future. For, notwithstanding the assurances given and the eulogies passed on the Church, it is *a plain fact* that no such predictions, having a direct reference to the condition of this Kingdom, *have ever been realized* in the history of the Church. And if it were not for this Church-Kingdom theory, no one would make the attempt to wrest and pervert them in this direction. Take, e.g. Isa. 65 : 17–25 (comp. with v. 9), and the ablest of writers, as Pres. Edwards, Alexander, etc., apply this to the Church even to the extent that "the new heavens and new earth" have appeared (although some admit also that it has a future reference). But if we leave *inspired* men give *their testimony,* we find that the location of this "new heavens and new earth" is indeed still future, 2 Pet. 3 : 13; Rev. 21 : 1. Moreover, if we concede that they have been already created, then surely *the results* of such a new creation should be fully exhibited in the Church. Is it true, however, that the voice of weeping has ceased in her, that the longevity has been realized, that the

safety, peace, and happiness predicted has been attained? No! the sad experience of individual believers and of the Church *forbids* such an appropriation.

But many of our opponents (even Alexander, e.g. *Com. Isa.*, vol. 1, p. 226), as we shall show under Props. 148-151, make numerous concessions which are antagonistic to their own Church-Kingdom theory. Many predictions are appropriated by setting aside the grammatical connection, or by making that which might interfere with the Church theory emblematic and figurative. Thus, to illustrate: few commentators do justice to Acts 15 : 13-17. They have much to say about the call of the Gentiles enforced by the passage, but make the restoration of the fallen tabernacle "an emblem (so Barnes, etc.) of the favor of God," etc., violating the order laid down, and substituting a sense *not found* in the text. To understand the connection of James's reasoning, it is absolutely requisite to notice *the covenanted* aspect of this Davidic tabernacle (with which the apostles were familiar), the context and text of Amos, and the facts stated by Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, suggesting James's reference. If this is done, then we have: (1) the rejection and overthrow of the Davidic Kingdom; (2) the preservation of some of the nation (in order to make a future restoration possible); (3) a fearful slaughter of the Jews; (4) a call extended to and accepted by the Gentiles to become also God's people; (5) this work of grace, including Jews and Gentiles, then going on; (6) this to be followed by a rebuilding or restoration of the Kingdom, now fallen and in ruins; (7) the result following.

Obs. 8. Many of the predictions are so exalted in their nature, and promise such a continued and ever-abiding blessedness, that it is *absurd* to predicate them of the Church in this age. Besides this, the identical language, ideas, and blessings are incorporated by John with the crowning period of restitution here on earth, so that it is *a violation of all propriety* to extend them to any other time of manifestation. The reader will perceive this by comparing, e.g. Isa. 60, with Rev. 21 and 22. Again, a fair interpretation must, as the connection requires, always link such predictions with a future restoration of the elect nation in its favored Theocratic position under the sublime reign of the predicted David's Son. These *are inseparable*, as the covenant teaches, and these the Prophets *always unite*.

The student can readily see, by a reference e.g. to Art. "*Kingdom of God*," in M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*, how the Church is transmuted into a Kingdom. The process is plainly stated, as drawn from Knobel, "*On the Prophets.*" Thus, when the prophets describe a deliverance from "political calamities," we must attribute "a higher sense," viz.: deliverance from "error and sin;" when they describe a restored people, God again dwelling among them in a restored and perpetuated Theocracy, we must again apply this "higher sense," viz.: it means reconciliation to God, access to Him, union of His people in faith, etc.; when they portray special provision for temporal wants, the blessings of life, civil duties, health, offspring, harvests, etc., the "higher sense" is again applied, viz.: it denotes spiritual good, the graces of the spirit enjoyed, etc.; when they delineate God's people, "supremely blessed in the enjoyment of all earthly pleasures," this "higher sense" elevates the meaning into spiritual pleasures, "eternal life," etc.; when they predict "the re-establishment of their people into a mighty state, which should endure upon the earth in imperishable splendor as an outward community," then the "higher sense" duly applied makes this "a religious invisible community." The student will observe (1) the admissions made that the prophets really predict these things in the plain grammatical sense, but (2) that this must be changed by "a higher and spiritual sense." Alas! what absurdities are engrafted on God's Word by the *assumed* superior reason of man. According to this principle, the interpretation, the meaning of the Scriptures, is left at the mercy of this *assumed* "higher sense," which in one is this, and in another that, as fancy, or imagination, or alleged influence of the spirit, or some favorite opinion suggests. In the Art. "Baptists" (*Ency. Relig. Knowl.*), in the Introd., it is asserted that the visible organized Church is "the Kingdom of God foretold by the prophet Daniel, and announced by John the Baptist as at hand, Dan. 2 : 44, Matt. 3 : 2." (What a departure from John Bunyan's position.) Dr. Mason (*Essays on the Church*, No. 1) correctly defines the

Church, and then designates it the Kingdom of God, and for the support of such an affirmation quotes such passages as Isa. 66 : 12, Isa. 49 : 23, Isa. 6 : 3, 5, and especially "He that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles." Schmucker (*Evang. Luth. Cat.*, p. 66) gives, in order to transform the Church into a Kingdom, Acts 5 : 31. These and other writers do not consider that their representations are utterly opposed by the general analogy of Scripture, as shown ; by the epitomes of history, as given in Matt., chs. 24 and 25 (comp. Mark and Luke), and 2 Thess., ch. 2 ; by such statements as Matt. 9 : 15, Matt. 23 : 39, Luke 17 : 22, Luke 21 : 31, etc. ; by the numerous reasons logically united as already given. The disposition is general to take the whole matter *for granted*, and then to quote Scripture without the least regard to its connection or order of fulfilment. It is even a sad fact that Apologists (e.g. Row, "*Ch. Evidences*," *Bampton Lectures*, 1877, p. 211, etc.), taking for granted as a fact that the Church is the covenanted and predicted Kingdom, present it *as evidence* why the Scriptures should be received as a Divine Revelation, viz. : through the fulfilment of prophecy exhibited in a matter of fact. Alas ! the fact does not exist ; it is wholly imaginary, as the least comparison between covenant and the Church abundantly proves. Such statements are misleading and injurious to the truth. A strong and reliable argument can be built upon the existence and mission of the Church, without introducing material that weakens the whole structure. A simple statement of the design of the Church and this dispensation has far more weight with infidelity than all the high-flown and exaggerated eulogies so lavishly employed ; for the former is seen to be actually in progress and realized, while the latter exists only in the imagination of the eulogizers, being opposed both by Scriptures and history.

PROPOSITION 105. *The Lord's Prayer is indicative of the fact that the Church is not the covenanted Messianic Kingdom.*

Jesus, in teaching His disciples to pray for a future, coming Kingdom, undoubtedly taught them to pray for *the same* Kingdom covenanted, predicted, and which they preached. He certainly desired them to pray understandingly, and, therefore, the views entertained by them respecting the Kingdom remaining uncontradicted to the end (Acts 1 : 6), and which must have inspired the use of the petition, are certainly correct (comp. Props. 37–45, and 54–68).

We call the student's attention to the fact that we have already quoted numerous able opponents, who frankly admit that down at least to the ascension the disciples of Jesus fully entertained the idea of the Kingdom expressed by us. A multitude more might be thus quoted, as evidenced by their enforced and fatal concessions when commenting e.g. on Acts 1 : 6. We refer to this in order to say : Is it reasonable to suppose that Jesus would give His disciples a prayer in behalf of the Kingdom, knowing as He must what construction they would place upon it, unless, if mistaken in their apprehension of it, He would also enlighten them as to its meaning, so that they could offer it up intelligently and with a proper hope? The fact that we do know with what sentiments these preachers of the same Kingdom prayed this prayer—specially instructed, too, as we are told, in private—goes far to sustain our position. If candid, those who oppose us will find this prayer, as understood and used by the disciples, a blow to their excessive spiritualizing of the promises.

Obs. 1. The petition "Thy Kingdom come" (Matt 6 : 10, Luke 11 : 2) cannot appropriately be prayed by one who is already *in* the Kingdom, for the sentiment expressed looks to futurity. The disciples to whom it was given, and evidently used it, had no idea whatever of the modern notions engrafted on the prayer. They prayed it looking, as we have in detail proven (as many of our opponents frankly admit), for a Kingdom to come visibly in the future, and this Kingdom was the Theocratic-Davidic restored under the Messiah. We may well ask, How could the Divine Master give them a prayer with such a clause in, which, as all the facts show, they —if the modern view is correct—grossly misunderstood, without some explanation? Our line of argument conclusively proves that such an explanation was unnecessary (and hence was not given) because they had *the true idea* of the Kingdom, when they prayed for the Theocratic Kingdom to come. Jesus, knowing the view of the Kingdom held, by giving this petition in its present form, *indorses* the disciples' opinion as a correct one. The integrity of the Divine Teacher, and His express assurance that He gave them the mysteries of the Kingdom (Prop. 11), forbid any other position.

There is an exquisite delicacy (which man could not have conceived) in the prayer, "Thy (i.e. the Father's) Kingdom come." The delicacy and propriety arises from Christ's position in the performance of an allotted mission, and in thus avoiding the word "My"

(which, as He and the Father are one, He might truthfully have employed), and in expressing the Theocratic relationship that the Kingdom sustains to the Father, and implying that the Kingdom is given (Prop. 83) by the Father, because of the obedience of Jesus (Prop. 84). Again, foreknowing His ultimate rejection by the nation and the consequent postponement of the Kingdom, the petition is purposely couched in language indefinite as to the time when it should come. Again, the clause annexed to this petition, "Thy will be done on earth," etc., is indicative of *the result* of this Kingdom coming, as stated by the prophets. But we add: The simple fact is evident that God's will is not verified in the Church, as her checkered history attests, and so long as she remains in her mixed condition, cannot be. The "will" of God respecting the earth *is easily read* if we but direct the eye of faith either to the past or to the future, as given in the Word; in the past it is reflected before the fall, and in the future, it shines forth in the renewed earth. It is, therefore, readily perceived, and any view that fails to grasp these two marks of the "will" falls immeasurably below the reality. To make it manifested now is to cover it over with the weakness, frailties, passions, etc., of poor humanity, and is to ignore the plainest statements in the predictions (e.g. 2 Thess. 2) relating to the Church.

Obs. 2. The petition "*Thy Kingdom come,*" is a prayer that *one* distinctive Kingdom should come, not two or more; not that one should be within the other, not that one should be a prelude to the other. The disciples only recognized in the petition one Kingdom; the early Church adopted the same belief, and we see no reason for a change of faith, seeing that the covenanted and predicted Messianic Kingdom, as expressed in the plain grammatical sense, is the one evidently denoted.

It is a matter of surprise that able and eminent men pervert this prayer by making out a variety of Kingdoms prayed for, as e.g. one writer (Bernard) has three Kingdoms petitioned for, viz.: "The Kingdom of Providence, the Kingdom of Grace, the Kingdom of Glory." (Comp. Prop. 3, and observe that all the meanings there noticed are, more or less, incorporated with this prayer.) Others have a visible and an invisible, a present and a future Kingdom in it. Some make it "piety," or "religion," or "God's reign in the heart," or "the spread of Christianity," or "the victorious development of the Christian Church," or "grace," or "power," or "the gospel," etc. Even Pre-Millenarians, forgetful of the logical covenanted meaning that the phrase undoubtedly possesses, while carefully insisting that it necessarily includes the still future Kingdom here on earth after the Sec. Advent, tell us (as e.g. Alford) that it embraces "the fulness of the accomplishment of the Kingdom of God so often spoken of in prophetic Scriptures, and by implication all that process of events which lead to that accomplishment," and so another (Lange) says it means, "the Kingdom of heaven in its spiritual reality, including both time and eternity." Hampered by a Church-Kingdom theory, the interpretation and application must be such that the prayer includes a petition for the Church, bringing out a prayer for Lange's "threefold Kingdom of grace, of power, and of glory." The absurdity of many of these interpretations appears if we but substitute them in the petition for the word "Kingdom," especially when contemplating the disciples as uttering them with their Jewish views. Meyer (*Com. loci*) is logically and scripturally correct when he asserts that the "Kingdom" simply denotes "the Messianic Kingdom." Dr. Schaff (Lange's *Com. loci*, Amer. ed.) objects to Meyer's rejecting all ecclesiastical and spiritual meanings attached to the petition, saying that he "forgets that the one for which he contends exclusively, the Messianic Kingdom, does in fact include or imply them all." But this reply to Meyer is suggested by the idea that the Church in some way must be included or implied, which view was certainly not entertained by the disciples and the early Church. Meyer's position is the correct one, historically and scripturally, and this opinion is steadily gaining ground with students. Nast (*Com. loci*) says that the view that this Kingdom "is not to be applied to the Church of God before the second visible Coming of Christ," "is held by many Evangelical divines of Germany at the present time, and has gained of late also the assent of some of the most learned theologians of England and America." (He adds: "Yet the Pre-Mill. theory has not yet been fully met, and is certainly entitled to far more attention and examination than it generally receives.") Yet Dr. Schaff is correct in so far, that when we pray for the Kingdom to come, the petition includes the preparative work of the Church that it may be hastened, but this preparatory stage is *not* the Kingdom itself.

Obs. 3. Attention is directed to the fact that critics (like Lightfoot, Schoetgen, Gregory, etc.), indorsed by various commentators, assert that Jesus collected this prayer out of Jewish Eschatologies, and prove the assertion by giving every sentiment expressed in full as drawn from them. If this be allowed, and Jesus did this purposely, it is only another proof of the correctness of our interpretation and application, seeing that Jesus thus, in the highest possible manner, indorses the Jewish views (comp. Props. 40, 44, 47, 20, 21, etc.) of the Kingdom by taking *their own* expressions, and framing them into a petition to heaven. Every Jew who employed it would, of course, use it in the sense indicated, and it is a mere begging of the question to declare that Jesus placed one sense on it and the Jews quite another; for if this were true, which it is not, it would invalidate the integrity of the Teacher, making Him to conceal the truth and leave His hearers under a wrong impression and in error.

We refer, as illustrative of the Observation, to what Barnes, *Com. Matt.*, p. 83, footnote, says of the usage or language of the Jews, and which "were doubtless familiar in the time of Christ." Thus, he says, that the Rabbins declared, "That prayer in which there is no mention made of *the Kingdom of heaven* is *not* a prayer."

Obs. 4. The quite early Church entertained our view of this petition, as is apparent from the Eschatology affirmed by them, seeing that they looked for the speedy Advent, etc. The modern engrafted views were foreign to their simple faith. The extracts that we have already given from them, exhibiting their belief in the covenanted Kingdom, forbids any other view, and so imbedded was this in the Church that even Augustine (Cumming, *Lects. on Romanism*, p. 207) could not transmute this Kingdom into "the Kingdom of Grace" (as was done by Ambrose and others), but held that it meant "the Kingdom of glory."

Tertullian (*De Oratione*) makes this prayer to be one for the coming of the Kingdom at the Advent still future, and thus urges this petition to be used: "Wherefore, if the appearing of God's Kingdom belongs to the will of God and to our earnest expectation, how can some pray for a lengthening out of the age, when the Kingdom of God, for which we pray that it may come, tends to the consummation of the age? *We wish to reign earlier, and not to serve longer.* Even if it were not prescribed in the prayer, about praying for the coming of the Kingdom, we should, of our own accord, offer that petition, hastening to the fruition of our hope. . . . *Yes, Lord, let Thy Kingdom come with the utmost speed!* The wish of Christians, the confusion of the heathen, the joy of angels, for which we struggle; yea, more, for which we pray." Cyprian and others refer the petition to the Kingdom still future, Cyprian e.g. saying: "That we who first are His subjects in the world may hereafter reign with Christ, when He reigns." The early Church linking, as Paul does, "the appearing and Kingdom" together, virtually made this petition a prayer for the Sec. Advent of Jesus, and the petition of Rev. 22 : 20 one including the Kingdom. In unity with this early view of the petition the student will find many utterances since the Reformation, e.g. Luther's (Meurer's "Life of," p. 33), Bish. Latimer (*Investigator*, vol. 1, p. 170), Archb. Cranmer (Brooks's *Essays*, p. 12), Bish. Newton (*Diss. on Proph.*, p. 587), Baxter (*Works*, vol. 2, p. 555), Increase Mather (*Discourse on Faith*), Spaulding (*Lectures*, p. 123), and hundreds of others for every Pre-Millenarian writer strenously holds that, if it does embrace more in its meaning, its main, great reference is to this Kingdom on earth after the Sec. Advent."

Obs. 5. The petition "*Thy Kingdom come*" assumes, by its allusion to futurity, that the Kingdom did not then exist. This forms corroborative proof of the position taken by us in previous Propositions, over against the utterances that it was present when Christ gave the prayer.

We have already presented numerous testimonies respecting the assertion that the Kingdom was already actually in existence. Others, as illustrative, may be added. Prof. Lummis (*The Kingdom and the Church*) quotes Dr. Warren, Pres. of Boston University, as saying: "The Christian Church is the Kingdom of God on earth viewed in its objective or institutional form. God's Kingdom among men is as old as human history." Beecher (*Christian Union*, Dec. 29th, 1875) defines the Kingdom to be "a state of mind," or "a Kingdom of character, and not a Kingdom of place or of organization," or "the development of human nature into spiritual manhood," and being thus allied to piety or religious growth, it is something that has always existed. Hence, when we pray "Thy Kingdom come," we only pray for spiritual things, spiritual growth, etc. If Jesus really intended such a meaning to be foisted on the idea of the Kingdom, He certainly used the most extraordinary language by which to convey it, owing to the precise, definite meaning attributed to it by the Jews and disciples.

Obs. 6. The expression "*Thy Kingdom come*" expresses faith in the realization of the covenant, and the predictions based upon it. What Kingdom is the proper subject of prayer, if not *the Theocratic-Davidic*? Faith, in its usage, is manifested that God's oath to David will be respected, that it is His determinate purpose to have it restored, and that God will institute the means and arrangements for its recovery. The *Theocracy* is, as we have proven, God's own Kingdom; *He* being the Ruler in it, gives force to the "*Thy.*"

John Ruskin, in *The Lord's Prayer and The Church* (*Contemp. Review*, repub. in *The Library Mag.*, Jan., 1880), observes: "I believe very few, even of the most earnest, using that petition (viz.: Thy Kingdom come), realize that it is *the Father's—not the Son's*—Kingdom, that they pray may come, although the whole prayer is fundamental on that fact: 'For *Thine* is the Kingdom, the power, and the glory.' And I fancy that the mind of the most faithful Christians is quite led astray from its proper hope, by dwelling on the reign—or the Coming again—of Christ; which, indeed, they are to look for and watch for, *but not to pray for.* Their prayer is to be for the greater Kingdom to which He, risen and having all His enemies under His feet, is to surrender His, 'that God may be All in All.'" Here are quite a number of mistakes, resulting from a total misapprehension of the covenanted Kingdom. 1. The Divine Sovereignty is not the Kingdom, Props. 79 and 80. 2. The Kingdom is both the Father's and the Son's; being Theocratic, Jesus is the representative of God, e.g. Prop. 200. 3. Admitting the doxology (comp. Lange's *Com. loci*, New Version of New Test, Variorum of New. Test.), the "Thine" refers to this Kingdom being given to David's Son (Prop. 81), and that the fulness of the Godhead sustains it. 4. The oneness of the Father and Son cannot be thus ignored. 5. The perpetuity of Messiah's Kingdom is thus flatly denied (comp. Prop. 159). 6. The ignoring and denial of prayer for the coming and reign of Jesus, in the light, e.g. of Rev. 22 : 20, Tit. 2 : 13, 1 Pet. 4 : 7, etc., is surprising.

Obs. 7. "*Thy Kingdom come*" embraces the idea of a conspicuous, visible, external coming, so that every one would *be cognizant* of its coming. The adoption of the Jewish language itself, which *included* this, is evidence sufficient to inculcate it. But aside from the reasons already assigned, and others that will appear under appropriate headings, it amply subserves our present purpose to say, that the Jewish view (which is eminently Scriptural), that an extraordinary exhibition of the Supernatural would be manifested (as e.g. in the resurrection of the righteous) with the re-establishment of the Kingdom, alone enforces this idea.

The establishment of the Church did not introduce the supernatural results confidently anticipated in the resurrection of the saints, the removal of evil, etc., but, while preparatory in its nature and imparting inestimable blessings, it left the righteous *still under the curse*, oppressed, burdened, chastened, etc. The visible consequences, as delineated by the prophets to be *the immediate issue* of the restored Theocracy, were all lacking. Hence no coming of a Kingdom was witnessed as covenanted and predicted,

for instead of a visible organized Theocracy, uniting Church and state, all-powerful and all-conquering, the Church exhibited an organization persecuted by the state, sustained by the blood of martyrdom, struggling and fighting to maintain an existence against encroachments from within and without. If we are to follow the teaching of the Word, we must conclude that the Jewish view, held by the disciples, is the correct one, viz.: that *so marked* are the distinguishing characteristics of the reintroduction of this coming Kingdom under the Messiah that no one can possibly mistake its time of commencement. Now, over against this, observe, as we have largely quoted, the conflicting views of our opponents, who select various beginnings, several of them united, etc. We give another illustration: "An Inquirer," in *the Ch. Union*, Jan. 16th, 1878, makes the Christian Church to be organized at the time of the Translation. The Editor (evidently recalling how eminent men fixed the same at the birth of Jesus, His baptism, the confession of Peter, His public entry, His death, His resurrection, His ascension, the day of Pentecost, and the destruction of Jerusalem), in reply, says: "It seems to us to be impossible to fix the date of its beginning as it is to fix the hour when the oak tree first begins."

Obs. 8. Prophecy, if the Church is the Kingdom prayed for, should, by way of encouragement, and in answer to faith, show that the prayer is realized in its delineation of events. But the reverse of this is true, as e.g. seen in Dan. 2 and 7. Auberlen (*The Proph. Daniel*) remarked the absence of any portraiture of the Church (and its sham imitation of a Theocracy when Church and State were united under Constantine) when God unfolds the history of the Fourth Monarchy, the Roman world-power excepting only as it suffers under the persecution of earthly Kingdoms. (The same absence is noticeable in the epitomes of Matt. 24, Mark 13, Luke 21, 2 Thess. 2.) Now if our opponents are correct with their theory, it seems reasonable that when an Empire is leavened and transformed into a nominal Christian power by the Church, such a change ought to be recognized, if it is a legitimate answer to such a petition. On the contrary, down to the end "the beast" remains "*a beast.*"

* Auberlen, thoroughly Chiliastic as he is, and able in his prophetical studies, embarrassed by an existing, invisible Church-Kingdom, explains the omission by saying, that as the prophet only describes "the course of the *world*-powers, hence the Kingdom of God enters the horizon at that point where *it begins* to be a real and external power of the world—that is, at the Second Advent of Christ." This explanation, while unsatisfactory to those who hold the visible Church to be a Kingdom, is equally so on any hypothesis that it is a Kingdom, seeing that the distinctive characteristics belonging to a Kingdom are only manifested at the coming of the Son of man, when the fourth beast and his brood are to be destroyed. The existence of such a Kingdom must first be proven, before its omission is thus accounted for in a prophecy. The omission itself, as conceded, decidedly favors our view. We insist that (as Prop. 35) the prophets and covenants describe only *one* Kingdom; they know absolutely nothing of those additional assigned by human reason, prejudice, and ambition.

Obs. 9. This petition must be, if Scripture is to give in its whole testimony, viewed in the light of the postponement of the Kingdom (comp. Props. 58, 66, 67, etc.). The simple fact that the Kingdom believed in by the disciples, and for which they prayed when using this phrase (and for which Jesus gave it to them), was postponed to the Second Advent, forbids our incorporating with or substituting for it any other Kingdom, alleged to be visible or invisible. If we do this, we take an unwarranted liberty with the same.

In addition to our reasons previously assigned in detail for the postponement of the Kingdom, the attention of the advanced student is directed to an exceedingly interesting Scripture, which, if we are to take the general analogy, teaches the postponement, and shows us how to understand this petition. We refer to Dan. 9 : 26, to the clause "shall

Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself." It is admitted by able commentators that the rendering "but not for Himself" was adopted (so Barnes, etc.) "from the common view of the atonement—that the Messiah did not die for Himself, but that His life was given as a ransom for others." Barnes, however, asserts that the marginal reading is the correct rendering: "And shall have nothing." So Hengstenberg insists upon translating, "and is not to him," i.e. "there was nothing to him," that is, the authority, dominion over the covenanted people would cease. Tregelles' rendering is, "and there shall be nothing to Him," i.e. no Kingdom. He says (*On Dan.*, p. 102) that the common application to Christ's sacrifice must be rejected as "placing a most true and important doctrine upon an insufficient basis," and adds: "I believe that the words simply imply 'and there shall be nothing for Him;' He will be rejected, and His earthly Kingdom will be a thing on which He will not enter." Now this position is amply sustained by the facts in the history and the declarations of Jesus, viz.: that when thus cut off, rejected and crucified, He did not establish a Kingdom, but it was postponed to the Second Advent, when, according to promise, He will come again and erect it. This reference to not having, *as Messiah*, a Kingdom by the expressive "nothing" (comp. Barnes, Lange, etc.), should certainly prevent us from attributing to Him, in this direction, something of a Messianic Kingdom. The *unity* of the Word forbids it, for as e.g. in the parable of the nobleman, the Kingdom is distant and the position of the servants in this dispensation is assigned. Even the admissions of our opponents strengthen our position, as e.g. Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, ch. 3), quoting Dr. Urwick, and conceding that Luke 19 : 11-27, Matt. 25 : 19, shows that the Kingdom to be set up was to be long delayed.

Obs. 10. Eminent divines take this petition, and in dedication and missionary sermons, employ it to denote the present existing Church, and vigorously and eloquently exhort their hearers or readers to help, by special labor and efforts, to make the Kingdom come. That which is *the special* work of the Lord Jesus (Prop. 129, etc.), under the Divine bestowment of the Father (Prop. 83), men, by a perversion and misapprehension, undertake to perform themselves (Prop. 175).

This widespread notion is found in thousands of published works and appeals. Simply to illustrate: The official oath required of ministers in Prussia, established in 1815 and renewed in 1835, was one in which they swear that they will "extend in my congregation the Kingdom of God and of my Lord and Master Jesus Christ." They may have succeeded, by God's grace, in urging piety, spiritual growth, etc., upon some, but as to a Kingdom, judging from the history of the Church in Prussia and the bitter struggles since then, no trace of one can be found. Waldegrave (*New Test. Millenarianism*, Sec. 2) assumes the Church to be the veritable Kingdom of Christ, and referring to the usual passages adduced in its behalf (which we shall notice), declares very emphatically, that, whatever this Kingdom is, our Lord taught that it was gradually and widely to extend its bounds by the preaching of the gospel (but fails to give *one passage* which asserts this idea, he transforming "the gospel of the Kingdom" into the Kingdom itself), and then triumphantly adds: "Is it possible that, after all, Christ did not intend His people to recognize in that Kingdom, when it should be set up, the very Kingdom of the Messiah? Is it possible that, after all, that Kingdom was not to come for eighteen centuries, at least?" The only reply that need now be given is this: Can Waldegrave point out the time *when* the Church first recognized herself to be the Messianic Kingdom? If so easily recognizable, why do he, and others who believe with him, make *so many different* Kingdoms, and *differ so materially* as to the beginnings? *Why* did the early Church employ this petition in the Lord's Prayer, without the least idea of the Messianic Kingdom having come, and *why* do they locate it at the Sec. Coming of Jesus? What are we to do with the Scriptures that *expressly* teach a postponement? Such questions can be multiplied, all of which he, however, completely ignores, complacently satisfied with *the merest inferences* drawn from Christ's present exaltation, the Divine Sovereignty, etc. Such affirmations like these are abundantly supported by assertions, but *direct* Scriptural proof is lacking in every one of them.

Obs. 11. "Thy Kingdom come" is the prayer of those who are "*heirs*," for they have *an interest* in it. It is the prayer of those who are

called," and the usage of this petition indicates an appreciation of their "high calling." It is a prayer designed to stimulate faith and hope, to wean from the world, to qualify us for a future "abundant entrance." It is a prayer which honors the Father who bestows it, honors the Christ who receives its glory, and honors the Holy Spirit, whose wonder-working power will be exerted in its behalf. It is a prayer that fell from the lips and heart of David's Son, expressive of His own desire, and it has encouraged, consoled, and strengthened the hearts and lives of multitudes of believers. To appreciate it properly, we must study its distinctive meaning, denoting as it does a well-defined ("Thy") Kingdom, which the Father has promised most solemnly under oath, and which David's Son receives from the Ancient of Days at the allotted period—a Kingdom bringing completed Redemption and the most precious blessings.

We only add: The Kingdom that we pray for is not one that shall fall terribly oppressed under the Antichrist; it is not one whose members shed their blood in behalf of the truth, reaping the vengeance of earthly powers, but it is a Kingdom which the Word, truthful and consistent, always represents as exalting its rulers in honor and glory, and in extending peace and happiness to its subjects. To this divine portraiture we cling; for it we long and pray. In reference to the ardent praying and longing for this Kingdom, compare e.g. Olshausen, *Com. loci.*, Nast, *Com. loci.*, Alford, etc. Nast remarks: "According to Olshausen the one leading idea is the ardent longing after the Kingdom of God, which constitutes the burden of all the prayers of God's children." But, it may be added, we should pray intelligently as the disciples—to whom the prayer was given and who preached this Kingdom—prayed. Much prayer in this direction is confused, and mingled with human opinions. In sadness, too, we must say that multitudes, if they really apprehended that the coming of this Kingdom is inseparably linked with the Sec. Advent, and that to pray for the one is really to pray for the other, would feel no interest in the prayer—yea, would dread its use—although identified with "the blessed hope" and perfected redemption. So long as they can apply it to the Church, or to the third heaven, or to a very distant future, they can employ it, but to give it the ancient Chiliastic interpretation and application, although amply supported by the analogy of the Word, is beyond their personal desires, for the speedy coming of the Messiah, although it be "unto salvation," is unwelcome or visionary to them.

Obs. 12. Pre-Millenarians are a unit in the application of this petition to a future Messianic Kingdom *at the Sec. Advent.* Some, indeed, as we have pointed out, being under the influence, more or less, of the prevailing views respecting the Church-Kingdom theory, think that the Church is also embraced in the petition (which we deem illogical and inferential), but such an application is expressly affirmed to be secondary or a lower sense. And it must, moreover, be borne in mind that even then, not one of these contends that the Church is, in any sense, *the covenanted and predicted* Messianic Kingdom. They unite in regarding it as simply *preparatory* to the Kingdom of covenant and of Dan. 2, 7, etc., which is to be manifested at the Second Coming of Jesus. Therefore all Pre-Millenarians unite in regarding the petition as embracing that still future Kingdom.

We thus again call attention to this uniformity of belief, as some of our opponents have called it into question, as if we prayed, longed, and hoped for different Kingdoms at different times. Thus e.g. Dr. Brown (Christ's Sec. Coming, ch. 7) professes himself to have gotten "entangled and nearly despairing," at the variance and confusion of Pre-Millenarians respecting "the period and the nature" of Christ's Kingdom. This is hardly complimentary to himself, seeing that they are easily classified: (1) Those who make the Church simply preparatory, and have the Theocratic Kingdom restored at the Sec. Advent. (2) Those who make the Church an initiatory Kingdom, but locate the proper covenanted, outward Kingdom at the Sec. Advent. (3) Both of these locate the cove-

nanted and predicted Messianic Kingdom at the Sec. Coming of Jesus—some correctly extending it beyond the one thousand years, others limiting it to the Mill. period. (4) As to details, a diversity exists, as is natural on such a subject (mainly arising from interpreters being still influenced by some of Dr. Brown's principles), but the points of union are clear and distinctive : (*a*) the covenanted Kingdom is at the Sec. Advent ; (*b*) this Kingdom is Theocratic in its nature ; (*c*) this Kingdom is visibly under the rulership of Jesus and the saints (some making the visibility of the rulers constant, others occasional) ; (*d*) the Church is only provisional ; (*e*) this Kingdom introduces the promised blessings, restitution, etc. Dr. Brown increases the supposed diversity by quoting persons who are strictly Pre-Millenarian, agreeing with us only in a few points. Now one should suppose that Dr. Brown's side must have perfect unanimity, seeing that he employs *such* a course of reasoning against us, which, if it proves anything, only shows that men, on important subjects, make mistakes. Instead of going to the numerous meanings, beginnings, etc., given to the Kingdom by others of our opponents (with whom Dr. Brown agrees), we will but briefly refer to Dr. Brown's own statements respecting the Kingdom to exhibit *the wonderful unity* of doctrine that his system presents, and this is the more satisfactory since it comes from the alleged champion against us, and forms, from *his own* writings, a strong answer to his charge of variance and confusion. On p. 106 of "Christ's Sec. Coming" he quotes the commission (Matt. 28 : 18-20) which is designed "to establish His (Christ's) Kingdom upon earth ;" on p. 130 he maintains that Christ's Kingdom was "in being before His ascension," but, on p. 136, was "formally recognized" and newly commenced at His ascension (for p. 138, etc., he asserts that Jesus is on David's throne in the third heaven, and p. 136, this is "a Kingdom of salvation or grace," preached by the apostles, and denoted by "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand"). In his Com. on Matt. 4 : 17, he informs us, "Our Lord sometimes speaks of the new Kingdom as already come—in His person and ministry ; but the economy of it was only 'at hand,' until the blood of the cross was shed and the spirit on the day of Pentecost opened the fountain for sin and for uncleanness to the world at large." Com. Matt. on the petition, "Thy Kingdom come," he remarks, that this Kingdom is "a moral and spiritual Kingdom, which the God of grace is setting up in this fallen world, whose subjects consist of as many as have been brought into hearty subjection to His gracious sceptre, and of which His Son Jesus is the glorious Head. In its inward reality of it, this Kingdom has existed ever since there were men who 'walked with God,'" etc. "When Messiah Himself appeared, it was, as a visible Kingdom, 'at hand.'" "On the day of Pentecost was a 'glorious coming' of this Kingdom," i.e. of this visible. Com. Matt. 21 : 43, "the Kingdom of God—God's visible Kingdom, or Church upon earth." Com. Rom. 14 : 17, the Kingdom of God is "Religion." This is a fair specimen of that system which he adopts as so clear and self-evident, built, as the student can see, upon a total perversion of covenant language and prediction. While guarding himself from many of the absurd meanings engrafted by Barnes and others, on the Kingdom, a sufficiency remains to show that the plain grammatical sense of covenant and prophecy must be completely set aside before such a belief can be entertained. Alas ! how such men of ability lead the Church into blindness and unbelief.

We turn from such an interpretation of the Lord's Prayer to those given by Pre-Millenarians with thankfulness, as evidence that the early faith is expressed in hope. Bh. Newton (*Diss. on Proph.*, p. 587) observes : "In the general, that there shall be such a happy period as the Millennium ; that 'the Kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High' (Dan. 7 : 27); that Christ shall have 'the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession (Ps. 2 : 8) ; that 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea' (Isa. 11 : 9) ; 'that the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, and all Israel shall be saved' (Rom. 11 : 25 26) ; in a word, that the Kingdom of heaven shall be established upon earth, is the plain and express doctrine of Daniel and all the prophets, as well as of St. John ; *and we daily pray for the accomplishment of it, in praying 'Thy Kingdom Come.'*" Hon. Gerard T. Noel (*Prospects of the Church of Christ*, p. 10) says : "It may confirm the view here given of the future (Pre-Millennial), to inquire into *the nature of that felicity* which our Lord Himself has *taught us in our prayers to expect*. It would be natural to suppose, that in *the selection of blessings* which He condescended to make *the subject of our prayers to God*, the *consummation of His own work of mercy* would find a marked place. The supposition is consistent with fact. He has concentrated a prayer for the completion of His own work, in the two remarkable expressions : '*Thy Kingdom come*,' 'thy will be done *on earth* as in heaven.' Can we refuse to admit that

our Lord here *bounds our view to this scene on earth?* In heaven, that is, in the other regions of the universe of God, His will is already done; but here we are surrounded with a scene of rebellion, anarchy, and sorrow. Does He then teach us to pray for a *translation from this unquiet land* to another and distant orb? He puts no such request within our lips; He directs us to pray for the establishment of His Kingdom, and this Kingdom appears to belong exclusively to this *material earth.* 'Thy will be done in earth, as in heaven.' Is not the inference twofold: first, that *the earth* is the theatre of *His Kingdom;* and secondly, that *conformity* to His will is the absolute *enjoyment of heaven?* and that no loftier supplication can be associated with our thoughts than that the hallowed sceptre should be *replaced* in human hands, even in the hands of the mighty Antitype, 'the second Adam, the Lord from heaven.'" Such testimonies could be reproduced from many able and eminent Chiliasts, and eloquently expressed (as e.g. by Bonar, Seiss, Bickersteth, Brooks, etc.). In addition to this, we might readily bring forth a mass of evidence to show that many writers of ability, cannot, and do not, limit this petition to the church as now constituted, but refer it to the future, after the Second Advent. Thus e.g. Baxter (*Saint's Everlasting Rest*, p. 438), in the peroration of his work, after expressing his most fervid desires for the speedy coming of Jesus and the resurrection of believers bursts forth: 'Return, O Lord, how long? O let *Thy Kingdom come.*' Thy desolate 'bride saith, Come!' for Thy Spirit within her saith, Come; and teacheth her thus to 'pray with groanings, which cannot be uttered; yea, 'the whole creation saith, Come, waiting to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.'" We conclude with the utterance of one of the Reformers. Archb. Cranmer wrote (so Burnet's *His.* vol. 3, B. 4), the Catechism drawn up by the English Prelates, and authorized by Edward VI. in 1553, and the following question and answer will be of interest, as indicative of the views then entertained. "Q. How is that petition, *Thy Kingdom come*, to be understood?"

"*Ans.* We ask that His Kingdom may come, for that as yet we see not all things subject to Christ: we see not yet how the Stone is cut out of the mountain without human help, which breaks into pieces and reduceth to nothing the image described by Daniel; or, how the only rock, which is Christ, doth possess and obtain the empire of the whole world given Him of the Father. As yet Antichrist is not slain; whence it is that we desire and pray that at length it may come to pass and be fulfilled; and that Christ alone may reign with His saints, according to the divine promises; and that He may live and have dominion in the world, according to the decrees of the holy Gospel, and not according to the traditions and laws of men, and the wills of the tyrants of the world."

PROPOSITION 106. *Our doctrine of the Kingdom sustained by the temptation of Christ.*

The Church-Kingdom view endeavors to sustain itself by referring to the temptation of Jesus, informing us that He was tempted by Satan "to adopt the worldly idea of Messiah's Kingdom," i.e. to receive just such a literal Kingdom as covenant and prophecy describe, but which we are to discard, as it is alleged Jesus did, as "sinful," and substitute a "spiritual Kingdom."

Obs. 1. This, however, is far from being sober, sound exegesis, being wrongfully inferred. The Kingdom offered to Jesus, as our opponents admit when they explain Rev. 11 : 15 or Dan. 7 : 14, 27, etc., is, taking *their own* explanations (as we have already seen), *the very Kingdom and world-dominion* tendered by Satan. And in this consists *the force* of the temptation : the first temptation is based on the actual existence of hunger and of real power lodged in the Christ ; the second on the protection promised to servants of God and God's ability to protect ; and so the third is also based on *facts*, viz. : the promised Kingship of the Messiah on David's throne and Kingdom, and the consequent attainment of Supreme Rulership over the world. Each temptation depends upon the *reality* of the thing proposed, and hence none of the things around which it entwines for support are to be removed, but only the manner of presentation and the design intended by the tempter are to be controverted. (For temptation, see Matt. 4 : 1–11 ; Luke 4 : 1–13 ; Mark 1 : 12, 13.)

Obs. 2. Hence, it is *inconsistent* to withdraw that from the temptation, which these same writers in their comments on Rev. 11 : 15 admit will ultimately be realized, viz. : "a real world-dominion." The far-fetched and one-sided comments of some who find in the third temptation "a negation of all the Chiliastic schemes of the synagogue" are refuted (1) by the third temptation, having no point or force if it had not, like the others, *been based on the promises of God* in that direction, and (2) by Jesus not denying that this honor would indeed be His, but, as in other cases, emphatically objecting *to the manner* in which it was to be obtained.

Uhlman (*The Sinlessness of Jesus*) has well observed that Jesus was tempted *both* as man and as the Messiah. Two of the temptations appeal to Jesus "if He be the Son of God," but one significantly omits this phrase, thus tacitly assuming *the covenanted* Messiahship to David's Son—"the Son of man." A friend, Rev. Rowe, suggests that as there is a declaration of "being forty days tempted of the devil," we may have, in the narrative, only the more salient or significant temptations selected and reproduced.

Obs. 3. So unguardedly do able men express themselves on this subject that we find Neander (*Life of Christ*, ch. 2 s. 27) declaring, "He regarded the establishment of a worldly Kingdom as inseparable from the

worship of the devil;" and argues from this that Christ's yielding to the establishment of such a Kingdom would have been "sinful." It is admitted that *the manner* suggested by the devil would have been sinful, and to this Christ *properly* objected, but Neander travels *beyond* the record and *confounds* things that are different when he asserts that the possession of "all the Kingdoms of this world" would have been in itself sinful. If this is necessarily sinful, *then* the promises which bespeak this very thing are sinful; *then* the Kingdom under the Theocracy uniting State and Church, *then* the literal language of the prophecies which describe it, *then* the visible outward world-dominion embracing in its rule all earthly Kingdoms, as Neander advocates in his *Ch. His.*, etc.—all these too *are sinful.* It is true, that under the Messiah's reign such earthly Kingdoms would undergo a change *to fit them* for that delightful union of Theocratic union of Church and State, but the very tender of the devil is such that nothing is reserved of them, but given for any purpose or transformation that might, suit the Saviour. Therefore we firmly and consistently abide by the record which teaches that Christ *rejected the worship of Satan by which* the tender was bound, and not that He refused because He would not have "a world-dominion" here on the earth. Besides this, as we have seen, Prop. 83–9, the Kingdom is given to the Son by the Father, and the acceptance of the offer of Satan would have been *a direct insult* to the Father.

Out of a multitude of assertions that Satan presented the Jewish and covenanted idea of the Messiahship, which tempted Jesus, and which He rejected owing to its "falseness and carnality," we give the following illustrations: Shenkel (Hurst's *Life and Lit.*, p. 122) says: "He was tempted to believe that the Messianic Kingdom was merely to take the prophecies of the Old Test. in *their literal* signification. The Jews were full of the Old Test. Messianic idea, and Christ was inwardly tempted to accord with it. His whole triumph over these inward stirrings was His great preparatory work for the accomplishment of His design." Alas! what a Saviour this presents! Woolsey (*The Relig. of the Present and of the Future*, p. 35, remarks of the temptation: "It was an endeavor to divert Jesus *from the aim* of setting up a spiritual Kingdom, and to induce Him to establish *such an one* as His countrymen were wishing for and expecting." (Why, then, e.g. leave the preachers of the Kingdom—if thus spiritual—*in ignorance* down to His ascension, Acts 1 : 6?) Woolsey (p. 29, etc.) correctly lays stress on the point that the temptation was specially intended "for Jesus in His official station as the Messiah," but he utterly misapprehends the meaning of Messiahship when he says that it was designed to test Him "whether He would remain true to *the spiritual idea* of the Messiah." The temptation is accounted for from Woolsey's standpoint, viz.: that the official title and office is wholly spiritual, a position *which cannot* be proven from covenant, prophecy, or promise. Much is written on this point irrelevant, imaginary, and derogatory of covenant and prophecy.

Obs. 4. The temptation would have failed in cogency and adherence, *if such power* had not, in some way, been the object or design of Christ's mission. It was derived from the covenant itself, and its allied predictions, and promises of supreme authority and acknowledged Rulership over the earth. It pertained *to the humanity of Christ*, and not merely to His divine nature: to the former was the rulership covenanted, the former was tempted and tried, and the former came forth out of the temptation pure and sinless, just such a King as the predicted Theocratic Kingdom restored needs in order to secure the solidity, stability, etc. connected with it. Even such writers as the author of *Ecce Homo*, who endeavor to make the temptation of Jesus a mental operation, still insist that the Saviour must have had in view the Messianic predictions which represented the Messiah enthroned in Jerusalem on

David's throne, swaying the world in triumph and glory. If the foundation of the temptation be sought in the promises of the Word of God, *then* we find it firmly laid. Satan *did not mistake* in the Messiah's power of making bread, of His being under the special providence of the Almighty, and thus he made *no blunder* concerning the authority to be vested in Him. Satan's mistake was in not fully apprehending that this Kingdom, owing to the unrepentant state of Jews and for gracious purposes of mercy, was *to be postponed* for a definite period, and that when the time arrived it was to be given to David's Son by God Himself, and *could not*, in the nature of the case, be obtained by an act of worship to himself. The temptation does *not vitiate* the power of creating, the Divine oversight and protection of God, and the final subjection of "all the Kingdoms of the world" to Christ.

As this temptation is *unjustly* urged against us, men forgetting that Jesus, while rejecting *the manner* of Satan's proposals, did *not deny* either the miraculous power, the tender of Divine protection, or the ultimate world-dominion belonging to Himself—it may be well to add a few words. Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, s. 130) remarks: "The three forms of his temptation were governed by one design—to induce Him to adopt the carnal Messianic expectations of the Jews; these converted the Kingdom of God into a Kingdom of the world." Neander (*Life of Christ*, ch. 1, s. 45), on the third temptation, says: "We consider it as involving the two following points, which must be taken together, viz.: (1) the establishment of Messiah's dominion as an outward Kingdom, with worldly splendors; and (2) the worship of Satan in connection with it, which, though not fully expressed, is implied in the act which he demands, and which Christ treats as equivalent to worshipping him." Such interpretations abound, all admitting that a visible Kingdom with the Messiah as King was embraced in it, but all, with few exceptions, declare that the temptation was based on a mistaken notion. They—overlooking their own concessions of a future visible Kingdom—gravely tell us that the Jews were mistaken in their interpretation of the covenant and prophets, and that Satan also likewise misapprehended the Scriptures, for no such outward Kingdom was designed for the Messiah. But this is a wrong inference, founded on the supposition that Satan proposed something which could not be realized, and which did not appertain to the Messiah. In the first temptation Jesus does *not deny* that He is hungry and able to make bread; in the second, He does *not deny* that He is the Son of God, and under special protection; and in the third, He does *not deny* the Kingdom or dominion which is to be given to Him, but only rejects *the mode* by which it is to be obtained. As observed, if such a Kingdom is not covenanted, predicted, and intended, the temptation would not have any force. Therefore, it is *mere assumption* to say, that the temptation is intended to teach that the Kingdom of Christ would not be visibly established here on the earth, and that the invisible Church is to be substituted for such a Kingdom. The exact reverse is the truth. Satan's temptation embraced a condition that was derogatory to God's honor; it embraced a right in bestowal which only belongs to God; and it overlooked the time and manner when the predicted Theocracy should be restored.

Obs. 5. In this connection, the conjecture of *Ecce Homo* is very derogatory to the character of Jesus. The supposition that Christ was tempted to employ force in the establishment of the Kingdom, and that this is the key to the whole matter, is *utterly unfounded*, and, notwithstanding the faint praise and professed laudation of Christ, stabs vitally. Is it true that the Messiah was so influenced by the prophecies that *He was Himself tempted* to grasp the Kingdom by violence, but milder thoughts prevailed; what, then, becomes of the character attributed to Him, and which He justly claimed? The theory is *unworthy* of Christ, and borders on the blasphemous; it destroys the clear conception of His mission and removes His oneness with the Father. The theory is broached under the idea that, mistaken in one Kingdom, an outward dominion, as the prophets predict, *another*, inner and spiritual, *is substituted*. Proposition after Proposition,

in reference to preaching, covenant, postponement of Kingdom, etc., refutes such a notion so unworthy of Jesus.

The conjectures, that it is mythical, added afterward to exalt the character of Jesus; that He was tempted perhaps by one of the Sanhedrim to entrap him; that it was merely suggested to Him, or a dream, are not worthy of a reply, because we see ample reason for this temptation as a test or trial of One who was to occupy the covenanted Davidic Sonship and the Second Adamic position. It vindicated *His complete fitness* for the Theocratic glory—being One who was *in perfect union* with the Father.

Obs. 6. The reality of the world's possession by Satan is claimed by him: "All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me: and to whomsoever I will, I give it" (Luke 4 : 6). This reality is abundantly sustained by the titles given to him, "the Prince of this world," "the god of this age." He endeavors to assume the lordship and dominion forfeited by Adam, and how he succeeds is vividly portrayed in the Apocalypse, etc., especially exhibited just before the open revelation of Jesus, in the person and confederation of the Antichrist. Therefore it is that Revelation represents Satan as bound, so that the Sovereignty of this world is securely in the hands of the once tempted Jesus.

Jesus, to whom "all power is given," now leaves Satan, "Prince of this world," but will, as promised, eventually "take to Himself His great power and reign." The reason for this delay is involved in the merciful provision made to gather out a people who, like the Master, shall be made perfect under temptation and trial. We refer to this under several Propositions.

Obs. 7. Ebrard on the temptation of Jesus (*Gospel His.*, p. 207) remarks: "But when Satan offers the whole world to Jesus, he reminds Him of the power which he exercises over this world of sinners. The promise which he makes, if He will but worship him, involves, therefore, the tacit threat, that he will let loose the whole terrible force of sin to resist His progress, if this *proskunesis* is refused. This threat on the one hand, and on the other the possibility of ruling over the whole of this glorious earth in carnal security and ease, were calculated to render the choice so difficult, that only one in whom the fulness of absolute holiness put forth fresh energy from moment to moment, could have been in a condition to resist the temptation." How soon, terribly, and extendedly the powers of sin were let loose, history, in the person of Jesus and the progress of the Church, painfully attests. But this threat, tacitly implied, culminates in *the final* great struggle, when all the forces of Satan are marshalled against Jesus and His army, to prevent Him, if possible, from securing this world-wide dominion (comp. Props. 161, 162, 163).

Krummacher, in a sermon (quoted by Nast, Com. Matt. 4 : 1-11), remarks that Satan "makes with his offer the covert insinuation that, by virtue of his dominion in heathendom, he has the power to turn the whole world against Jesus if He rejects the proposal." Many writers declare that this was a falsehood of Satan's—an assumption of power beyond his ability. Fully admitting and joyfully receiving the fact that Jesus eventually, because of His resistance of temptation and obedience, becomes the victor, yet Satan is truthful also in this claim of power as frequently partially manifested in the past, and ultimately completely exhibited in the culminated Antichrist with the kings of the earth and their armies, prostrating the Church in dire persecution, and arraying themselves against Jesus (comp. Props. enumerated, and likewise 164, 165, 115).

CATALOGUE OF

FUNK & WAGNALLS'

Publications.

Young's Analytical Bible Concordance.

On an entirely new plan. Containing every word in Alphabetical Order, arranged under its Hebrew or Greek original, with the Literal meaning of Each, and its Pronunciation. Exhibiting about 311,000 References, marking 30,000 various readings in the New Testament. With the latest information on Biblical Geography and Antiquities. Designed for the simplest reader of the English Bible. By ROBERT YOUNG, LL.D., author of "A New Literal Translation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures," etc., etc. *Fourth Revised, Authorised Edition.* Printed on heavy paper. One large volume, 4to, cloth $5.00; sheep $6.00; Fr. im. morocco, $7.00; half morocco, $9.00. full morocco, $12.00. Every copy of this, the authorized and correct, edition has on the title-page "Authorized Edition," and at the bottom of the page our imprint.

Analytical Bible Treasury.

Designed for the use of Teachers and Divinity Students. By ROBERT YOUNG, I.L.D., author of the Analytical Concordance, etc., 4to, cloth, $2.00. CONTENTS: (1) Analytical Survey of all the Books, (2) Of all the Facts, (3) Of all the Idioms of the Bible. (4) Bible Themes, Questions, Canonicity, Rationalism, etc. (5) A complete Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament. (9) Idiomatic use of the Hebrew and Greek Tenses. (7) A complete Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament.

Concordance to the Revised New Testament.

An Analytical Concordance to Eight Thousand Changes of the Revised New Testament. By ROBERT YOUNG, D.D., LL.D. author of Young's Concordance to the Bible, etc. 8vo, 25 pp., price 40 cents. 12mo, 72 pp., price, paper, 40 cents.

Apostolic Life.

Apostolic Life as revealed in the Acts of the Apostles, from the Ascension of Christ to the Withdrawal of Peter. By JOSEPH PARKER, D. D. Author of "Ecce Deus," "Inner Life of Christ," etc. 8vo, cloth. Price, $1.50.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post paid, on receipt of price.*

Biblical Lights and Side Lights; or,

Ten Thousand Biblical Illustrations, with Thirty Thousand Cross References, consisting of Facts, Incidents, and Remarkable Statements for the use of Public Speakers and Teachers; and also for those in every kind of Profession, who for illustrative purposes desire ready access to the numerous and interesting narratives contained in the Bible. By REV. CHARLES E. LITTLE. 8vo, cloth. Price, $4.00.

Biblical Notes and Queries.

A general medium of communication regarding Biblical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation, Ecclesiastical History, Antiquities, Biography and Theological Science, Reviews, etc. It answers thousands of questions constantly presented to the minds of clergymen and Sunday-school teachers. By ROBERT YOUNG, LL.D., author of the Analytical Concordance to the Bible. Royal 8vo, cloth, 400 pp. Price, $1.75.

Bible Work; or,

Bible Readers' Commentary on the New Testament. The text arranged in Sections; with Readings and Comments selected from the Choicest, most Illuminating and Helpful Thought of the Christian Centuries. In two volumes. Vol. I. The Fourfold Gospel. Vol. II. The Acts, Epistles and Revelation. With Maps, Illustrations and Diagrams. By J. GLENTWORTH BUTLER, D.D. Royal 8vo, cloth, 800 pp., per vol., $5.00; sheep, $6.00; half morocco, $7.50; full morocco, gilt, $10.00.

Blood of Jesus.

By Rev. WM. REID, M.A. With an Introduction by Rev. E. P. Hammond. Paper, 10 cents; cloth, 40 cents.

Burial of the Dead.

A Pastor's Complete Hand-Book for Funeral Services and for the Consolation and Comfort of the Afflicted. By Rev. GEORGE DUFFIELD, D.D., and Rev. SAMUEL W. DUFFIELD. Entirely practical, wholly unsectarian, and far in advance of all other Manuals of the kind. Cloth, 75 cents; limp leather, $1.00. Arranged, for ease of reference, in four parts: I. Scriptural Forms of Funeral Service. II. An exhaustive Biblical Study on the subject of Death. III. A short treatise on the Funeral itself, as it is found in the Bible. IV. Texts, Topics and Hints for Funeral Sermons and Addresses.

Christian Sociology

By J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., Professor in the Theological Department of Wittenberg College. A new book in a fresh field. Exceedingly suggestive and practical. 12mo, cloth, 382 pp., $1.00.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

Commentary on Exodus.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus, with a new translation by JAMES G. MURPHY, D.D. New Unabridged Edition, with Preface and Notes by John Hall, D.D. 2 vols., paper, 233 pp., $1.00; 1 vol., cloth, $1.50.

Commentary on Mark.

Studies in the Book of Mark, for Teachers, Pastors and Parents. By Rev. D. C. HUGHES. Critical, Exegetical, and Homiletical. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Commentary on Luke.

A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neufchatel. Translated from the Second French Edition. With Preface and Notes by John Hall, D.D. New Edition, printed on heavy paper. 2 vols., 8vo, 584 pp. paper, $2.00; 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

Commentary on Luke.

A Suggestive Commentary on Luke, with Critical and Homiletical Notes. By W. H. VAN LOREN, D.D. Edited by Prof. James Kernahan: London. 4 vols., 8vo, 1104 pp., paper $3.00; 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, $3.75.

Commentary on Acts.

A Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Acts of the Apostles. By HEINRICH A. W. MEYER, Th.D. With Preface, Index, and Supplementary Notes to the American Edition. By William Ormiston, D.D., LL.D. 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

An American Edition of Meyer's valuable, critical and exegetical commentaries by HEINRICH A. W. MEYER, with Preface, Notes and Introduction, by several eminent American scholars, will be issued during the year at the very low price of $3.00 per volume. Uniform with Meyer's Commentary on Acts.

Commentary on Romans. (Meyer's)

Edited by TIMOTHY DWIGHT, LL.D., of Yale. (*Ready.*)

Commentary on I. and II. Corinthians. (Meyer's)

Edited by TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D., New York. (*In Press.*)

Commentary on St. John. (Meyer's.)

Edited by Prof. A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., Rochester. (*In Press*).

Commentary on St. Matthew. (Meyer's.)

Edited by GEO. R. CROOKS, D.D., Drew Seminary. (*In Press.*)

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

Commentary on Mark and Luke. (Meyer's.)

Edited by M. B. RIDDLE, Rochester. (*In Press.*)

Commentary on Galatians, Ephesians and Philemon. (Meyer's.)

Edited by . (*In Press*).

Commentary on Romans.

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neuchatel. Translated from the French by Rev. A. Cusin, M.A., Edinburgh. The Translation Revised and Edited, with an Introduction and Appendix by TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D. 1 vol., 8vo, 544 pp., cloth, $3.00. Uniform with Meyer's Commentary on Acts.

Commentary on the Catholic Epistles.

Commentary on the Catholic Epistles. By JOHN T. DEMAREST, D.D. A thorough work. 8vo, 650 pp., $2.00.

Godet on John.

An entirely new American Edition, translated *de novo*, and edited by TIMOTHY DWIGHT, LL.D., will appear in a few weeks. Those who purchased Godet on Luke and Romans need no commendation on this work. 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

Companion to the Revised New Testament.

Explaining the reason for the changes made on the Authorized Version. By ALEX. ROBERTS, D.D., member of the English Revision Committee, with Supplement by a member of the American Committee. Also, a full Textual Index. *Authorized Edition.* 8vo, 117 pp., paper, 25 cents; 16mo, 213 pp., cloth, 75 cents.

Companion to the Revised New Testament.

Contributions to a New Revision; or, a Critical Companion to the New Testament. By ROBERT YOUNG, D.D., LL.D. 12mo, 392 pp., cloth, 75 cents.

***One-half of each page is left blank for notes. Prominent words in the text are numbered.

Compend of Baptism.

The cream of the literature on the Baptism Controversy. Its aim is, by brief but exhaustive exegesis, to elucidate and establish the fact clearly that affusion is at least as classical and scriptural a mode of Baptism as immersion, and that infants are entitled to it as their biblical right. By WILLIAM HAMILTON, D.D. 12mo, 390 pp., cloth, price, 75 cents.

Complete Preacher.

A Sermonic Magazine. Containing nearly one hundred sermons in full, by many of the greatest preachers in this and other countries in the various denominations. 3 vols., 8vo, cloth, each $1.50; the set, $4.00.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

Conversion of Children.

Can it be Effected? How Young? Will they Remain Steadfast? What Means to be Used? When to be Received and how Trained in the Church? By Rev. E. P. HAMMOND, the Children's Evangelist. Should be studied by all lovers and teachers of children. Paper, 30 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Early Days of Christianity.

By CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. This standard work needs no commendation. Printed from imported plates without abridgment. Paper and press-work excellent. Substantially bound in brown or green cloth. *Authorized Edition.* 8vo, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 40 cents.

From Gloom to Gladness.

Illustrations of Life from the Biography of Esther. By Rev. JOSEPH S. VAN DYKE. A companion book to "Through the Prison to the Throne." Rich in suggestive and practical thoughts. 16mo, 254 pp., cloth, $1.00.

Fulton's Replies.

Punishment of Sin Eternal. Three Sermons in reply to Beecher, Farrar, and Ingersoll. By JUSTIN D. FULTON, D.D. 8vo, paper, 10 cents.

Gilead: An Allegory.

Gilead; or, the Vision of All Souls' Hospital. An Allegory. By Rev. J. HYATT SMITH, Congressman from New York. *Revised Edition.* 12mo, cloth, 350 pp., $1.00.

Gospel of Mark.

From the Teacher's Edition of the Revised New Testament, with Harmony of the Gospels, List of Lessons, Maps, etc. Paper, 15 cents, cloth, 50 cents.

History of the Cross.

The Lamb in the Midst of the Throne; or, the History of the Cross. A theological work, treating the condition and tendencies of modern religious thought as related to the pulpit, and some of the grave questions of the day. The author has sought to bring out the universality of the relations of Christ's death as an expiation for sin, and as a moral reconciling force. The style is fresh and vigorous. By JAMES M. SHERWOOD, D.D., editor for many years of *The Presbyterian Review.* 8vo, 525 pp., cloth, $2.00.

History of English Bible Translation.

Revised and Brought down to the Present Time by THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D., Member of the Old Testament Revision Committee, and Translator for the American Bible Union Edition of the Scriptures. A Complete History of Bible Revision from the Wickliffe Bible to the Revised Version. 2 vols., paper, 8vo, 284 pp., 50 cents; 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

☞ *The above will be sent, post paid, on receipt of price.*

Holy Bible.

The "Perfect" Edition of the Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, together with Cruden's Concordance; the Psalms in Meter; A Comprehensive Bible Dictionary fully illustrated; a Pictorial History of each of the Books of the Bible; Biographical Sketches of the Translators and Reformers; the Lives and Martyrdom of the Holy Apostles and Evangelists; Egyptian, Jewish and Biblical Antiquities; Cities of the Bible, with descriptive Scenes and Events in Palestine; Biblical Scenery, Manners and Customs of the Ancients; Natural History, Religious Denominations, Science and Revelation; Temple of Solomon; History of Jewish Worship, etc., etc. Profusely illustrated, elegantly bound. Royal 4to, 1663 pp. *A*, American morocco, raised panel, gilt back, $9.00.; *B*, fine French morocco, antique panel, full gilt, $11.00; *C*, fine German morocco, massive panel, full gilt, $13.50; *D*, genuine turkey morocco, elegant panel, full gilt, $16.50.

Home Altar.

An Appeal in Behalf of Family Worship. With Prayers and Hymns for Family Use. By Rev. CHARLES F. DEEMS, LL.D., Pastor of the Church of the Strangers. *Third Edition.* 12mo, cloth, 281 pp., 75 cents.

Homiletics.

A Standard Work, invaluable to Clergymen. By JAMES M. HOPPIN, D.D., Professor in Yale College. *New Edition.* 8vo, 809 pp., cloth, price, $3.00.

Homiletic Encyclopedia.

A Homiletic Encyclopedia of Illustrations in Theology and Morals. Selected and arranged by Rev. R. A. BERTRAM. Royal 8vo, cloth, 892 pp., $2.50; sheep, $3.50; half morocco, $4.50.

Homiletic Monthly.

Devoted to Homiletics, Biblical Literature, Discussion of Living Issues, and Applied Christianity. I. K. FUNK, D.D., Editor. Subscription price, $2.50 per year; single numbers, 25 cents. Volumes III., IV., V., VI., each 8vo, cloth, 724 pp., $3.00.

The Homilist.

By DAVID THOMAS, D.D., author of "The Practical Philosopher," "The Philosophy of Happiness," etc., etc. Editor's Series. 12mo, cloth, 368 pp., tinted paper, $1.25.

How to Pay Church Debts

And How to Keep Churches out of Debt. By Rev. SYLVANUS STALL. 12mo, cloth, 280 pp., $1.50.

The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Inner Life of Christ.

These Sayings of Mine. Sermons on St. Matthew's Gospel, Chaps. I.–VII. By JOSEPH PARKER, D.D. With Introduction by Dr. Deems. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Servant of All. Sermons on St. Matthew's Gospel. Chaps. VIII–XV. By JOSEPH PARKER, D.D. A sequel to the above volume. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Things Concerning Himself. Sermons on St. Matthew's Gospel, Chaps. XVI–XVIII. A sequel to the above volumes. By JOSEPH PARKER, D.D. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Manual of Revivals.

Practical Hints and Suggestions from the Histories of Revivals, and Biographies of Revivalists, with Themes for the use of Pastors, before, during, and after special services, including the Texts, Subjects, and Outlines of the Sermons of many distinguished Evangelists. By G. W. HERVEY, A.M. 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Metropolitan Pulpit.

The Metropolitan Pulpit, containing carefully prepared Condensations of Leading Sermons, preached in New York and Brooklyn, Outlines of Sermons preached elsewhere, and much other homiletic matter. Vol. I. Royal 8vo, cloth, 206 pp., $1.50. Vol. II., cloth, enlarged. (Metropolitan Pulpit and Homiletic Monthly.) 388 pp., $2.75. The set $4.00.

Preacher's Cabinet.

A Handbook of Illustrations. By REV. EDWARD P. THWING, author of "Drill-Book in Vocal Culture." *Fourth Edition*, 2 vols., 12mo, paper, 50 cents.

Popery.

Popery the Foe of the Church and of the Republic. By Rev. Jos. S. VAN DYKE, author of "Through the Prison to the Throne," etc. 8vo, cloth, 304 pp., $1.00.

Pulpit and Grave.

A volume of Funeral Sermons and Addresses, from leading Pulpits in America, England, Germany and France; Sketches of Sermons, Obituary Addresses, Classified Texts, Scripture Readings, Death-bed Testimonies, Point on Funeral Etiquette, etc. Edited by E. J. WHEELER, A. M. 8vo, 365 pp., cloth, $1.50.

Pulpit Talks

On Topics of the Time, including "Religion and Science," "Religion and Social Organization," "Religion and Popular Literature," "Religion and Popular Amusements." By Rev. J. H. RYLANCE, D. D. 12mo, 46 pp., paper, 25 cents.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

Revised New Testament

With New Index and Concordance, Harmony of the Gospels, Maps, Parallel Passages in full, and many other Indispensable Helps. All most carefully prepared. Cloth, $1.50. Other bindings, from $2.50 to $10.00.

Revisers' English.

A Spicy Criticism on the English of the Revisers of the New Testament. By Rev. GEO. WASHINGTON MOON. 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

A Religious Encyclopedia; or, Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal and Practical Theology. Based on the Real-Encyklopädie of Herzog, Pitt and Hauck. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, assisted by Rev. Samuel M. Jackson, M. A., and Rev. D. S. Schaff. Complete in three large volumes. Royal 8vo, *per volume*, cloth, $6.00; sheep, $7.50; half morocco, $9.00; full morocco, gilt, $12.00. *Sold only by Subscription.* ☞ *Full descriptive circulars with Testimonials sent, gratis, to any address.*

The Theocratic Kingdom.

The Theocratic Kingdom of our Lord Jesus the Christ, as covenanted in the Old, and presented in the New Testament. An exhaustive work on Eschatology from the pre-millenarian standpoint. By Rev. G. N. H. PETERS, A. M. In three large vols., 8vo, cloth, $3.00 each. (In press.) *Send for an exhaustive prospectus and specimen pages.*

Theology of the Old Testament.

By Dr. GUST. FR. OEHLER, late Professor Ordinarius of Theology in Tubingen, Leipzig. This American edition is edited by Prof. GEO. E. DAY, D. D., of Yale College, and compared with the latest German Edition (1882). A very great work. It has been introduced as a text book in Yale, Princeton, New Brunswick, Lane (Cincin.), and other Seminaries. Royal 8vo, cloth, $3.00. ☞ *Send for prospectus.*

Thirty Thousand Thoughts.

This great work contains the best thoughts, Illustrations and Literary Gems of the world's ablest books on almost every subject, homiletically arranged. It is the result of researches made by a score of contributors. Edited by Rev. CANON SPENCE, M. A., Rev. J. S. EXELL, M. A., Rev. C. NEIL, M. A., Rev. I. STEPHENSON, M. A. A most valuable, and carefully arranged work. To be completed in six or seven volumes, large 8vo, cloth, per volume, $3.50. To be issued every three months.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post paid, on receipt of price.*

Thoughts of John Foster.

John Foster ranks among the most original and suggestive writers of this century. His style equals the terseness and strength of that of Butler, Clark or Barrow; his imagination is more ardent and powerful than that of Taylor or Coleridge, and his conceptions dazzle with their splendor, and awe with their majesty. By W. W. EVERTS, D. D. Cloth, 12mo, $1.00.

Through the Prison to the Throne.

Illustrations of Life from the Biography of Joseph. By REV. J. S. VAN DYKE, author of "Popery the Foe of the Church and of the Republic." 16mo, cloth, 254 pp., $1.00.

Treasury of David.

Containing an Original Exposition of the Book of Psalms: A Collection of Illustrative Extracts from the whole range of literature; a series of homiletical hints upon almost every verse, and lists of writers upon each verse. By REV. CHARLES H. SPURGEON. 8vo, cloth, per volume, $2.00; sheep $2.75. Complete in Seven Volumes, Six now ready. ☞ *Sold separately or in the Set.*

Vol. I., Psalms 1-26 (iuclusive) Vol. II. Psalms 27-52; Vol. III., Psalms 53-68; Vol. IV., Psalms 69-103; Vol. V., Psalms 104-118; Vol. VI., Psalms 119-124; Vol. VII., Psalms 125-150.

Miscellaneous Works.

Bulwer's Novels.

Leila; or, the Siege of Granada: and, The Coming Race; or, The New Utopia. By EDWARD BULWER, Lord Lytton. 12mo, 284 pp., leatherette, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Child's Guide to Heaven.

By REV. E. P. HAMMOND. Paper, 10 cts., leatherette, 25 cts.

Christmas Books.

Containing A Christmas Carol, the Chimes, the Cricket on the Hearth, The Battle of Life, The Haunted Man. By CHARLES DICKENS. 2 vols., paper, 270 pp., 8vo, 50 cents; 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, 75 cents.

Calvin.

John Calvin. By M. GUIZOT, Member of the Institute of of France. 4to, paper, 15 cents; 12mo, 160 pp., cloth, 50 cents.

Cyclopedia of Quotations.

The Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations, English and Latin, with an Appendix, containing Proverbs from the Latin and Modern Languages; Law and Ecclesiastical Terms and Significations; Names, Dates and Nationality of Quoted Authors, etc., with Copious Indices. Contains 17,000 classified quotations and 50,000 lines of Concordance. By J. K. HOYT and ANNA L. WARD. Royal 8vo, 900 pp., cloth, $5.00; sheep, $6.50; half mor., $8.00; full mor., $10.00.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

Deems Birthday Book.

Selections from the Writings of REV. CHARLES F. DEEMS, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Church of Strangers, New York. Arranged by SARAH KEABLES HUNT. The book has for a frontispiece a very fine vignette portrait of Dr. Deems. Cloth, $1.00; gilt edges, $1.25.

Diary of a Minister's Wife.

By ALMEDIA M. BROWN. (*Complete Edition.*) 8vo, paper, 30 cents; cloth, handsomely bound, $1.50.

Drill Book in Vocal Culture.

Drill Book in Vocal Culture and Gesture. REV. PROF. EDWARD P. THWING. (*Sixth Edition.*) 12mo, paper, 115 pp., 25 cts.

Eastern Proverbs and Emblems

Illustrating Old Truths. Selected from over 1,000 volumes, some very rare, and to be consulted only in libraries in India, Russia, and other parts of the Continent, or in the British Museum. All are classified under subjects. This book is a rich storehouse of emblems and proverbs. By REV. A. LONG, member of the Bengal Asiatic Society. 8vo, 280 pp., cloth, $1.00.

Gathered Lambs;

Showing how Jesus "the Good Shepherd" laid down His life for us, and how many little Lambs have been gathered into His fold. By Rev. EDWARD PAYSON HAMMOND, author of "Child's Guide," etc. A book for children. 12mo, 176 pp., paper, 10 cents; cloth, 40 cents.

Gems of Illustration.

From the writings of Dr. THOMAS GUTHRIE, classified and arranged. A priceless book for clergymen and all public teachers. *Second Edition.* 8vo, 196 pp., cloth, $1.50.

Giving or Entertainment; Which?

A Clear, Concise Discussion on Church Entertainments in Contrast to Giving. By Rev. JOSEPH S. VAN DYKE, author of "Through the Prison to the Throne," etc. 12mo, 32 pp., paper, 25 cents.

Gospel by Mark, in Phonetic Spelling.

The Gospel by Mark, in Phonetic Spelling. By C. W. K. Issued to illustrate the reform in spelling as suggested by an able advocate of this movement. Paper, 15 cents; cloth, 40 cents.

Henry Ward Beecher.

A Sketch of his Career, with analysis of his power as a Preacher, Lecturer, Orator, and Journalist, and incidents and reminiscences of his Life. By LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D. Finely illustrated, 8vo, 600 pp., cloth, $3.00; sheep, $4.50; half morocco, $6.00; full morocco, gilt, $7.00; memorial copy, extra fine, $10.00

☞ *Send for illustrated circular.*

The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Statement of his Doctrinal Beliefs and Unbeliefs before the Congregational Association of New York and Brooklyn, October 10, 1882. Paper 10 cents.

Heroes and Holidays.

Talks and Stories about Heroes and Holidays. Short illustrated lectures to Boys and Girls by twenty-one preachers in United States and Great Britain. Edited by Rev. W. F. CRAFTS, A.M. 12mo, 265 pp., cloth, $1.25.

History of England.

A Popular History of Society and Government in England from the Earliest period to the Present Times. By CHARLES KNIGHT. Tables of Contents, Index, Appendix, Notes and Letterpress unabridged. 8 vols., 4to, paper, 1370 pp., $2.80; 2 vols., 4to, cloth, $3.75; 4 vols., $4.40; 1 vol., sheep, $4.00; 2 vols., $5.00; 1 vol., Fr. im. morocco, $4.50; 2 vols., $25.50.

This is the most complete, and in every way the most desirable History of England ever written. The former price of this History was $18.00 to $25.00.

How to Enjoy Life.

Clergymen's and Students' Health; or, Physical and Mental Hygiene, the True Way to Enjoy Life. By WILLIAM MASON CORNELL, M.D. LL.D., Fellow of the Massachusetts Medical Society, Member of the American Medical Association. (*Fifth Edition*). 12mo, cloth, 360 pp., $1.00.

Hymns for All Christians.

Compiled by CHARLES F. DEEMS, D.D. LL.D., and PHEBE CARY. (*Fifth Edition*). 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

In Memoriam.—Wm. Cullen Bryant.

A Funeral Oration. By HENRY W. BELLOWS, D.D. 8vo, paper, 10 cents.

Is Romanism Good Enough for Romanists?

This is a sermon in tract form, very earnest, bristling with facts. It has excited already wide interest. By JUSTIN D. FULTON, D.D. Single number, 6 cents; 50 copies, $2.50; 100 copies, $4.00.

Lothair.

By Rt. Hon. B. DISRAELI, Earl of Beaconsfield, 2 vols., paper, 256 pp. 50 cents; 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

Lectures by Pere Hyacinthe.

"Respect for the Truth," "Reformation of the Family." "The Moral Crisis." Translated from the French by Rev. LEONARD WOLSEY BACON. 8vo, paper, 15 cents.

Leech's Reply.

An Incisive Reply to Ingersoll's Attack on the Bible. By S. V. LEECH, D. D. 8vo, paper, 10 cents.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

"My St. John."
A remarkable pastoral experience by JAMES M. LUDLOW. D.D. "A most pathetic and interesting story, which has brought tears from many eyes." 32mo, 10c.; 50 copies, $3.50; 100, $6.

Pastor's Record.
For Study, Work, Appointments and Choir for one year. By Rev. W. T. WYLIE. 12mo, paper, 50 c.; cloth, 75, leather, $1.

Robert Raikes' Centennial Addresses.
Delivered at the Raikes Centennial Celebration, by Rev. Drs. J. P. Newman, Thos. Armitage, Rufus W. Clark, Chas. S. Robinson, R. S. Storrs; and others. 8vo, paper, 10 cents.

Rock that is Higher than I.
This is a beautiful gift book suitable at all seasons. By Rev. JOHN EDGAR JOHNSON. 8vo, cloth, 75 cents.

Sartor Resartus.
The Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdrockh. By THOMAS CARLYLE. Paper, 176 pp., 25 cents; 8vo, cloth, 60 cents.

Standard Hymns.
With Biographical Notes of their Authors, Compiled by Prof. ED. P. THWING. 12mo, paper, 6c.; fifty or more, 5c. each.

Talks to Boys and Girls about Jesus.
With Bible Links to make a Complete and Chronological Life of Christ for the Young. Edited by Rev. W. F. CRAFTS. 12mo, 400 pp, cloth, 75 cents, illustrated, $1.50.

Talks to Farmers.
A new book of nineteen Addresses to Farmers. 12mo, 360 pp., cloth, $1.00. By Rev. CHARLES H. SPURGEON.

Traps for the Young.
A new, thrilling, but prudent description of the author's adventures with crime, and in bringing the victims to justice. A book for parents, divested of all improper language or representations. By ANTHONY COMSTOCK, of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, uthor of "Frauds Exposed." 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Wall Street in History.
Giving the History of this Street from Colonial Times to the present date. By MARTHA J. LAMB, author of "History of New York," editor of "Magazine of American History." Copiously illustrated; 4to, cloth, $2.00.

What our Girls Ought to Know.
A book of practical hygiene for girls, containing excellent advice and va'uable information. The author was a physician of large practice; a graduate, resident physician and teacher of Natural Sciences, in the Mass. State Normal School; graduate of the Woman's Medical College, New York. 12mo, 261 pp., cloth, $1.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post paid, on receipt of price.*

The Standard Series.

Best Books for a Trifle, printed in readable type, on fair paper, and in manilla, wholly without abridgment except Nos. 6–7, 9–10. All Books with star (*) (15 vols.) are *also* bound *one* volume, cloth, $3.50. ☞ Books with dagger (†) are *also* bound *separately* in cloth. See prices elsewhere.

No.		Price.
*1.	John Ploughman's Talk. C. H. Spurgeon. Carlyle on Choice of Books. 4to. Both	$0 12
*2.	Manliness of Christ. Thomas Hughes. 4to	10
3.	Essays. Lord Macaulay. 4to.	15
4.	Light of Asia. E. Arnold. 4to.	15
*5.	Imitation of Christ. Thomas à Kempis. 4to	15
*6–7.	Life of Christ. Canon Farrar. 4to	50
8.	Essays. Thomas Carlyle. 4to.	20
*9-10.	Life and Work of St. Paul. Canon Farrar. 4to, both	50
*11.	Self-Culture. Prof. J. S. Blackie. 4to	10
†12-19.	Knight's Popular History of England. 4to, both	2 80
*20-21.	Ruskin's Letters to Workmen and Labourers. 4to both.	30
22.	Idyls of the King. Alfred Tennyson. 4to	20
23.	Life of Rowland Hill. Rev. V. J. Charlesworth. 4to	15
24.	Town Geology. Charles Kingsley. 4to	15
25.	Alfred the Great. Thos. Hughes. 4to	20
26.	Outdoor Life in Europe. Rev. E. P. Thwing. 4to	20
27.	Calamities of Authors. I. D'-Israeli. 4to	20
28.	Salon of Madame Necker. Part 1. 4to	15
29.	Ethics of the Dust. John Ruskin. 4to	15
30-31.	Memories of My Exile. Louis Kossuth. 4to	40
*32.	Mister Horn and His Friends, Illustrated. 4to	15
33-34.	Orations of Demosthenes. 4to	40
35.	Frondes Agrestes. John Ruskin. 4to	15
36.	Joan of Arc. Alphonse de Lamartine. 4to	10
37.	Thoughts of M. Aurelius Antoninus. 4to	15
*38	Salon of Madame Necker. Part 11. 4to	15
39.	The Hermits. Chas. Kingsley. 4to	15
*40.	John Ploughman's Pictures. C. H. Spurgeon. 4to	15
*41.	Pulpit Table-Talk. Dean Ramsay. 4to	10
*42.	Bible and Newspaper. C. H. Spurgeon. 4to	15
*43.	Laocoon. Rev. C. Colton. 4to	20
44	Goldsmith's Citizen of the World. 4to	$0 20
45.	America Revisited. George Augustus Sala. 4to	20
46.	Life of C. H. Spurgeon. 8vo	20
†47.	John Calvin. M. Guizot. 4to	15
†48-49	Dickens' Christmas Books. Illustrated. 8vo	50
50.	Shairp's Culture and Religion. 8vo	15
†51-52.	Godet's Commentary on Luke. Ed. by Dr. John Hall. 8vo, 2 parts, both	2 00
†53.	Diary of a Minister's Wife. Part. I. 8vo	15
†54-57.	Van Doren's Suggestive Commentary on Luke. New edition, enlarged. 8vo	3 00
†58.	Diary of a Minister's Wife. Part II. 8vo	15
59.	The Nutritive Cure. Dr. Robert Walter. 8vo	15
†60.	Sartor Resartus. Thomas Carlyle. 4to	25
†61-62.	Lothair. Lord Beaconsfield. 8vo	50
63.	The Persian Queen and Other Pictures of Truth. Rev. E. P. Thwing. 8vo	10
64.	Salon of Madame Necker. Part III. 4to	15
†65-66.	The Popular History of English Bible Translation. H. P. Conant. 8vo. both	50
67.	Ingersoll Answered. Joseph Parker, D. D. 8vo	15
†68-69,	Studies in Mark. D. C. Hughes. 8vo. in two parts	60
70.	Job's Comforter's. A Religious Satire. Joseph Parker, D. D. (London) 16mo	10
†71.	Reviser's English. G. Washington Moon. F.R.S.L. 12mo	20
†72.	The Conversion of Children Rev. Ed. P Hammond. 12mo	30
73.	New Testament Helps. Rev. W. F. Crafts. 8vo	20
74.	Opium—England's Coercive Policy. Rev. J. Liggins. 8vo.	10
†75.	Blood of Jesus. Rev. Wm. A. Reid. With introduction by E. P. Hammond. 12mo	10
76.	Lesson in the Closet. Chas. F. Deems, D. D. 12mo	20
†77-78,	Heroes and Holidays. Rev. W. F. Crafts. 12mo, 2 pts., both	30
79.	Reminiscences of Rev. Lyman Beecher, D. D. 8vo	10

☞ *The above works will be sent, post paid, on receipt of price.*

The Standard Library, 1883.

Previous Numbers (1-79) of this Library are known as STANDARD SERIES.

The set (26 books), paper, $5.00; cheap cloth, $10.00; fine cloth, extra paper, $16.00. 26 adjustable covers, with name of each book on back (for paper edition), $2.75; single cover, 15c.

☞ *All books of this series are 12mo in size.*

80. Oliver Cromwell. His Life, Times, Battlefields and Contemporaries. By PAXTON HOOD, author of "Christmas Evans," etc. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

81. Science in Short Chapters. By W. MATTIEU WILLIAMS, F.R.A.S. Author of "Fuel of the Sun," etc. A leading scientist in England. 312 pp. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

82. American Humorists. By Rev. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A. A distinguished clergyman of London. Author of "Music and Morals, etc. 192 pp. Paper, 15 cents, fine cloth, 75c.

83. Lives of Illustrious Shoemakers. By WILLIAM EDWARD LINKS. A book of "Self Help." 288 pp. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

84. Flotsam and Jetsam. A Yachtsman's Experiences at Sea and Ashore. By THOS. GIBSON BOWLES, Master Marine. 276 pp. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1 00.

85. Highways of Literature. Or What to Read and How to Read. By DAVID PRYDE, M.A., LL.D. Author of "Great Men of European History," etc. 168 pp. Paper, 15 cents, fine cloth, 75c.

86. Colin Clout's Calendar. The Record of a Summer—April to October. By GRANT ALLEN, author of "Vignettes of Nature," etc. 235 pp. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

87. The Essays of George Eliot. Collected and Arranged, with an Introduction to her "Analysis of Motives." By NATHAN SHEPPARD, author of "Readings from George Eliot," etc. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

88. Charlotte Bronte. An Hour with Charlotte Brontë; or, Flowers from a Yorkshire Moor. By LAURA C. HOLLOWAY, author of "Mothers of Great Men and Women," etc. 156 pp. Paper, 15 cents; fine cloth, with steel engraving of Charlotte Brontë, 75 cents.

89. Sam Hobart. The Locomotive Engineer. A workingman's Solution of the Labor Problem. By JUSTIN D. FULTON, D.D. 255 pp. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

90. Successful Men of To-Day, and what they Say of Success. Based on facts and opinions gathered from Five Hundred Prominent Men. By Rev. WILBUR F. CRAFTS, A.M. A Book of Self Help. 276 pp. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

91. Nature Studies. By GRANT ALLEN, ANDREW WILSON, THOMAS FOSTER, EDWARD CLODD and RICHARD A. PROCTOR. A sterling volume. 264 pp. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

92. India: What can it Teach Us? A course of lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. By F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M. With an Introduction and Notes by Prof. Alexander Wilder, M.D. 288 pp. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

93. A Winter in India. By Rt. Hon. W. E. BAXTER, M.P. A fascinating story of a journey through India. With map. 154 pp. Paper, 15 cents, fine cloth, 75 cents.

94. Scottish Characteristics. By PAXTON HOOD, Author of "Oliver Cromwell," "Christmas Evans," etc. 315 pp. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

95. Historical and Other Sketches. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. Edited with an Introduction by David H. Wheeler, LL.D. 288 pp. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

96. Jewish Artisan Life in the Time of Jesus. By Prof. FRANZ DELITSCH. Translated from the latest German edition, by Bernhard Pick, Ph.D. Paper, 15 cents, fine cloth, 75 cents.

97. Scientific Sophisms. A review of current Theories, concerning Atoms, Apes and Men. By SAMUEL WAINWRIGHT, D.D., author of "Christian Certainty," etc. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

98. Illustrations and Meditations; or, Flowers from a Puritan's Garden, distilled and dispensed by C. H. SPURGEON. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

99. French Celebrities. Part I. Brief Biographies of Marshal De MacMahon, Leon Gambetta, Jules Grévy, Louis Blanc, Charles De Freycinet, Victor Hugo, Ferdinand De Lesseps. By ERNEST DAUDET, and others. Paper, 15 cents, fine cloth, 75 cents.

100. By-Ways of Literature. Or Essays on Old Things and New, in the Customs, Education, Character, Literature, and Language of the English-speaking People. By DAVID H. WHEELER, LL.D. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00.

101. Martin Luther. His Life and Times. By Dr. WILLIAM REIN, Eisenach, Germany. Based upon Köstlin's "Life of Luther." Translated. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

102. French Celebrities. Part II. Brief Biographies of Jules Ferry, George Clemenceau, Ernest Renan, Henri Rochefort, Challemel, Lacour, Jules Simon, Erckman-Chatrian, Paul Bert, and Alphonse Daudet. By JULES CLARETIE, and others. Paper, 15 cents, fine cloth, 75 cents.

103. Christmas in a Palace. A traveler's story by EDWARD EVERETT HALE. 12mo. Paper, 25 cents, fine cloth, $1.00; Holiday edition, cloth, $1.00.

104. With the Poets. A selection of English poetry. By CANON FARRAR. Paper, 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

105. The Life of Zwingli. The Swiss Reformer. By JEAN GROB. Translated. Paper 25 cents, cloth, $1.00.

☞ *The above works will be sent, post paid, on receipt of price.*

The Standard Library, 1884.

ISSUED BI-WEEKLY.

Set, 26 Books in Paper, $5; Adjustable Covers (26) with name of each book on back, $3.75. Set, 26 Books, in cheap Cloth, $10. Set, 26 Books, fine Cloth, extra paper, $16.

Announcement.

1. The Standard Library, 1884 Series, will contain 26 books, one to be issued every two weeks. The paper, binding, etc., will be the same as "1883 Series."

2. Some nine of the books will be fiction, by many of the ablest of our writers; the other books will be, also, all new—not heretofore published in America.

3. Each book will be 12mo in size, with clear type, good paper, and bound in signatures (not inset), the same as cloth books are bound.

4. The books will be bound in heavy cover paper, with artistic design printed in two colors, making the book an ornament for any parlor table.

5. The books will stand erect on the Library shelf the same as a cloth-bound book. THE TITLE *will be* PRINTED ON THE BACK, *also on the side.*

PRICES:—Paper, 15c. and 25c. per volume; cloth, 75c. and $1.00. Subscription (26 Books), paper, $5.00; cloth, $16.00.

☞ *Send for "Standard Library" Catalogue.*

106. Story of the Merv. Epitomized from the "Merv Oasis," by the author, EDMOND O'DONOVAN. A story of travel in Central Asia. 12mo, paper, 25 cents; fine cloth, $1.00.

107. Mumu and the Diary of a Superfluous Man. Two Novels. By IVAN TURGENIEFF. Translated from the Russian. 12mo, paper, 15 cents; fine cloth, 75 cents.

108. Memorie and Rime. A story of Western Life, sketches of travel in Europe, and various poems. By JOAQUIN MILLER. 12mo, paper, 25 cents; cloth, $1.00.

109. Christianity Triumphant. Its defensive and aggressive victories. By J. P. NEWMAN, D.D. 12mo, paper, 15 cents; fine cloth, 75 cents.

NEW BOOKS BY

JULIAN HAWTHORNE,
JOAQUIN MILLER,
GEORGE P. LATHROP,
EDWARD EVERETT HALE,
JOHN HARBERTON,
Capt. ROLAND COFFIN
Etc., Etc.