

# THE SECOND ADVENT OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST A PAST EVENT <sup>1845</sup>

*Tenth Anniversary*

Available Online At:  
[www.PreteristArchive.com](http://www.PreteristArchive.com)

BY EARLIEST KNOWN FULL PRETERIST  
**ROBERT TOWNLEY, A.B.**  
MINISTER OF CHARLESTON UNIVERSALIST CHURCH

*The Doctrinal Depot*

1/28/2007

**PRODUCED BY TODD DENNIS AND GOOGLE BOOKS**





HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL  
AND/OR HARVARD THEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY



FROM THE COLLECTION  
OF THE  
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY

THE

**WITHDRAWN**

SECOND ADVENT

OF

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST

A PAST EVENT.

Τί ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια.

PILATE.

BY

ROBERT TOWNLEY, A. B.,

LATE MINISTER OF ST. MATTHEW'S, LIVERPOOL.

---

LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND COMPANY.

D. MARPLES, LIVERPOOL.

1845.

## P R E F A C E.

---

WHEN I commenced writing, it was merely with a view to publishing my reasons for quitting the communion of the Church of England. Having enlarged upon my original intention, I find it necessary to affix to this work a few prefatory observations.

The substance of the work was delivered in a course of lectures to the congregation which lately assembled at St. Matthew's, in this town. This will account for the matter of the few opening pages, which, had I known how far I should have been obliged to exceed my prescribed limits, would have formed of themselves the preface, instead of having a preface written in explanation.

The volume is sent forth into the world as a trifling contribution towards establishing what is much needed — a sound principle of Scripture interpretation. The truth of every statement propounded is by no means contended for. I prefer no claim similar to that of Swedenborg, Irving, and, in fact, all theologians who maintain that the present is a dispensation of the Holy Ghost. I claim not to have received any doctrine through an immediate and miraculous revelation. So far from asserting any thing of the kind, one position strongly taken up by me is, that Scripture is its own interpreter, and that what I have written is only so far valuable as that, in 'comparing spiritual things with spiritual,' I have brought various portions of the word of God to harmonize, and have shown that the Scriptures are not contradictory, wherever I have had occasion to examine them. It is probable, and more than probable, that some errors in reasoning, and some defects of exposition, may be detected. In the minor details, there may be mistakes; but while making these admissions, I contend most strenuously that there is not a shadow of a shade of error in the conclusion at which I have arrived. I assert in the most positive and distinct manner possible, that the doctrine of a past second advent is proved to a demonstration, and is unassailable. The belief of this doctrine has seriously affected my temporal wellbeing; though I am quite sensible that this is no evidence of its truth, and no excuse for its advocacy if it be untrue. The defence

of the doctrine has caused me to feel most acutely how much better I would have consulted my worldly prospects, if I could have stifled my convictions, and sailed along with the stream as others have done. The mere rumour of my religious belief has exposed me to the imputation of all the vile names which the vocabulary of a spurious Christianity can furnish forth. But even if it have been said of me, 'he hath spoken blasphemy,' it is nothing more than the repetition of an old charge: and following the example of my Divine Master, I would desire to make no complaint. Appealing to the same testimony as that to which Christ himself and his Apostles appealed, I would ask, Is the charge substantiated by proof, and by facts? I am most anxious to bring an opponent to the book; and having this leading object, among others, in view, I have prevailed upon myself to hazard a public, and, under existing circumstances, perhaps an apparently egotistical statement of my belief. I know not, nay, I am doubtful, whether I shall be any gainer by so doing. I do know, from a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the religion of human nature, and from the history of religious opinion, that my defence will be condemned in the mass, by many who will be so much offended at the conclusion expressed in the title page, that they will never think of putting themselves in possession of the premises. I do fear that prejudice—the prejudice of creeds and catechisms—will in most quarters operate so powerfully, that there may be few readers who will follow the example of the noble Bereans, and search the Scriptures whether these things are so. Most earnestly would I deprecate a hasty condemnation, or even any judgment of the work which is not founded upon a careful, and, as far as possible, an unbiassed perusal. After what I have stated, and with the solemn conviction on my mind *that I am in the right*, I feel that I have license to make this appeal, and that I shall not be considered transgressing if I enter my protest against the insane verdict of prejudice and preconception. I feel, moreover, that if I can secure the calm attention of enlightened minds, they will rise from the perusal of this work with the conviction, that the head and front of my offending is not that I have undermined any truth of Christianity, but that I have endeavoured to set forth a full and complete statement of its one cardinal and central doctrine—the atonement of the Son of God.

But it is time to enquire, To whom do I thus address myself, in the language of earnest expostulation? I answer, To the people, to the laity; to the hearers, not to the preachers; not to the teachers, but to the taught. I appeal to the pews: I make no appeal of any kind to the pulpits, except by way of a challenge to come forward in defence of their order. I know that all expostulation with the 'ministry' is lost

labour—a sound, and nothing more. Charges which never can, and never will be substantiated, will by the priesthood be repeated to those (and, alas, their name is Legion!) who are weak enough and deluded enough to believe them. They will be so repeated, simply because I have endeavoured to carry out the doctrine of the past second advent in all its important bearings, keeping in mind the Divine law, “what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” This doctrine is examined in the following pages *in its consequences*, and not merely as an isolated article of a religious belief, which can make no change in the relationship of man to God, whether it be fulfilled or no. The *consequences* of the past second advent are *fearful* to the priesthood; and when I say priesthood, I include, of course, the ministers of all sects, from Romanism to Mormonism, *presbyter being no other than priest* WRIT LARGE. The priesthood will be alive to this; they will see at a glance, that if the doctrine which I advocate be true, their occupation as a priesthood is gone, the source from which they get their gain being cut off. Hence the unmitigated condemnation of this view of Divine revelation: a condemnation which could force a priest of the Church of England to say, “Go to any dissenting chapel, rather than to St. Matthew’s,” and which can now draw from a priest of any dissenting body, “Go to any church—to a Roman chapel—but don’t go near Mr. Townley.” If these things were “done in a corner;” if this was the line of conduct pursued when I was merely an obscure individual, addressing a despised handful, who were likeminded with myself, what, it may be asked, will be done to this obscure individual, who has been presumptuous enough to commit himself and his opinions to the press?

In order, if possible, to save trouble, I will mention a few things which will *not* serve the purpose of the priesthood.

It will be of no avail to follow the example of Exeter Hall, and to try to put me and my book down by the use of opprobrious names. Hard words break no bones. Raillery is not *necessarily* reason; neither does it follow that invective is *always* argument. Neither, again, will it be of any avail to endeavour to substantiate a wholesale condemnation by the *ipse dixit* of any man, or of any body of men. I take my stand as a Protestant, on the right of private judgment. I acknowledge only one rule of faith, the Holy Scriptures, and reject all Mass-books, Prayer-books, Assembly’s Catechisms, and such like, as expositors of that rule. Neither, I would observe, will it answer the ends of religious systems, to meet the arguments of this work by that convenient resource of ignorance—the contemptuous pleasantry which affects to despise what it secretly fears. This volume makes pretensions of no ordinary kind, and must be met, if it be opposed at all, in no ordinary way. To say that

I am beneath notice—only worthy of silent contempt—or that I am mad and deluded, upon religious subjects, may impose upon fools and fanatics, but upon an independent, thinking individual, never. On the contrary, this course of procedure will be, to the reflecting mind, the strongest of all possible evidences that the work is unanswerable, and the doctrine not to be overthrown.

But why do I thus trouble myself, by anticipating a reply which may never be forthcoming, through sheer inability on the part of those who are called upon to render a “reason of the hope” that is in them? If we confine our observation to the priesthood of the Church of England, to whom shall we look for a Scriptural refutation of the proved statements of this work, viz., that the Bible promises no future coming of Christ, and, consequently, no resurrection of the body, nor any end of the world, neither a day of judgment? These positions *may* be taken up by an avowed infidel, and urged by him against *the* Christianity of the day. Nay, it may be, as it has been contended, that I am little better than an infidel in advocating them. Be it so. I repeat, to whom, and to which of the clergy shall we look for an exposure of their fallacy, if they be fallacies? So far as I am acquainted with the Establishment, with its theology and theologians, the search will be in vain. It is admitted even by the heads of the Church themselves, that there is nothing less taught in the Universities than divinity. The Bishop of St. David’s, not long ago, in his place in Parliament, made this humiliating confession; and the reason is obvious. Of what use, it may be asked, is it to attempt an investigation of the Scriptures, when human creeds, and standards of centuries gone by, are opposed as a barrier to all investigation? These devices of man’s contrivance are the great hindrance to the spread of Biblical knowledge; and, without a doubt, Christianity would be an immense gainer if they were one and all swept away into the oblivion of the dark and superstitious ages from which they emanated. The knowledge of the volume of nature every one allows to be progressive. The hidden mysteries of God’s beautiful and natural creation, are one by one, brought out to the astonished gaze of his intelligent creatures. We hear on every side propositions such as the following:—What would our forefathers think, if they were to come among the men of this generation, and see the wonderful progress which hath been made by a world around us? Who can doubt, asks another, that the most advanced outposts of the territory conquered by the science of this age, will have dwindled and become scarcely perceptible to the retroverted eye of the philosopher of 1946? How many great questions in physical science, and in ethics, will then have been solved; and to how many of the distresses of the sons of men



will remedies have then been applied? Alas! reflects a third party, alas! how sweetly will the wheels of the social machine, as well as the current of individual life, then move; and why, O why, have we been condemned to live in the early part of this darkling century, streaked but with the dawnings of so much glory! How glorious the prospect for those who shall be born to our children's children!—What have we in any measure corresponding with this, asked of that book, which I believe to be the perfection of science—the emanation of the mind of Deity? What are the facts? For centuries of blinded ignorance, the Church of Rome has said, “Hitherto shalt thou go, and no farther.” For nearly 300 years, the Church of England, in close imitation of her mother, has, by reason of her creeds, shut the volume of inspiration to her members. The knowledge of the language in which the Scriptures were written is ever progressing. Men the most learned have given us improved versions of one book of the Bible after another, without, however, venturing to impugn the veracity of a single orthodox article of a human creed. Grammarians, lexicographers, and critics, are putting into our hands the key to unlock the treasures of Oriental philology; and it is every day more and more obvious, says a learned writer, that philology is giving laws to theology. Obscure places of Scripture are becoming plain, rough places smooth, and crooked things straight. The Inquisition absurdity, which condemned Galileo, is now the subject of ridicule, the Romanist himself being judge. A better acquaintance with the original Hebrew has shown that it was the *sunshine*, and not the *sun*, which Joshua commanded to stand still, and that therefore the Bible and the philosopher are both agreed that the sun is fixed in the centre of our system, while the earth and the other planets move round it: the motion of the earth being arrested by the word of Joshua, and consequently the *apparent* motion of the sun. But of what avail is all this? Our Churches put a veto upon all search which would venture to arraign the *infallibility* of their creeds and confessions. The Church of England cannot be prevailed upon even to amend her Prayer-book. She declares that if a man do not believe every tittle of her Athanasian Creed, *without doubt he shall perish everlastingly!* The attempt to alter *this* has been made, time after time, by her own clergy, and all to no purpose. Much less is it to be expected that she will ever issue another and a better version of the Scriptures, or that the state will take upon itself to do this necessary work, so long as connected with the Church. The revision might be left with her own University Professors: nay, with one of them, the present Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. *We* would humbly beg and pray for *two slight alterations only*: for the erasure of the traditionary date fixed to the Revela-

tion of John, and for a scholarlike rendering of the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." The entreaty would be in vain; for the Hierarchy, from the Archbishop to the working Curate, would easily divine that even an alteration so trifling might prove the ultimate downfall of the Establishment. The most learned of all her learned men, who have commented upon the Bible, dare not carry out their researches to their full extent—an extent which themselves must secretly have been convinced is just and true, viz., a declaration that the foundation of their Church is visionary—that its fundamental position, the doctrine of Apostolic succession, is a fallacy. But it is to be hoped something effective may, even in existing circumstances, be accomplished. I trust to see the day when one of the Gospels shall be printed and circulated, as faithfully rendered from the original, without the glosses of priestcraft, and the false coloring of preconceived notions, and natural religion, which now to a great extent make void the word of God in the apprehension of the unsuspecting English reader. I know no dearer desire than to see the Gospel by Matthew published, with a commentary advocating the views propounded in this work; and should be most willing to give every assistance in my power to any who had means and ability to undertake a labour of such momentous importance. The commentary would live and be valued when hundreds of the books which are now so popular would be known and remembered no more. All that has been hitherto written and spoken upon the doctrine of the past second advent, would sink into absolute insignificance before an undertaking like this. In the meanwhile, sanguine in a cause which I believe has Omnipotence for its patron, and believing that the past second advent will be recognised in the land, and by the people, as universally as is now the past first advent, I rest assured that sooner or later such a work will appear; and, as before hinted, when it does appear, it will be "a heavy blow and great discouragement" to a religious system which already shows evident symptoms of an approaching doom. The signs of the times seem to the watchful observer to point ultimately towards an enquiry, deep and searching, into that Book from whence all our Churches profess to derive their existence and authority. The Churches themselves are helping on to this conclusion, as they are now confessedly the great disturbers of the national peace, and the chief obstacle in the way of the Government of the country: yea, so much so, that, by their incessant agitation, they have forced the Ministry (doubtless much against its will) to propose an educational scheme for Ireland, wherein there is no religious provision whatever. If the nation is to be thus everlastingly embroiled—if the people are to be thus kept in a continual turmoil—they will begin surely to enquire more narrowly

into a matter which concerns them so nearly as a revelation of God. As the beautiful harmony and order of the material universe is more and more laid bare before them, they will surely at length arouse themselves (for the matter rests with them, not with their rulers, whether political or religious,) to ask, Are we for ever to be harassed with two exhibitions of the Deity, the one in direct antagonism to the other, and can these discordant and quarrelsome sects be truly derived from the Bible? When this enquiry is really entertained, not one of the existing caricatures of Christianity will escape it. Religious systems of every description may be as the Garden of Eden before it, but behind they will be a desolate wilderness: and here we echo the aspiration of the philosopher—"How enviable will be the position of that man, who shall witness what may with truth be called, the regeneration of a world." The question is, What is truth? There is no fear but the answer is recorded in the Bible to the full, and that it is, like its author, "holy, and just, and good." "Let no man," writes the father of philosophy, "taking the credit of a sobriety and moderation ill applied, think or maintain that men can search too far in the book of God's word; but rather let them excite themselves to the search, and boldly advance in the pursuit of an endless progress in it; only taking heed lest they apply their knowledge to arrogance, and not to charity—to ostentation, and not to use."—BACON.

R. T.

LIVERPOOL,  
June, 1845.

## THE SECOND ADVENT.

---

IN submitting to you our reasons for seceding from the Church of England, I will at once introduce these reasons by stating, that they differ entirely from anything which has ever been offered by any secession previous to our own.

I do not intend to offer, in apology for our present position, that such position is in consequence of conscientious objections to certain matters connected with the Church of England.

Such a course of objection may very well suit the purpose, and be adapted to the consciences, of a numerous class of persons (sincere, I do not doubt,) who quit the communion of one religious system for another, or who, finding fault with existing systems, devise one of their own, which contains, in principle, all the evils of the one they may have left.

To object to certain portions of a system—to flagrant outrages on common sense—to doctrines which would disgrace the Heathenism to reform which such system sends out missions—to object to services, to catechisms, and confirmations, to absolution, baptismal regeneration, burial services, and such like, appears to me to be labour in vain; inasmuch as such objection might well consist with an application to the objector of the reproach of Christ, “Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.”

I think I may venture to say, for you as well as myself, that we object neither to this nor that particular of this or that party, but to the whole—believing that, in their existing constitution, they are contrary to the Word of God; that even the very name of party, sect, or society is unscriptural.

We object to the entire constitution of the various religious establishments of the day, because we believe that they are nothing more nor other than Judaism, in divers forms and fashions, some, doubtless, more disguised than others, but all maintaining the great foundation principle of Judaism, viz., an outward and visible church; indeed, a church, and, by consequence, a ministry of divine authority, and therefore, by consequence again, maintaining Apostolic succession; or if not, in so many words, maintaining these things, then inconsistent with themselves, and attempting the impossible service of worshipping God and Mammon, pretending to hold out one hand to the truth, and refusing the other.

Having thus briefly stated the nature, I will now proceed to explain the grounds, of our objections; and in so doing, prove that it was no rash declaration with which I opened this address. For this end I would call to your remembrance the closing words of the last discourse which I delivered as a minister of the Church of England.

It will be in the recollection of many of my late congregation, that the discourse alluded to was a statement and accompanying refutation of sundry objections which had been urged against our view of divine revelation. The conclusion of that discourse was in the form of a question—"Is the second coming of Christ a past or still future event? Until, it was observed—until that question be settled, and unless the second coming is past, all attempt at expounding the Scriptures is, so far as I am concerned, lost labour, and must go for nothing. I search the Scriptures (it was further observed,) exercising the Protestant right of private judgment, upon which principle the Reformation professed to be founded, I search the Scriptures, 'comparing spiritual things with spiritual,' and not, as is the almost universal fashion of the day, comparing spiritual things with natural. And with what result? it was further asked. Even this. I behold in every part of the book of revealed truth, a testimony to this effect—"That which is perfect *is* come, so then that which was in part is done away.' I behold evidence upon evidence of the fulfilment of the whole of God's mind, as he has revealed it to man, in his dispensations in connexion with a chosen people. I see the religion of Heaven stripped of the unhallowed garments which priestcraft has wrapt around it, and appearing in its own native simplicity, beauty, and majesty. I believe the Bible to be one continuous, harmonious display of love, not contradictory, but one part beautifully agreeing with another, when properly understood, and explained by itself; one star or dispensation (if we may be allowed to apply a Scripture figure,) differing from another in glory, and each moving in its own proper orbit."

Such was the conclusion of my last discourse, and here we find the sum and substance of our objections to the Church of England; here we find the circumstance of our present position explained. It is the firm, well-grounded, scriptural belief of the *past* second coming of Christ, which has placed us in our present situation; not, be it observed, the belief of this as an isolated event, but one which comprehended the fulfilment of all prophecy, the unsealing of every mystery, and the revelation of all knowledge, according to the scripture testimony, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled;" or again, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom;" and coming, as the verse immediately preceding declares, "to reward every man according to his works;" and therefore, we conceive, coming at "the end of the world," to "the judgment of the great day," and "the resurrection of the dead;" or, to take another view, coming "to the revelation of the perfect state," and the "establishment of the eternal kingdom;" in short, and in full, to the fulness of the blessing of all the counsels of God, which he purposed in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the ages.

We were persuaded that the New Testament teaches the above as past events, and being so persuaded, there was no alternative but that of acting as we have acted, in seceding from the Establishment, or laying ourselves open to the charge of "dishonesty and duplicity."

The second coming of Christ being satisfactorily proved to be past, we were aware of the consequence long before that consequence was

developed, as we witness this day. This doctrine was powerful to effect what none other was able; and if it be asked why we continued so long within the Establishment, contradicting in the pulpit, what we affirmed in the desk, I might, if the question needed an answer, reply, that we have an excuse for such a course of conduct in that when I was ordained, I solemnly promised that I would be "ready to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." If I thought that this was laid upon me in the discharge of my office, I must then, as an honest man, begin at home; and, as a minister of the Church of England, I must banish and drive away the erroneous and strange doctrine which I had formerly preached. That doctrine is commonly known by the name of Calvinism. You and I have tried Calvinism, and believe that it is no better than any other "ism" now in fashion; we know that it clashes with every chapter of the Bible; we know that it reduces the Bible to a very small revelation, to be at all consistent; "the bed is shorter than a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than a man may wrap himself in it;" moreover, we are persuaded that *as* Calvinism is opposed to Arminianism, there are two Bibles, and therefore no Bible. When I entered upon the discharge of my office in Liverpool, I would have been called a Calvinist; and now it is my firm conviction, however humiliating, however self-renouncing the confession may be, that at that time, and for months after, I was not able to give one scriptural view of any one scripture doctrine; that I was totally unable for such a work, until I could read the Bible as a new book, in the light of the past second coming of Christ. The interpretation of scripture which we now hold being correct, such preaching as mine, when I entered on the charge of St. Matthew's, and till within the last few months, would leave, and did leave, you and me as ignorant of the Scriptures as the Arminian Methodist, from whom we professed so much to differ, and whose ignorance we professed so much to pity. As to any opening up of the Word of God, that which goes under the name of Calvinism is now, to you and me, no better than the "old wives' fables" which our view of divine revelation is charged to be. We know that Calvinism talks about a finished salvation, and the unconditionality of eternal life; and we know also, that a finished salvation is a mighty expression, to which Calvinism can attach no meaning; and "unconditionality" is a glorious something, which none who are ignorant of a past second coming can in any measure comprehend.

But it is not my purpose to speak of ourselves. This is irksome, to one who has such glorious things to unfold, as we are persuaded the Bible contains. To the short explanation of the nature and ground of our objections, which I have just offered, I may be allowed perhaps to add a few words upon the origin of these objections. If it be any advantage, either to myself or to our objectors, I beg to say, that I did not arrive on the threshold of the views of scripture which I now entertain, from reading any author holding similar sentiments. No publication advocating the second coming of Christ fell into my hands until some time after I had seen, and *preached* upon, the important position which the destruction of Jerusalem occupied in the Scriptures. Neither, I beg to say, was it from conversation with others that I was led into a glimmering of that grand event, which is passed by in total

silence by the systems of the day. It was by searching the Scriptures, it was purely from the only sure and solid process of comparing spiritual things with spiritual, comparing the Old Testament with the New, and especially the Book of Psalms, with the history of Christ as given by the Evangelists, and that of the Apostles, as recorded in the Acts and in their Epistles,—it was from this source that I derived the views which I am now so diligently and earnestly advocating, because I believe them to be truth. I was, from this comparison of the Old Testament and the New, convinced somewhat of the meaning of that great and comprehensive scripture, “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.” It was in and through the Psalms that I learned somewhat of the importance of the apostolic ministry. The Psalms appeared to me to be full of prophecy concerning that miraculous dispensation, long before I had anything like a clear comprehension of those prophecies. It was through the same medium that I was led to investigate the meaning of an expression which has changed the Bible, and made it a new book. I allude to the words, “the end of the world.” I discovered that the end of the world was the end of the Jewish economy. I found that the passage which is taken as a basis for the pretended apostolic succession of religious systems, was the scripture which of all others most flatly contradicted that pretended succession. The passage to which I allude is Christ’s promise to his apostles, when he entrusted to them their commission, “Lo, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the age;” and not, as it is (it may be designedly) rendered, “to the end of the world.” The discovery of the true meaning of this phrase was to me a treasure indeed; it was a key wherewith to unlock the glorious Book which priestcraft of every age has exhibited as “confusion worse confounded.” I brought the true interpretation of “the end of the world” to bear upon many a verse and many a doctrine; and now it is my firm conviction, that if these words had been literally rendered from the original Greek, in the one single sentence I have quoted, this alone would have sufficed to put an end to the religious establishments of the day.

With this short explanation of matters immediately connected with ourselves, I will leave all that is merely of a personal nature, and address myself to the investigation of the vast subject before us.

I am fully alive to the suspicion, if not more than suspicion, which what I have now stated to you will excite in the minds of many who may read this address when it is published, as I intend it shall be. I am not insensible to the fact, that the grand doctrine of the past second coming of Christ, is a complete revolution in religion — that it scatters to the four winds of heaven, doctrines which have been imbibed from earliest infancy, which have “grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength;” that it brings proud man into the depths of humility, unlearning all that he has previously learned, and crying, as it were, “Abba, Father, what I know not, teach thou me.” I am not insensible to all this, because it is the record of my own experience, and I know that you will bear a like testimony.

If there should be one individual present to whom these things, being entirely strange, sound like a most fearful heresy, let me entreat that person, as I would entreat every objector, to hear what I have to say in defence of my opinions, before he condemns them. I will

promise him that my defence shall be drawn from the Bible, and the Bible alone.

While thus deprecating a senseless condemnation of our views of divine truth, I am not, neither I trust are you, unprepared for that which we deprecate. I well know that there are those who seem determined to abide by the opinions which we oppose, independent of all reason, whether those opinions be error or truth; and if we, who have forsaken the religious systems of the day, in seceding from the Establishment, were to expect that these parties should hereafter look favourably and hopefully on our proceedings, we should conclude contrary to the nature of things, and the issue could be nothing but disappointment. It is therefore well to be prepared to hear anything, however false or ridiculous, advanced against us, for I doubt not we shall have frequent opportunities of practically illustrating the Christianity in which we are believers. I do not doubt but we shall be, as we have been already, called upon to prove, that if our interpretation of the Bible be, as asserted, "the vilest of heresies," it is a heresy which is attended with at least one peculiar characteristic—it settles and sobers a mind naturally impetuous; and in proportion as it is seen and embraced, it corrects any tendency to travel out of the way for the mere purpose of self-gratification; and it effects this, because it is accompanied with the possession of perfect scriptural peace, in the face of all opposition, and under every opprobrium leading the mind, as nought beside can, indeed, up to God, crying, "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." In short, ours is an interpretation of truth, which exhibits a religion of all-glorious love—that "charity" which hopeth all things, and endureth all things, while yet it rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.

I have urged a word of entreaty to objectors, and a word of caution to ourselves. I would linger a moment for the sake of proving that neither entreaty nor warning is made for nothing. Suppose to yourselves—no uncommon case—one who thinks, and speaks, and acts as though he were so wise in the knowledge of the Scriptures that he can be taught nothing more, and has no more to learn—one who condemns you in a moment, and without hesitation, if you venture to believe aught contrary to what he has received—one who imagines himself, to all appearance, to be gifted with the apostolic, miraculous power of "trying the spirits whether they be of God;" such an one objects, it may be, to matters which are advanced; suppose, for instance, the doctrine of the resurrection, in connexion with a past second coming,—and interposes with his "It cannot be; it is impossible; it contradicts the evidence of my senses;" "it is preposterous;" "you might as well tell me that black is white, and white is black; or that two and two make five, and not four." Now, on the threshold of our investigation of the objected doctrine, I must be allowed to observe, with all earnestness of conviction, that an objector of this class is almost a hopeless case. I am reminded thereby of the flippant yet confident saying, "Are we blind also?" and also of the solemn but quiet answer, "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but ye say ye see, *therefore* your sin remaineth." On the threshold of our great undertaking, may



I not, with all reasonableness, expostulate, and ask, if it would not be well for an objector to reflect awhile before exhibiting an opposition which seems determined to listen neither to reason nor revelation? Would it not be well to ponder over the scripture of the prophet, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord"—and would it not startle the same determined opponent to be told, that in the chapter where the prophet is thus beautifully expressing the opposition between God and man, it is in reference to the covenant of grace, to a spiritual and superhuman law? nay, moreover, that we have the testimony of the Apostle James, in Acts xiii., that the truth,—“My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,” respects the very doctrine of the resurrection in question; “And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.” (Compare Isaiah lv. 3, with Acts xiii. 34.)

And to examine more closely the value of such assertions as “It cannot be,” “it is impossible,” let us ask for one moment of any of the contenders for the present authority of the exhortation, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;” how do you reconcile your opinion of the non-fulfilment of that scripture, with Paul’s express writing to the Colossians, “The gospel which ye have heard, and which *was* preached to every creature under heaven.” (Col. i. 23); or again, to the Romans, “But I say, Have they not heard? yea, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world.” (Rom. x. 18.) And, moreover, how can you deny that in these two passages of the Epistles there was a fulfilment of what Christ said should come to pass in that generation; “The gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world (empire), for a witness to all the nations; and *then* shall the end come;” (Matt. xxiv. 14.) According to your view, the end is not yet come; according to the apostle’s view, it must: according to your view, what the apostle says, cannot be true; it contradicts the evidence of your senses; it is preposterous to affirm that “the gospel was preached to every creature,” and so forth; therefore, that you cannot believe so and so, is no evidence that what is objected to is false. You make an assertion, set up yourself as a ruler and judge of God’s meaning, and set yourself in array against those to whom it was promised, that “they should see eye to eye, and be led into *all* truth.” This maintenance of your own individual judgment, would, by an apostle, be condemned as the thought of “the natural man,” to whom the covenant of grace is “foolishness;” to whom it appears as absurd to declare that in Paul’s day the gospel had been fully preached, just as it appears equally absurd for Peter to proclaim as he did, on the day of Pentecost, “This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days (*these* last days, Heb. i. 2,) saith God, I will pour out my spirit on *all* flesh.” No, this cannot be; Peter is wrong, you say; “all flesh,” is contrary to fact, contradicts the evidence of our senses; we say, “Let God be true, though every man be found a liar;” let his Word speak its own language, “My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.”

Again, It may be that an objector brings before you a scripture which you interpret in accordance with a past second coming, but which, through ignorance or prejudice, or perhaps both, he cannot receive, and immediately, because he cannot receive it, he condemns you as being in error, and repeats his objection, as though not a word had ever been offered in answer. Passing by the folly of such a proceeding, suppose there were scriptures (and I am not saying whether there are or not,) but suppose there were scriptures which we could not reconcile with the doctrine of the past second coming, is the doctrine to be denied and condemned for that? No sensible person would say so; no sensible opponent would venture to take such ground, and why? Because he would prove too much; he would damage his own cause, more than he would ours; for where the upholder of any religious system could bring one scriptural objection against our doctrine of the past second coming, I would undertake to bring fifty, or five hundred, against his opinion of a future coming. And then, moreover, with respect to the supposed non-ability of interpreting every scripture in favour, which appears to make against us, may we not be allowed to ask, if it is not quite as possible that the revelation of the infinite God should not yet be exhausted in a way of discovery of its glories; just as it is possible that the same should be the case in natural things; in every department of natural science; especially if, as we believe, priest-craft has so prevailed in the world as to shroud in Egyptian darkness what must be considered to be the commanding truth of the Word of God, I mean, this same second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is the question in debate between us and the various religious establishments of the day.

Mention of the second advent reminds me, that I must leave, at all hazard, this preparatory matter, and come to the consideration of that our fundamental position. The consideration will involve a view of opposition between us and the common Christianity of the day; and this view will, I expect, embrace a short outline of divers important events connected with a past second coming; and this outline will convey much by way of answer to the many objections that are urged against the interpretation of Scripture which we maintain.

I purpose, then, to prove, from the Bible, the second coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. This must be done in a manner concise enough to be consistent with clearness; and so many are the different methods of proof which the Scriptures allow, that the difficulty is to select that which is best adapted to my present address, and which will at the same time place the subject in the most incontrovertible position. I do not wish, and we have no need that it should be said of us, as we affirm of our opponents, that *we* deal only in assertions, as might be said, if I were to take it for granted, that because the second coming was proved over and over again, in times past, in another place; there is therefore no occasion to go over the same ground again, though we now stand in a different position, and are bound to give the reason of the faith that is in us. And moreover, as I know well that these views of divine truth are a complete revolution in religious matters; therefore, I do not forget that there is a necessity for line upon line, and precept upon precept, in order that the gene-

rality of minds may arrive at anything like an apprehension of what I conceive to be their vast and all-important bearings.

In proving the doctrine of the past second advent, on this occasion, I am disposed to adopt the plan which has been ably followed out by my friend Mr. Stark, of Torquay. The plan to which I allude is, the explanation of the Bible by means of diagrams, shewing the various states, dispensations, or constitutions of God, in which he was pleased to deal with and manifest himself to his people (his church) under each covenant, the law and the gospel. (See *Biblical Inquirer*, No. 2.) I would observe, in passing, that I might confine myself, for proof of the doctrine, to the testimony of Christ to his disciples, as given in the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew. I might rest the doctrine of the past second coming on the answer which Christ returned to the disciples' question about the temple. "*When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the consummation of the age?*" I might now maintain and prove, as you know I have often proved, that all which is related in answer, down to the end of the 25th chapter, refers to one and the same period of time; and as all commentators will allow that some matters relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, and some to a final judgment yet to come, I might ask a question, which has never yet been answered, "*Where does one topic end, and the other begin?*" Or if, to extricate themselves from this difficulty, the commentators say that they are *interwoven*, I ask again for the proof, and that proof not from carnal reason, not from human imagination, but from the word and testimony alone. And if the proof should be attempted, I might ask innumerable questions like the following :—"How do you reconcile *your* view of this scripture, 'This gospel of the kingdom must first be preached in all the world, for a witness to all the nations, and *then* shall the *end* come;' how do you reconcile this with Christ's promise to his apostles, 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the age,' seeing that the promise, *in effect*, is now no longer visible, let the end have transpired or not—now no longer visible, if (as must be allowed on all hands,) the *effect* of that promise was, that which is declared in the last verse of Mark's Gospel, 'They went forth, and preached *everywhere*, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with *signs* following;' which signs, the Apostle to the Hebrews declares expressly, 'God also bearing them witness with signs, and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts (distributions) of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will.' (Heb. ii. 4.)"

Or again, in choosing to rest my belief of the past second coming on these two chapters of Matthew, if it were argued that there is a double fulfilment of these chapters—and let me here observe, that every popular commentary which I have seen upon them, does not argue the double fulfilment, but takes the same for granted; or if there is a shadow of reason offered for the double interpretation, it is the stale human objection, "*because it is impossible that such and such things could be spoken in reference to Jerusalem alone.*" Well, if it were objected that the circumstances related in Matthew xxiv. and xxv. were fulfilled, in a primary sense, at the fall of the temple worship, and the end of the Jewish economy, but that there is a secondary sense in which

they are yet to be fulfilled, I might ask again for the proof. I deny the doctrine of double fulfilment, as having no authority from Scripture; as a doctrine which has been exploded by one of the first Biblical scholars of the day, in a work to which no answer has ever been vouchsafed. (Dissertations on Prophecy, by Dr. Lee, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.)\* I can here speak with the greatest confidence, and am disposed likewise to speak strongly, because I believe that it is the same absurd double interpretation which is at the bottom of the thousand-and-one different doctrines of the day, all of which doctrines, we are told to believe, are equally and alike the truth of God. I would, to prove this, call to your remembrance how often you have heard preachers, especially what are called "Calvinistic experimental preachers," give a double interpretation, a primary and a secondary sense, of Christ's promise to his about-to-be inspired apostles, "Take no thought how or what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; for it is not you that speak, but the *Holy Ghost*." How often have you heard the ministers of the day apply this to themselves; and yet one of these ministers (Arminian) is "able to gainsay and resist" the other (Calvinist), not on a matter of mere ceremony, but the very vital doctrines of Christianity itself.

Again, to show the absurdity of double interpretation, I may mention, that I remember reading a review of a sermon which I published in the times of my ignorance, in which review there was a passage to the following effect:—"It will rejoice us to find the author 'led into all truth.'" Now, according to the religious belief of the reviewer, so far from being led into all truth, I am, doubtless, in his estimation, the upholder of the "vildest heresy that has ever appeared in Christendom." Behold, then, in this scripture, the application of what belonged to an *inspired* ministry; and in the reviewer's expressed wish, behold the assumption of the miraculous gift "of trying the spirits, whether they be of God," and in the failure of that assumption, behold the absurdity of double interpretation; and, as the originating cause of the above absurdities, behold the assumption of apostolic succession by those who would be horror-struck if you told them that they believed in that doctrine as firmly, but not by any means as honestly, nor as wisely, as the poor despised Roman Catholic. Our view, which we believe to be scriptural, is this:—The Old Testament is typical of the New, and, as typical, contains all that is in the New: but the New Testament is neither typical of another New Testament, nor yet of itself. The commonly received view is the reverse of this, and the inevitable consequence of such view is that which the Mormonites have arrived at. We must have a further revelation, to explain that which is already in our possession: we must, if any prophecy of scripture is yet to be fulfilled, have a ministry to give us the infallible interpretation of such prophecy: therefore, by consequence equally inevitable, there being none of these requisites visible, God is charged with imperfection, with beginning a work, and not being able to finish it; or, if this be preferred, God is thought to be even such a one as ourselves.

We might thus proceed to our proof of the past second coming, from the 24th and 25th Matthew; and in the proof we might bring in

\* See Note A.

the other three Gospels, and the Apostolic Epistles, by way of confirmation; but this would extend the address further than our limits allow. I choose, for the present, to adopt the diagram method of dealing with the Scriptures—for many reasons, chiefly because of its simplicity. A plan of this kind deals with particular passages of scripture according as they fall under different states or dispensations: a plan of this kind preserves that right division of the Word of Truth which Paul, in sketching the character of an *inspired* bishop, enforced upon Timothy, and exhibits that beautiful scripture in a glorious fulfilment, "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." This method of dealing with the Scriptures, moreover, as has been justly observed, addresses both the eye and the ear, and thus appeals to an objector, requesting him, as might well be done in a public lecture, to point out what he may consider to be erroneous.

Diagrams, showing the order of divine revelation, abound in Scripture, and are to me a convincing proof that "the hand which wrote it is divine;" that the same Almighty Being who spread the starry heavens, who "appointed the moon for certain seasons, and the sun to his going down," is He who has declared, "Out of Zion, the whole perfection of beauty, God shineth clearly." (Compare Psalm l. 2, with Heb. xii. 18, 21.) Diagrams, attended with this glorious consequence, abound; take, for instance, the diagram presented to our notice in the first chapter of Genesis, as an illustration of the above remarks. We find therein the scriptural account of the creation of the world, solely intended, I am inclined to believe, for the purpose of exhibiting a shadow of the different dispensations in the church. I allude to the division into days. How read we? "The earth was emptiness and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep;" but there ensued, as we are told, the distinct operations of God in his creation work; which work is described by the division of successive days, each day's work being distinct, and each day's work complete. The chaos is reduced to order—at the end of the sixth day there ensued the Sabbath, or rest; and "God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good." These days, we observe, were shadows of the dispensations, and the rest was a typical rest, the antitype being a rest in the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ, which was to remain for the people of God. In the light of these days we are satisfied to behold the creation of "a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness;" which believers of the apostolic day were looking for (2 Peter iii. 13), and for which they were exhorted "so to run that they might obtain," but which, if modern doctrines are true, they have not yet obtained, and are looking for still. We are persuaded that the last day in which it was lawful for a man to work out "even his own salvation, with fear and trembling," was that of the apostles; that this preceded a seventh day, a "Sabbatismos" (Heb. iv. 9) of a finished work, of rest—"rest," as Paul observes, "with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels" (2 Thess. i. 7); and that this revelation was at the cessation of their ministry and apostleship, that is, when the Lord came to the destruction of Jerusalem, and was "glorified in his saints, and admired by all them that believed;" while the adherents to the Jewish house

were "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power," as it is to this very day. We are persuaded that then was the eternal Sabbath-keeping ushered in, into which we have entered, most, if not all of us, after a weary pilgrimage through the dispensation work, as though that were to be enacted over again in our own individual person. This is our belief. On the other hand, according to religious systems, there is no such beautiful arrangement as the above at all; being ignorant of God's distinct dealings, being ignorant of God's righteousness, which is the righteousness of a new heaven and new earth, and not of Moses—being unable rightly to divide the word of truth, they look upon, and virtually make, the Bible to be a book without form and void—a chaos of unutterable disorder, and have reduced it, in the estimation of thinking minds, to the degraded position of the most inconsistent, absurd, and contradictory system of religion that was ever devised.

Again, I take another diagram—The descendants of Abraham went down into Egypt, and Moses (a prophet like unto Christ,) was sent to deliver them from the bondage to which they had been subjected, the seed of Abraham having been promised an inheritance in the land of Canaan. Here again we have a diagram, which is presented to us in the following order:—

1st.—The redemption from Egypt.

2nd.—The journey through the wilderness.

3rd.—The possession of the promised land.

This was typical, and the same order is antitypically observed in the New Testament:—

1st.—The redemption from spiritual Egypt, or the bondage of Moses' law.

2nd.—The journey through the trials and tribulations of the Apostolic state.

3rd.—The land, rest, inheritance, or new heaven and earth manifested and obtained at the second advent of Christ.

No one, I think, can object to this arrangement; it is a comparison of type and antitype, which recommends itself to every unprejudiced mind at a single glance. No one will quarrel with the arrangement, but very few will be disposed to agree with me as to the time of type receiving fulfilment in antitype. Into this, then, I will most patiently enquire.

I presume that it will be admitted on all hands, that the first of these three typical representations was accomplished on Calvary, when Jesus said, "It is finished!" that spiritual Israel was then redeemed from the bondage of Moses' law, as literal Israel had been from Egyptian slavery; that the mild invitation of Immanuel then indeed began to take effect, "Come unto me, all that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" that "grace and truth" were then introduced, with a "yea and amen" witness, to supersede the law that came by Moses. I suppose none who call themselves Christians will deny this; so far from that, I believe there are few but would *in words* carry that redemption further than I should myself; for I do not view it complete in salvation until the appearing again the second time. I pass by this as granted by all parties, and come to the second typical representation,

“The journey through the trials and tribulations of the apostolic state,” answering to the journey of the Children of Israel through the wilderness. That there were trials and tribulations in the Apostolic state, needs no Apostle of this day to prove; nay, so far from want of proof, if men would but be honest with themselves, and had “such an heart in them” as seriously to resolve upon examining the pretensions of their several ministers and pastors, they might weigh them in the balance of Apostolic suffering alone, and find them, one and all, to be utterly wanting. If Christians of every denomination would but contrast the temporal reward of the “ministers of Christ,” with that of those who have assumed their office, with the hireling labourers of the day; if they would but examine the testimony of an Apostle, and hear him show forth this *his* apostleship; “We both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place, and labour, working with our own hands (though the labourer was worthy of his hire); being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat; we are made as the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things to this day”—“unto this day;” if Christians would but seriously resolve whether that “unto this day” is visible now; if they would bring these matters, in their true and scriptural meaning, to bear upon their self-styled ministers, the whole fabric of the priesthood must soon be tumbled to the ground.

That there were trials and tribulations in Apostolic times is granted. The testimony above quoted is decisive. But we need not leave the matter here. It is written, “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution;” and religious systems say that it is exactly the same now. It may be; but in order to know whether it be the Scripture persecution, I must know what it is to “live godly in Christ Jesus;” and to know this, it must be resolved to me what the words “in Christ Jesus” mean. I go round to one body calling itself Christian, and they give me their definition of what it is to be “in Christ Jesus.” I go to another, and another, and another, and I receive their several interpretations. I expect that they will all “speak the same thing,” “be of the same mind and judgment.” I open them, I compare, and to my distress and perplexity I find that their sentiments on the subject are so various and discordant that it would be a hopeless task to attempt to make anything of them. I therefore reject their preaching, and believe that for any of them to say, “All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution,” is a mere assertion, unsupported by a shadow of proof. It was not so in the Apostles’ day. These inspired teachers had no disagreement as to what it was to be “in Christ Jesus;” and, being of one mind in the doctrine, we receive their persecution as persecution for truth’s sake.

Again, it is written, “we must, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of God” (Acts xiv. 22), but then religious systems deny that the kingdom is yet come. And again, it is written of the 144 thousand, “the remnant according to the election of grace,” the “all Israel,” saved in that day with an everlasting salvation, it is written of these, and “the number which no man could number,” “These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” But

religious systems say that this is true of every Christian now living, after departing this life; and truly if it be affirmed of any coming out of tribulation now, we need not travel far for an example, in one whose name has been cast out as evil, by those who not long ago could address him as a "dear brother in Christ Jesus." But no matter. Religious systems say that there is this tribulation still, as preparatory to an entrance into the kingdom of God. How do they prove it? Oh, the answer is in a moment, from such systems as pretend to this part of Apostolic succession—Oh, it is said, look what a sinner passes through before he finds peace; remember a law-work upon the conscience—a horrible dread of eternal misery—doubts and fears as to the soul's everlasting welfare—and so forth.

Is this the tribulation of which Apostles speak? Nothing of the kind; the Apostles knew better; they preached the gospel with demonstration of the Spirit and power; they preached the glorious doctrine of the assurance of faith; "Whosoever loveth is born of God, and knoweth God; and if we should say we know him not, we should be liars, like unto the world." Is this the tribulation of the kingdom journey, then I grant there is plenty such like at the present hour. But then, we ask, "Who is the author of it, and whence its origin?"—The very systems themselves: they have "darkened counsel with words without knowledge;" they have buried Christianity under a heap of "wood, hay, stubble, gold, silver, and precious stones;" they have set up, each for himself, a "standard;" they have made poor enquiring souls their "hewers of wood, and drawers of water;" and, having done all this, they call it Apostolic tribulation. Apostolic tribulation was of heaven, and not of men. It was because of the existence of that Jewish economy which was in their day called "Satan transformed into an angel of light;" which was "Satan going about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he might devour;" (compare 1 Peter v. 8, with Psalm xiv. 4,) which was Satan raging because the time was short; all which is proved on a reference to the Acts of the Apostles, where we find Satan going about seeking whom he might devour, in the person of the Jews persecuting the Christians from city to city, because, as was averred, they "spake blasphemous things against Moses, the law, and the holy place." This was the originating cause of trouble then, from the man of sin, Antichrist, flesh, (the law, see Romans viii. 8,) the carnal mind, which was attached to the law, whose strength was sin, which was the sting of death, the wages of sin, of which death the devil had the power. The religious systems of the day have taken up "the body of this death;" they have dressed and decked out the loathsome corpse; they have called the same Christianity. There is no beauty in it that men should desire it, and in trying to fancy it, to love it, to fall down before it, and worship it, there is trouble superadded to all the ills which "flesh is heir to;" and what could you expect but trouble? The truth is, systems attach their own meaning to the scripture tribulation, and that is a meaning which has no reference to the times and seasons, and is quite independent of God's meaning.

Having offered these remarks upon the word tribulation, I might go on at great length to prove, from the Apostolic Epistles, these wilderness trials of theirs, in connexion with the typical trials of Israel of



old. Take one instance out of many. Paul addresses the Corinthians, in chap. x. 1st Epistle, in a way of warning, by contrasting their position with that of Israel in the wilderness. "These things were our ensamples," or types, is the literal rendering. Here is the very thing which we are contending for: and again, in the 11th verse, "Now all these things happened unto them for types, and they are written *for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages* (not as it is in our translation rendered, "the ends of the world,") *are come.*" And what are these? "Neither let *us* tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted; neither murmur ye, &c. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them." This comparison of Old Testament with New, is sufficient alone to prove the exact correspondence, even in point of time, between type and antitype, which we seek to establish. But this is not all. If Scripture is any authority, we can fix the time.

The type in this diagram occupies a space of forty years. "Forty years was I grieved with this people." Now, let us bear in mind the testimony which has been brought forward from Corinthians, and compare that with the 3rd and 4th of Hebrews. Instituting a comparison, we find the Apostle applying the same warning to the Hebrew believers as to the Corinthians; and in the Hebrews it is glorious truth to notice how, in declaring the antitype, he fixes the time to the same period of forty years. Having discoursed of God's anger with Israel of old, his long-suffering for the space of forty years, the "to-day," "the Lord's day," as it is styled by John in the Revelations,\* he then enforces this type, and applies it to those whom he was addressing, "Exhort one another daily, while it is called 'to-day,' and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." (Compare Heb. iii. 13, with Heb. x. 25, and Rom. xiii. 12.)

This comparison appears to me conclusive as to the *time* of the second advent, and beautifully so when I recollect that the Apostolic ministry, "the Lord's day," in which God was grieved with the Jews, as he had been with their forefathers, was the like period of forty years. I cannot avoid believing, from this comparison, that as Old Testament Israel entered into the temporal Canaan at the expiration of forty years, so also spiritual Israel entered, not by faith, but by sight and enjoyment, into the eternal and spiritual Canaan, after the forty years' wilderness troubles of the Apostolic ministry.

On the other hand, the common opinion of the day is well expressed in a verse of a well-known hymn—

"Jerusalem, my happy home!  
Name ever dear to me;  
When shall my labours have an end,  
In joy, and peace, and thee?"

It might be asked, if it were worth while, How is the common opinion to be reconciled with what Paul expressly states respecting himself and his fellow-Christians, "Ye *are* come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem."

The religious establishments of the day, one and all, believe that Moses led the children of Israel through the wilderness, and that when

\* See Note B.

Moses was taken away, Joshua was raised up to be a leader and commander of the people in his stead. Therefore they believe in an Apostolic succession under the old covenant, until the object of that succession was obtained. They believe also that the Apostles led the New Testament believers under their ministry; they believe that they committed their own miraculous gifts "to faithful men, who should be able to teach others." They do not believe that these Apostles, and their fellow-trustees of the New Testament, led their people to the promised land, executed their trust, till they all came to the incorruptible inheritance; therefore they now believe in Apostolic succession; and if so, we ask where are the gifts by which to prove our present trustees "faithful," and to which of the conflicting parties of the day are we to address ourselves as our guides, our watchmen, our ministers, our pastors, our executors, under the New Testament will, or covenant, till we all do come to this rest, which is still, it is said, to appear for the people of God? These officers must be somewhere, if the rest be not yet made manifest; for it is written, "He gave some apostles, some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, *till we all* come into the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man; to the measure of the fulness of the age of Christ." (Eph. iv. 11.) These pastors and teachers were miraculously endowed men, as well as the Apostles; Stephen and Philip, both deacons, were able to cast out devils, to speak with new tongues, and so forth, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. We ask for these signs from our present "pastors, teachers, and deacons;" they cannot shew them; we have the evidence of our senses that these gifts have failed. But they were to continue till a given time, "till we all come." We conclude, then, that this has come; that the great state of the unity of the faith is manifested; and as there is no evidence of these miraculous gifts continuing after the days of the Apostles, we conclude likewise that the time of their ceasing was when the spirit of prophecy departed. "*We* know in part, and *we* prophecy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." I submit this view of the subject to the consideration of my fellow-Christians, as a test whereby they may try them which say they are "pastors and teachers," whether they be the very successors of the originals or no. If these successors reply, that though they cannot work outward miracles, "signs to them that believe *not*," yet they are commissioned of the Holy Ghost, as well as Paul or Timothy, or the "faithful men" to whom Timothy entrusted his commission; then let us ask for the Scripture proof of this assertion; let us ask this, because, without proof, a thinking mind will laugh such an assertion to scorn. And if, leaving this refuge, they affirm that though the heavenly Canaan be not yet entered into, there needs no divinely appointed ministry until this do come to pass; then let us ask what is to become of the above-quoted passage from Ephesians, and how can it be denied but that Christ has been guilty of a breach of promise, when he said, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the age." Let the present pastors and teachers read that promise as they choose to read it, "to the end of the world;" let them

understand that promise as they are bound to understand it by the scripture, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be condemned. *And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.*" Mark xvi. Let, I repeat, the present pastors and teachers act thus honestly with the Word of God, and they must, from the Romanist down to the Baptist, know that their name of minister and pastor is only a "cloak whereby to lie in wait to deceive."

I come now to a second series of typical representations. I shall show how the New Testament unlocks the mysteries of the Old, in a series of antitypical references to the kingdom state, *i. e.*, how the same conclusion which we have just considered is exhibited in another way.

We have,

1. The kingdom or house of Saul.
2. The kingdom or house of David.
3. The temple of Solomon, for the record of God's name, to move no more.

This is typical, in the Old Testament; and antitypical to this, we have, under the New Testament—

1. The opposing house of Saul, or the Jews under Christ's ministry
2. The kingdom of David (Christ) in the ascension state.
3. The opening of the temple at the sounding of the last trumpet when the mystery of God was finished.

If time would allow, it would be very profitable to institute a comparison of scriptures under these several heads of type and antitype. For instance, with respect to the kingdom or house of Saul answering to the Jews under Christ's ministry, is there not much instruction conveyed to us when we read of David in the cave of Adullam, that "every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented gathered themselves unto him." It will not, I presume, be thought fanciful to conclude that we have here a typical representation of the fact regarding David's Lord, "The publicans and sinners came together for to hear him," and he said, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted; to preach deliverance to the captive" (Luke iv. 18). Then, again, as respects the kingdom of David, in comparison with the ascension kingdom of Christ, we have this record in the Old Testament, "There was long war between the house of Saul and the house of David, but David waxed stronger and stronger, and the house of Saul weaker and weaker." Is not this, it may be asked, a shadow of the glorious truth recorded by the Apostle to the Colossians, "Having spoiled principalities and powers, (Jewish,) he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in himself." (Colos. ii. 15; compare Psalm ii.) And do we not acknowledge the antitype of David's house growing stronger and stronger, in scriptures like these, "So mightily grew the word of the Lord and prevailed," "to

the pulling down of *strong holds*, casting down imaginations, and *every high thing that exalteth itself*." (2 Cor. x. 4, 5; compare 2 Thess. ii. 4.) And then, once more, it is written, "The LORD (Jehovah) said unto my Lord, (the resurrection name of Jesus; compare Psalm cx. i, with Acts ii. 36,) Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool,"—is there no mention of anything typical to this in the words of Solomon to Hiram, king of Tyre? "Thou knowest how that David my father could not build a house to the name of the Lord his God, for the wars which were about him on every side, until the Lord put them under the soles of his feet. But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither adversary nor evil occurrent." (1 Kings v. 2, 3.)

I think what has been stated will, if Scripture is to be the standard of truth, be allowed; and being allowed, we must draw the same conclusions from this diagram as from the preceding. Paul's commentary in Hebrews iii. and iv. applies equally to both. We are led to believe that as the Lord God put all enemies under the soles of David's feet, and gave Solomon rest on every side, so also was it with antitypical David and Solomon. The Lord God, at the destruction of Jerusalem, made his foes his footstool; he completely abolished death, of whom it is said, in 1 Cor. xv., "Death, the last enemy, is disabled:"\* he took away entirely the first covenant, which was "the ministration of death," that he might establish supremely the second, which was the ministration of life; he removed the things which, in Paul's day, "were shaken, that the things which could not be shaken might remain." (Heb. xii. 27) "The heavens (of the Jewish church) passed away with a great noise; the elements ('beggarly') melted with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that were therein, (all that attached to the Mosaic economy, see Heb. ix. 1—11,) were burned up, and the new heavens and new earth appeared," (2 Peter iii.) Now, if at the destruction of Jerusalem there was a taking away of the first covenant; a removing of the old heaven and earth, and a burning up of the same; and if sin, Satan, death, and hell have their true and scriptural meaning in reference only to the two covenants of Sinai and Sion, as consequent upon the Adamic transgression—and proof to the contrary is defied—if these things be so, then are we warranted in concluding that the time when the covenant of Sinai was "everlastingly banished from the presence of God, and from the glory of his power," being the destruction of Jerusalem, and every thing *opposed* to God being comprehended in that covenant, and having no Bible meaning out of that covenant—that at the same destruction of Jerusalem all these the enemies were put under Christ's feet, the fall of Jerusalem being, if his own words are any authority, most indisputably his second coming to "reward every man according to his works." (Matt. xvi. 27, 28.)

On the other hand, the common opinion of the day is, that so far from sin, Satan, death, and hell being destroyed in the finished work of Christ, these several enemies are stronger than ever; and truly they are so, if we consent to leave the Bible out of the question, and look at the revival of the Jewish economy as it exists in the different religious systems of the day. What is the origin of all this, which we believe

\* See Note C.

to be a mistake? The truth is, that here, as in the matter of tribulation already mentioned, religious systems have fixed their own meaning to these terms, which is a meaning independent of the Bible; which knows nothing of what it was John's intention to convey, when he said, "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not;" and which carries itself, as might be expected, even into what these systems call heaven itself; for, holding a resurrection of the same body which is laid in the grave, they must believe that "flesh and blood" can enter into their kingdom of heaven, seeing that it is impossible to apprehend how the body which we now have can be raised, while yet it is denied that it is raised a flesh and blood body.

But I am satisfied, as in the former series of types, so in this, to test both by the ministry, by the doctrine of Apostolic succession. We exhibited the antitype of the building of the temple by Solomon; in the opening of the temple not made with hands, at the sounding of the last trumpet, when the kingdom of God was fully established. Now the Apostle, in 1 Cor. xv., connects the sounding of the last trumpet with the doctrine of the resurrection "at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised." Now we know, from the Acts of the Apostles, that the grand theme of Apostolic preaching was "Jesus and the resurrection;" so much so, that the Athenian philosophers imagined this resurrection to be the name of some God: and again, Paul declared, that "he was called in question of the hope of the resurrection of the dead, the hope of the promise made unto the Fathers; to which promise the twelve tribes, instantly *serv*ing God night and day, hoped to come." (Acts xxiii. 6, with xxvi. 6.) Now the resurrection, being part and parcel of that preaching of the gospel to which this promise was made, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the consummation of the age;" therefore the resurrection must be limited by the same consummation of the age, and must consequently be past, the Apostolic age and ministry being now no longer visible, and the promise of Christ being now of none effect. No, say modern systems, the resurrection is not yet past. Then it follows, we must have preachers of the resurrection, and if so, we ask how is their doctrine established? What sign have these preachers that they are the great power of God? if they cannot shew the credentials of their ambassadorship, the authority for their preaching, the "outward and visible sign" that it is "faithful" preaching, then no wonder that we reject them, and disbelieve their doctrine.

But they give a sign. If, for a sign, they tell you and me of a "mouth and wisdom," is it such as we, their adversaries, can neither gainsay nor resist? If for a mighty wonder whereby to prove their authority, they talk of "a sealing of the spirit," or a sealing to their ministry, is it such as can overthrow the "sealing unto the day of redemption," which has been proclaimed to you, and is proclaimed this day? If they test a minister of Christ, and a steward of the mysteries of God, by what they call an ability to remove the stumbling-blocks out of the way of Zion's children, then should we long to see a specimen of their handiwork in removing the scandals which, on their own showing, I have laid on their path. If they can, as they say, wield the sword of the spirit in favoured seasons, there is opportunity given for

wielding it with effect in cutting down "the vilest heresy which has ever appeared in Christendom." If they surname themselves by the name of Paul, do they not aver that here is a successor of Hymenæus and Alexander? then, like Paul, in *his* day, let these his successors, in *their* day, give us the *inspired* word of God, a *New Testament Epistle*, and so prove that this is an error which declares the resurrection to be past already, that same already being the short space of nearly 1800 years, and a generation only nearly twice as old as Methuselah; and when these self-same successors have proved the doctrine of a *now* past resurrection to be erroneous, then, executing their high commission, let them deliver me, the successor of Hymenæus and Alexander, "over to Satan, that I learn not to blaspheme."

So much then for our two diagrams. I shall now proceed to bring before you a diagram on a larger scale, embracing a comprehensive view of the whole Bible, running upwards from Adam through the line of promise, to the second advent of Christ at the time of the fall of Jerusalem.


Having described the utility of the diagram scheme, I give, on the next page, a sketch of the diagram now under consideration.

This diagram shows the line of promise up to the time when all promises were fulfilled. This line I call "the truth as it is in Jesus," which opens up to us that glorious scripture, "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy." The line runs from Adam through Seth, who was given another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew, and is carried on to Shem, the son of Noah, in whose time was the deluge, or end of that world; "the *world* that then was being overflowed with water, perished," says Peter, in 2 Epistle iii. 6; and yet "the perishing" consisted only in this, "all flesh died that moved upon the earth;" the fish of the sea did not die; the sun, moon, and stars remained as at the first, and continue to the present time, even though it was said, eighteen hundred years ago, that the stars should fall from heaven, before some then alive should taste of death!

The line runs from Shem, through Arphaxad, and up to Abraham, who is styled in the New Testament, "the heir of the world." Abraham was the heir of the world, as two special and particular promises were made to him; the one under the name of Abram, the father of the families of the tribes of Israel; the other, as Abraham, or the father of the nations; and here I may observe, that a distinction which has been drawn between the person, character, and work of Christ as spiritual Adam, and spiritual Abraham, appears to be altogether without foundation, spiritual Abraham being evidently, in the promises, co-extensive with spiritual Adam.\* In Abraham and his seed, the families and the nations, Israel and the heathen, were to be blessed. The seed was Christ, a fact which religious systems would (judging from their conduct in other and similar cases,) never have allowed, had not the New Testament placed it beyond dispute. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the *promises* made. He saith not, And to seeds, as to many, but as of one, ("as the body is one, so also Christ,") and to thy seed, which is Christ." The line of promise, looking at the diagram, proceeds from Abraham to David, and on to Christ. And so we find that

\* See Note D.

THE ETERNAL KINGDOM ESTABLISHED, BEING THE LAST AND FINAL STATE  
GOD IS ALL AND IN ALL.



THE LINE OF PROMISE.

Matthew begins his Gospel with these words, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

Having offered these few observations on the line of promise, up to the opening of the New Testament, I shall now proceed to give a brief explanation of the four last states under the New Testament, to the end of the Apostolic ministry, which end we believe to be the fulfilment of all the purposes of God in Christ Jesus, in the establishment of his eternal and unchanging kingdom.

The first state extends to the first boundary line, and exhibits the ministry of John the Baptist, as the forerunner and messenger to prepare the coming of the Lord. This messenger of God, with his ministry, was prophesied of, under the Old Testament; "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." (Isaiah xl. 3.) Now suppose, for a moment, that the diagram represents a ladder, Jacob's ladder, if you will, and suppose that the four states under consideration are four rounds of the ladder, and that the last round is the Apostolic ministry, at which the ladder ends. This ladder, we read, is "set up on the earth, and the top of it reaches to heaven," and they that ascend and descend upon it, are these same Apostles—the angels of Michael, and the churches, as we shall hereafter have occasion to show. This ladder is the line of promise, beginning on the earth, with the first man, Adam, who was of the earth; so that Jacob does not reach anywhere near the first of the four rounds we speak of, which was the ministry of John. Between Jacob's round of the ladder, and John's, Isaiah comes in. Now, in looking at the diagram, you observe lines drawn from an oblong square, and running up into one or other of the four states of the New Testament. These lines are so many different prophecies of Isaiah, and one, which runs into the ministry of John, is the prophecy above quoted out of Isaiah's 40th chapter. I desire here to offer a very important observation. The prophet speaks of John as "a voice;" and John said, "I am the voice;" but before John appeared on the stage of God's dispensations, there was no voice at all, nor any that answered to Isaiah. Isaiah's declaration was a hidden mystery—a vail was over the face of it; it was, in fact, a prophecy to be fulfilled, a word of the wise, and yet a dark saying. When John began to fulfil his course, the voice spoke, the vail was withdrawn, such and such portions of the Old Testament were interpreted by the New, and men were no longer to be left in doubt, either as to the time or person of the fulfilment. Imagine then to yourselves, and you must do so, in order to attain to a right understanding of the Scriptures—imagine that you, like Apollos, (Acts xvii. 25,) lived in John's day, and, like Apollos, though mighty in the Scriptures, you knew only the baptism of John. How much of the Old Testament, in reference to the New, would you understand? John's baptism or ministry, as did Apollos, and no more. You are standing within the first boundary line, in the first of the four states of the New Testament, on the fourth round of the ladder from the top; surely, then, are you not entirely ignorant of the remaining three? Is there not a vail over them? is not the curtain down? the mystery yet unsealed? is there anything more than a seeing afar off, as in the case of Abraham and the Fathers?



And yet, notwithstanding this fact stares Christians in the face, they will read the Bible as they read a newspaper, as though all of it had taken place only yesterday; they will persist in mixing together the "times and seasons;" they will have it, that, instead of God being a God of order, he is the author of confusion. I am the more earnest in offering these strong remarks, because I do believe that if the right division of the Word of Truth were attended to, the view of Divine revelation which we entertain would be brought home with irresistible power to many a mind, which, for want of that right division, cannot receive it. But to proceed. John's ministry was of divine appointment; he was "called of God." He had, as Paul declared at Antioch, a course to fulfil—a baptism, which the same apostle calls, the "baptism of repentance" to minister, and prophecies to declare. Having such commission, seeing that "the law and the prophets were until John, but since then the kingdom of God was preached;" thus, indeed, John was "a burning and shining light." He was that Elias who was first to come, and restore all things, of whom the disciples were ignorant that he had come.\* John was dignified with the high and honoured title, "the friend of the Bridegroom;" and Christ, in the parable of the sheepfold, calls him the porter—"to him the porter openeth." John was "more than a prophet;" of those born of women—David, and Samuel, and all the prophets, there had not risen a greater than he; and yet, mark the glorious truth, "He that was least in the kingdom of heaven (the ascension kingdom of Christ,) was greater than John."

We have here a list of remarkable sayings concerning this forerunner of "the Consolation of Israel," the meaning of which sayings religious systems can only guess at, and which they, for the most part, pass by as of no account whatever. In the knowledge of a right division of the word of truth, these sayings are clear in their interpretation, and precious in their exhibition, of God's orderly counsel and revelation; here we are at no loss to comprehend somewhat of the eternal weight of glory which is laid up in that scripture of Proverbs, "The path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth brighter and brighter unto the perfect day." Shining light!—look for a moment at the testimony concerning John; "He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. This is the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Here we also can bear witness to that light, and believe that it is not such "a Will o' the wisp" as religious sects would have us be persuaded; for we see, in the case of John, that as the different states, or different phases, of the Church of God were unfolded, so they advanced in importance, clearness, and extent, till it was not a voice that spake; but there were heard voices, and thunders, and lightnings, and a great voice came out of the temple of heaven, from the throne saying, "It is done" (Rev. xvi. 17); and, after these voices, after the pouring out of the seventh vial in the desolation of Jerusalem, "the seventh and last trumpet sounded, and there were great voices in heaven (all the prophecies sounding harmoniously together,) and the mystery of God was finished, as he had declared by his servants the prophets." (Rev. x. 7; xi. 15.)

\* See Note E.

I shall not, for want of time and space, go through the remarkable history of John's birth, worthy of a prophet indeed as that history is. I pass on to observe that in due time John began to fulfil his course, and we find, in Matt. iii, that he who was to make straight in the desert a highway for our God, (compare Isaiah xxxv. 8,) commenced preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, saying, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The kingdom of heaven was at hand, but not yet come; just as when Paul wrote, "The time of my departure is at hand," the time of his death was near, but not yet arrived. John, in his preaching, fulfilled the prophecies recorded in Isaiah and Malachi concerning him; and here let me remark, that lines might be drawn from either prophet, running up within the last boundary line, on the side of the ministry of John. In reference to his ministry, and the succeeding, John said of Christ, "He must increase, but I must decrease." John was a burning light, a star in the firmament of the church, but a brighter star was rising, which, in its sending to, and shining upon, the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and bearing a light to the Gentiles, should eclipse the former, though that outshone the splendours of all that ever came before it. John prophesied, "I indeed baptize with water, but there standeth one among you whom ye know not; he shall baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Jesus came to John's baptism, recognising his divine commission, and fulfilling all righteousness, as a "minister of the circumcision." John knew not Jesus till this baptism, but afterwards he bore testimony to him, and diverted attention from himself, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!"\* Thus John preached, and this was the consummation of his preaching, which began with a voice, "Repent," and proceeded to a proclamation of the things that were to come to pass. John spake, with the greatest clearness, of the fall of Jerusalem,—“the old wives' fable” question, as it is called,—when he warned the Scribes and Pharisees, by intimating to them that the axe was now laying to the root of the tree, that every tree that brought not forth good fruit should be hewn down and cast into the fire; that he was among those whose fan was in his hand, and whose purpose it was to burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. This was John's prophetic testimony, which he wound up with this exclamation, "O, generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come!" Here are strong expressions, terrific figures, and it might well be asked, What right have any, as is the common practice, to put a different interpretation on these things, than they evidently bear in John's ministry, and by what authority is it that modern successors of John, interpret, for instance, "the wrath to come," apart from God's just vengeance on the Jewish nation? John continued his ministry, and men "rejoiced in it for a season." To that ministry, as we have seen, belonged a baptism, so likewise prayer. This is clearly to be understood. The disciples came to Jesus, and said unto him, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." John's prayer was a dispensation matter peculiar to his ministry, and doubtless, looking at Christ's prayer, it was offered up for the greater and succeeding ministry, for the further revelation of God's will; just as the prayer which Christ

\* See Note F.

taught his disciples, was for that kingdom in which they should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. The Baptist fulfilled his commission, and then disappeared from the stage of God's dispensations. His ministry was complete in itself. *There was no succession to that ministry*; and I trust we shall be able satisfactorily to prove, indeed we have already proved, that it is as reasonable for modern ministers to affirm that they are successors of John the Baptist, as it is to speak and act in the character of successors of the Apostles, which is a charge that fairly attaches to them, from the highest Calvinist down to the lowest Arminian.

---

WE have now considered, at some length, the ministry of John. That ministry appears to me to require a much more minute investigation than the compass of this work will allow. The records which are left concerning it in the Gospels, are most pointed and peculiar. It appears also that these records are of such character and complexion, because John's ministry was the connecting link between the Law and the Gospel, the Old Testament and the New; or, in other words, between the natural man and the spiritual, that is, the covenant of works, and the covenant of grace.

It has been proved that John's ministry was prophesied of in the Old Testament, and that the ministry was fixed, as regards time, "before the coming of the Lord." It has been seen that John occupied the position which had been assigned to him; that he rose a star in the firmament of the church, at the season appointed of the Father. So far, then, all is well; a due order and arrangement is preserved; of all the good things which the Lord had promised Israel should come to pass in the last days, not one thing has failed hitherto, to the conclusion of the course which John was to fulfil. This is by no means of trifling importance, for if one of these things so promised had failed—if, for instance, Elias had not come, as the disciples, in their carnal ignorance once supposed—if the ministry of Jesus had been the first under the New Testament, and a gap or a gulph had been left where the ministry of John should have come in, then that Jesus would have been no better than (as Gamaliel hinted, see Acts v. 33—41) the Theudas and Judas who had preceded him; then the Apostolic day, (if we can imagine such day at all,) would have been as a Babel, worse confounded than that on the plains of Shinar, instead of exhibiting a glorious oneness and simplicity of the truth. Indeed, the consequence would have been none other than that which is evident in the different systems now mistaken for Christianity. These systems affirm that the perfect state of the unity of the faith is not come; and by such affirmation they create a gap between the cessation of the Apostolic ministry and the present period, which it is impossible for them to fill up from the Bible. The Bible will render them no assistance. The consequence is as fatal to Christianity as though I should take the Book of Genesis, and the Revelations, and maintain that these two solitary

books were the whole of the inspired writings. But we have not so learned Christ.

Having offered these further remarks on John's ministry, I will now proceed with the following, and entirely distinct, ministry of Christ. I now come, in a right division of the word of truth, to consider the second of the four New Testament divisions.

John was baptizing in Jordan, and Jesus came to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" Jesus answered, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him." (Matt. iii. 13.) After this baptism, there ensued the temptation in the wilderness. "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." I may be allowed to make a short digression on a matter connected with this temptation. I would desire to ask, for a moment, Who or what is signified here by the name of "Satan?" For my own part, I have no difficulty in considering Satan, in this temptation, to signify Christ's own countrymen, the Jews, or, in one word, human nature; just as I look upon Satan, in Job, to be no less nor more than Job's three miserable comforters, and his own self-righteous principle.\* The words, "Get thee behind me, Satan," in the temptation in the wilderness, do not much differ from Christ's word to Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou art a scandal unto me;" neither, again, is there much obscurity in the suggestion, "Command that these stones be made bread," when I compare it with John iv. 31, "His disciples *prayed* him, saying, "Master, eat;" but he said unto them, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." There was a needs be for the temptation, and also that it should here be recorded at the beginning of Christ's ministry, in this figurative form. The Apostle to the Hebrews writes, "In order that he might destroy him that had the power of death, the Devil ('accuser of the brethren'), it behoved him to be made in all things like unto his brethren (the accused), that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." (Heb. ii. 14—18.) One glorious instance of this succour is recorded in the history of Peter, when, after the denial, the Lord turned and looked upon Peter, and he went out and wept bitterly. Now it is evident who was the tempter, the Devil, in the case of Peter and the rest of the disciples. The Lord, in the garden of Gethsemane, had straitly charged them thus—"Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation." It is evident that the temptation was from the Jews, as it is written, over and over again, "for fear of the Jews;" and observe how beautifully this corresponds with Christ's own saying at that time to the Jews, "This is your hour and the power of darkness." (Luke xxii. 53.) Paul writes, "He is able to succour them that are tempted." Follow that Apostle from city to city, behold him flying on the wings of Christian affection, proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ, and ask yourselves, who were his tempters, where lay his troubles, whence his fightings without, and fears within? That same Jewish house, that same covenant of

\* See Note G.

works, in which the carnal mind delighted, was at the bottom of all. And what is true of him, is true of the rest. Peter writes to the brethren, "Think it not strange concerning the fiery trial (temptation) which is to try (tempt) you." But religious systems say it is the same still to this day. So say I; but, as was asked in the matter of tribulation, so we ask here in that of temptation, Who is the cause of this? The systems themselves. They are revivals of the Jewish house, and if I, for instance, were willing to let Bible terms have any other than a Bible meaning, I might come forward and say, that I have endured temptation from the revival of the Jewish economy, as exhibited in the Church of England. O that men would permit that the Bible should speak for itself; that there were such a heart in them as to cease from perverting the good ways of God.

This digression will be pardoned. I will now return to our regular history. Jesus, having overcome the temptation, "the Devil departed from him for a season;" and if this be a personal Devil, an individuality, it will be difficult to prove that he ever came to Christ again: not so, however, if the Devil were the Jews; for how often is it written, "They came to him tempting him?" After the temptation, Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned into Galilee, and there commenced his ministry, upon which ministry I intend to offer but few remarks, as the subject speaks for itself, and is its own interpreter. In looking at the diagram, you observe the ministry of Christ begins at the first boundary line, and ends at the second, which is the period of time immediately before his crucifixion. These were its limits, and if any one should extend those limits, or bring into the ministry matter which did not belong to it, this would be to make the word of God of none effect. For instance, if any should aver that either Christ or his disciples, in this ministry, preached the gospel, "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," they would confound two distinct dispensations, and give occasion for innumerable errors, which would only end, in what indeed we witness, in our religious systems—a heap of confusion. This ministry of Christ was peculiar, as was that of John; and as in the examination of John's ministry, it was first of all proved that that ministry was prophesied of in the Old Testament Scriptures, so also I shall now proceed to prove the same respecting the ministry of Christ. I have directed your attention to lines drawn from the prophecy of Isaiah, in the diagram. One of these lines, as we have seen, is a prophecy running up into the ministry of John, foretelling that ministry. I now call you to notice another line—a prophecy from the same prophet, running up into the ministry of Christ, foretelling that ministry. The prophecy to which I allude is the opening verse of Isaiah's 61st chapter, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." I might go much further back for prophecies respecting the ministry now under consideration. There is a most remarkable one delivered unto Moses, in Deut. xviii. 18, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all the words that I shall com-

mand him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." We observe from these words how forcible was the testimony of the Son of God to the Jews in his ministry; "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, Moses, in whom ye trust; for had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me." (John v. 46.) I might also refer you to the Book of Psalms, that glorious armoury of truth; "Hear this, all people; my mouth shall speak of wisdom, ('Christ, the wisdom of God,') and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding ('he shall be of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord'); I will incline mine ear unto a parable, I will open my dark saying upon the harp." Now this latter verse, from the 49th Psalm, is quoted in Matthew's Gospel as a prophecy of the ministry of Jesus; "All these things spake Jesus to the multitude in parables, and without a parable spake he not unto them; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the *prophet*, saying, I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world." (Matt. xiii. 35.) This is explicit enough, as not belonging to David, but to David's Lord, to whom, and to whom alone, belongs the crown of the Psalms, as of every other portion of the word. The like testimony is delivered in the Gospels, respecting Isaiah's prophecy above quoted, and that by Christ himself; "When Jesus came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read: and there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias; and when he had unrolled the book, he found the place where it was written, 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.' And having rolled up the book, he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all of them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture *fulfilled* in your ears." (Luke iv. 18—21.) It has been beautifully observed on this passage, that it is remarkable the Son of God did not go through with the whole of this prophecy concerning himself and his ministry. He was not only to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, but also the "day of vengeance of our God." I would here invite you to notice how our all-wise God hath "made every thing beautiful in his time." It was in time now for Jesus to preach the acceptable year of the Lord; "Come unto me, all that are weary and heavy laden, and I will refresh you." It was not in time to proclaim the day of vengeance of our God. When the Son of the Highest, the Carpenter's Son, in his countrymen's estimation, stood up amidst the doctors in the synagogue of Nazareth, the hour was not yet come for the pathetic lament, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem!" The day of vengeance had its appointed season of proclamation. It was after he had stretched out his hand, and no man regarded; after he had wrought many miracles, and wonders, and signs, among a disobedient and gainsaying people; after he could say, "I have laboured

in vain, I have spent my strength for nought; for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing"—it was then that he executed his commission to the full, saying, "*These* be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." In this scripture we see that the Lord Jesus performed the work of the ministry, according to Isaiah's prophecy; and we are not left without further testimony of his own to that fulfilment, to this doing the work of an evangelist. When he was about to leave the world, and go to the Father, he offered up the following, in a prayer which, if any, may indeed be called, the Lord's Prayer. "I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." (John xvii. 4.) Now a question might very pertinently be asked, either of Calvinism or Arminianism, What interpretation do you put upon this scripture? and how can you reconcile it with a subsequent scripture, when Jesus said on the cross, "It is finished!" and how do you reconcile this with Jesus' own word, of all things written being fulfilled, in the destruction of Jerusalem? and then, having accomplished the task of making these three texts agree, how do you reconcile with them your view of fulfilments yet future?

Being ignorant entirely of a right division of the word of truth, being altogether strangers to God's righteousness, such questions as these are of the number to which the Bibles of Calvin and Arminius can return no answer. In the knowledge of God's perfect and harmonious work, there is to us no difficulty of reconciliation in the case. When we read of Jesus speaking to the Father of a finished work, we understand that of the ministry now under consideration. We do not confound it with his redemption work, which was wrought out through his death, neither with his salvation work, which was accomplished when, (as we shall see,) being a high priest, not after the order of Aaron, but Melchisedec, he came not, like Aaron, out of the holy of holies, but out of heaven itself, in the fall of the Jewish economy, thereby making manifest that God had accepted his ministerial, redemption, and intercessory work, appearing as he did, a second time, without sin unto salvation.

The finished work, then, of which we read in John xvii., is the prophetic and ministerial office, to which office Christ, quoting Isaiah lxi., declared himself to be sent. Now it is in this work that we behold Jesus a greater than John; just as we shall behold the Apostles greater, as ministers, than Jesus, according to his own testimony, "The works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to the Father." Jesus said of John, "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness to the truth." But he said also, "I receive not testimony from man;" nay, he said of himself, "If I bear witness myself, my witness is not true." What then was the witness? The answer is plain. Having said that he had greater witness than that of John, he adds, "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." Examine the context in the 5th of John, in which chapter the above texts occur, and you find that these works were connected with this solemn saying, "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and they that hear shall live;"

and again, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice," (John v. 25—28,) which "marvel" somewhat resembles that addressed to Nicodemus, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again;" and, indeed, the same truth is expressed in both verses. Examine, I repeat, the context thus; and when you hear the Son of God discoursing of works like these; and when you read him affirming that these works were given him to finish, for a testimony of his mission; and when you find that one of these works is expressed thus, "All that are in the graves shall hear my voice," then stay a moment, and ask yourselves a question or two about the common doctrine of the resurrection, whether it do or do not bear testimony to the mission of Christ, eighteen hundred years having elapsed, and as yet, according to the commonly received views, no fulfilment. Examine the works of the Son of God, from the first beginning of miracles which Jesus did in Cana in Galilee, down to the last work on record, the fall of Jerusalem, and you hear one and all giving greater witness than that of John, "Truly this was the Son of God."

Thus then it has been proved that Christ's ministry was prophesied in the Old Testament. Three several prophecies, from as many different prophets, have been quoted, with their fulfilment in the New Testament; therefore, as in the preceding ministry of John, it follows, that such and such portions of the prophets became, in Christ's ministry, a clear revelation to the church, no matter whether understood or not. Having thus exhibited the ministry, and its fulfilment, I will now proceed to enquire somewhat further into the circumstances attending it. And first, of the call of the disciples. John came preaching in the character of the forerunner of the Lord; so likewise Jesus "chose seventy disciples, and sent them before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come." (Luke x. 1.) This choice of the seventy was subsequent to that of the twelve Apostles; "After these days, the Lord chose other seventy also." The preaching of the seventy, in the character of forerunners, was similar to that of John, "Be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you;" and yet their preaching differed from John's. John did no miracle, though Jesus puzzled the Scribes and Pharisees, so that they could not say that John's baptism was of men, because all the people counted John for a prophet. John's preaching was prophecy, unattended with miracle; the preaching of the seventy, and of the twelve, was accompanied with miraculous power, for Christ said, "Into whatsoever city ye enter, *heal the sick* that are therein, and say unto them, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." They did so. Having gone forth with their message, and exercised the powers with which they were entrusted, they returned to Jesus with joy, saying, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us." Thus, it is evident, from the prophetic testimony entrusted to John, and the miraculous powers bestowed upon the seventy, that there never was an imperfect ministry sent forth of God, but that when he commissioned any man, or any body of men, to perform the work which he had in hand, he fitted and qualified them for the work, and enabled them to go through with and finish it; and, if he has any work in hand now, any dispensation service, it is the very



same to this day; we must have ministers to do the work, and these must be qualified equally with their predecessors. There are ministers, we are told. Are they prophets? No. Can they work miracles? No. Therefore they are no ministers.

Jesus, as we have seen, sent the seventy before his face; and when they returned with joy, he intimated to them the high honour which in this their ministry they had received, "He turned him unto his disciples, and said privately, 'Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see; for I tell you that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.'" (Luke x. 23, 24.) Here, once more, have we occasion to notice the paramount importance of a right division of Scripture; and here, again, we are reminded that the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. The disciples went into every place whither Jesus himself would come, but they were commanded not to go into the way of the Gentiles, nor any city of the Samaritans, but rather unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. This latter part of the verse exactly corresponds with Christ's own ministerial mission, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." I beg that this may be particularly noticed, as drawing a line of separation between the ministry of Christ and his disciples, and the succeeding ministry of the Apostles, and also as affording us a key, wherewith, among other things, to open the true meaning of the parables. When I hear, from Christ's own lips, that he was not sent (ministerially) except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; when I know, moreover, that his parabolic discourses were delivered especially to the Jews, then I am led to search into the meaning of those parables, with special reference to the Jewish history. And how does the search operate, and with what result? With a result which alone is sufficient to convince me that the views which I entertain are the truth of God. I consider what is left on record of the preaching of Christ to his own nation and people; I find that his preaching embraced the world before the flood, "declaring the end from the beginning;" I observe particularly, that he went to the root of the apostacy in that age, when he said to the Jews, "Ye are of your Father the devil, and the lusts of your Father ye will do," (surely the Devil is Cain here,) "he, the Devil, was a murderer from the beginning," just as he was a liar in Eve's peccable composition. I see, in Christ's preaching, that he associates the fratricide Cain with the fratricide Jews, in his declaration that the blood of Abel should be required of that generation, which had gone in the "way of Cain." (Jude 11.) I discover that Christ was very particular, in discoursing upon Sodom and Gomorrah, the overthrow of Nineveh, and other remarkable Old Testament portions; and that he discoursed on these subjects, in order to confirm the evidence of prophecy, in a way of warning to the men of that generation, upon whom the ends of the world were come, and for whom the Apostle declares these things to be ensamples or types. (1 Cor. x. 11.) I behold, then, that Christ's preaching to the Jews was occupied with little else than the fall of Jerusalem, let the fall of Jerusalem be "old wives' fables" or not. I behold all the prophetic testimonies revolving round "that great and

notable day of the Lord," that day being, if the figure may be allowed, the centre from which the whole Bible is a multitude of radiating lines. I refer to the parables, properly so called, and the same Jerusalem, Jerusalem, is Alpha and Omega throughout; the same stiff-necked and uncircumcised people are still the inexhaustible theme. I behold, in the light of the successive ministries and dispensations, that the parables have a definite meaning, of which, while a Calvinist, I could form no conception whatever. Take, as an illustration, the parable of the prodigal son. The common notion of the prodigal son is, that he represents a repenting and returning sinner. Therefore it comes to pass that there are as many prodigal sons, as there are different descriptions of a repenting sinner, and there are as many different definitions of a repenting sinner as there are sects, systems, or parties — their name is legion. And then, for an interpretation of the elder brother, this is a character which religious systems could never fathom; all that they can say about him, or the whole parable, is, on their own confession, conjecture. How do we interpret this word of the wise, and his dark saying? The prodigal is none other than the ten lost tribes, which modern religious systems are so diligently seeking for to this day. The elder brother represents the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and who the Father is was never doubted. The same interpretation applies to the lost sheep, and the lost piece of silver, in the same xvth Luke, as also to Lazarus, in the parable of the rich man, which rich man denotes the elder brother Judah. The like interpretation is true of the "other sheep which are not of this fold," in John x. These represent the lost ten tribes, the lost sheep of the house of Israel, as do also the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind, for whom a feast was made and provided. Here is a list of parables, which, by understanding the nature and object of Christ's ministry, are plain and intelligible, but which, for lack of that understanding, are still parables, in the preaching of religious systems. Here is a power to exhibit God's most blessed will as one undivided truth, in opposition to a thousand different doctrines, which must be false.

Having considered the ministry of Christ, our next step (following the plan adopted in discoursing on the preceding ministry,) ought to be into the baptism thereto appended. I shall dismiss this part of our subject with a remark or two upon the latter part of the 3rd chapter of John's Gospel. We read, in verse 22, "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa, and there he tarried with them and baptized." This is explained in a parenthesis, in 2nd verse of 4th chapter, "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," showing that the disciples' ministry, at that time, was only an appendage to that of Christ. John was baptizing at the same time, and his disciples, with certain of the Jews, came to him, saying, "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him." John's disciples and the Jews were then disputing a certain question about purifying, so that in this mention of purifying, and two baptisms, we are led to understand what was in Paul's mind when, in 6th Hebrews, he exhorted to leave the first principles, among which was the doctrine of "divers baptisms," or washings. The disciples, in their address to John, appear

to have entertained a fond thought that John was himself the Messiah, or, at least, a desire that he should assume that character, and the answer which is returned to that address would lead us so to conclude; "Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said, I am not the Christ, but I am sent before him." The same remarks are illustrative of John's sending certain of his disciples, when he was in prison, to Christ, asking, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" This was not, surely, for John's satisfaction, but for the satisfaction of those who followed him. He would here again divert men's minds from himself; and such would be the effect consequent upon the answer to the disciples' question, "Go and shew John again those things which ye do see and hear. The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." (Matt. 4.) Now John did no miracle; this, then, was to tell the disciples that he (Christ) had greater witness than that of John.

I will now offer a few observations on the subject of prayer, in connexion with this ministry of Christ. "And it came to pass, that as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." The Lord did teach them a prayer, and that is commonly called The Lord's Prayer; and it is prayed four or five times every Sunday morning, thereby transgressing the precept, "Use not *vain* repetitions." This prayer was very necessary at the time when it was given, "Jesus said, If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit unto them that ask him." (Luke xi. 13.) How glorious here is the comparison of spiritual things with spiritual, in John vii. 39, "The Holy Ghost, or Spirit, was not yet given, for Jesus was not yet glorified." To ask for the Holy Spirit *now*, betrays the most lamentable ignorance of the Bible.

Again, "Thy kingdom come," was once a beautiful petition, for they were then preaching, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." According to religious systems, it is at hand still. The cloven foot of Apostolic succession is ever creeping in, as exhibited in the absurd scheme of a double interpretation of scripture terms. It will be allowed by all sects, that the kingdom of heaven is come, in a certain sense or senses. They will speak of a kingdom of grace in the heart, a kingdom of Christ in the church, and a kingdom of glory above, while there never was but one kingdom of heaven. That was the Apostolic dispensation of the Holy Spirit-preached gospel, in its progress and final establishment to be an eternal and unchanging kingdom. It was this kingdom of the new and better covenant in Christ's blood, which the disciples prayed for, but when it *was* come, the petition was made void, because obsolete, out of date. This will clearly appear, if for a moment we connect the petition with what Christ is recorded to have said to his disciples; in John xvi. He had told them, "I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." After this he added, "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing." What day? This question puzzled me a long time, until I discovered the answer in the foregoing verse. That day in which they should ask

him nothing, was the day when he should see them again ; that is, the time between the resurrection and ascension ; which day, for aught I can see, may as well be called the Lord's day, as the first day of the week. Thus scripture is truly its own interpreter, and thus it is that every day we see fresh cause for exclaiming, "It becometh well the just to be thankful." Well then, to proceed. When Christ had said, "At that day ye shall ask me nothing," he said, moreover, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it to you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name ; ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." Was Christ a false witness, or the faithful and true, when he said, "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name?" Every one, from the highest Calvinist, down to the lowest Arminian, replies, "The faithful and true." Then, I ask, by what authority do you repeat, or by your presence in the services of the Church of England sanction, the repetition of this the Lord's prayer ? If the testimony of Christ is of any value, there is nothing asked in his name in that prayer ; indeed, this is plain, from the wording of the prayer. But he bids them henceforth to ask in his name. If men are to be guided by the testimony of Christ, then that which is called the Lord's Prayer was a proverb to the disciples. "These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs, or parables." (John xvi. 25.) This is borne out by facts ; for when the disciples prayed, "Thy kingdom come," every one knows that their notion of the kingdom was that it should be a kingdom of this world, a kingdom in deliverance from the Roman power, and not from Moses' law. Exactly the same is the notion of those who pray, "Thy kingdom come," to this day, as is evident from their millennial dreams. But to return. "These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs ; but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall shew you plainly of the Father." After this there follows, in the next verse, "At that day ye shall ask in my name." What day ? The time then coming, when there should be no more proverbs ; when they should be led into all truth ; when the Holy Ghost, the wonder-worker, should bring all things to their remembrance ; then should they ask in his name, and if in his name, they must put the Lord's Prayer aside. Now that they did ask in his name is evident ; "Whatsoever ye do, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus"—that Jesus who was crucified, and in his resurrection made Lord and Christ—"giving thanks unto God, even the Father, by him." And that the disciples did put aside the prayer Christ taught them, is equally evident ; not a vestige of it is to be found in any one of the Epistles, or in the Acts ; therefore, I conclude that on this one ground of objection we might safely rest our secession from the Church of England.

I have thus glanced at the subject of prayer, in its connexion with Christ's ministry, and have proved from Scripture that the prayer of that ministration passed away.

Two states or constitutions have now been manifested ; every thing that appertained to them has come to pass, whether one or one thousand understand the fulfilment. The vail has been withdrawn from the ministries of Christ and John ; the curtain has been lifted up so far ; we have read the proof of this revelation in the words, "I have finished the

work which thou gavest me to do." We are come, then, to the garden of Gethsemane, wherein the 69th Psalm, among other prophecies, lifts up a voice on high. We travel from Gethsemane to the judgment-hall of Pilate, and from thence to Calvary, and there, at that hour and power of darkness, we read of the fall of Jerusalem occupying the mind of the Son of God, be the interpretation of that fall what it may. There, on the road to the place where they crucified him, he turned unto certain that followed him weeping, and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children; for behold the days are coming in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare. *Then* (in these coming days,) shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us, and to the hills, Cover us;" and yet, notwithstanding this is so definite in its meaning, modern Christianity steps in with the monstrous absurdity of double interpretation, and thinks it a small matter to affirm that the cry, "Mountains, fall on us," is a cry yet to be lifted up, at an imaginary judgment-day. (See Scott's and Henry's Commentaries, &c., &c.) We accompany the Son of God to his death, and in the scriptures just quoted, we behold how truly his ministry was to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Into the history of that death it is not my purpose to enter, neither into the prophecies concerning it. We know the record, the unconditional record, of the same, "The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." It was a prophecy of this man, "His name shall be called Wonderful." One record of that name I read in the closing words of the Gospel by John, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written. Amen." One very touching example of these "many other things" we have in the conversation of Jesus with the disciples on the way to Emmaus; "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv. 27.) We are tempted to wish that that exposition had been written; glorious indeed it must have been, when the effect upon the ignorant hearers was such as this; "Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?"

We are advanced now into the third state under the New Testament, the third division of the diagram, which represents the period of time from Christ's resurrection to his ascension. Of this state we have no obscure intimation in Isaiah liii. 10, "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." This prophecy is the line which I would draw from the oblong square already mentioned, into this third state. There is an explicit prophecy of this state in the 16th Psalm, of which the Holy Ghost, by Peter, has this remark, "David, seeing that God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, spake before of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, neither his *flesh* did see corruption." During this state, the conversation of Christ was confined to his disciples; his ministry was ended, therefore he spake no more to the people, though he was seen of above 500 brethren at once. This state

was very peculiar; peace was written upon it, and Christ appears to have been all in all to his disciples, so that it was indeed true which he had told them beforehand, "At that day ye shall ask me nothing." But while thus happy in the society of their Lord, and of each other, we must not forget that the ignorance at which the Lord hinted, in the close of his ministry, was yet untaken away. In order to prove this, I must go back a little way, to the season between the death and resurrection. The women which had followed Jesus prepared spices and ointments, that they might embalm his body; so much did they understand the psalm which said, that his flesh should not see corruption. They came to the grave—the body was gone—and they were told that Jesus was risen. They returned to the eleven; they informed them of what they had heard and seen, and with what results? "Their words seemed unto them as idle tales, and they believed them not." And why did they not believe? Because, as we are informed in John's Gospel, "they knew not the Scripture, that Jesus must rise again from the dead." This is plain enough, and yet who of the preachers of these times recognises it? which, of all of them, does not in his preaching hold forth, that the disciples were equally well informed before as after the ascension? Nay more, have we never heard that David was better instructed in spiritual things than any Christian is or can be now? How seldom do we meet with even a glimmering of a knowledge of the times and seasons, and how pitiable is the thought of the unutterable confusion which has thus ensued! O yes, when we think of these things, we cease to wonder at Mary's simple question to him whom she supposed to be the gardener, "Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." We cease to wonder that two of the disciples, as they journeyed to Emmaus, should say, even after they knew that Jesus was gone from the grave, "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel." And ceasing to wonder at these things, in the present prevailing ignorance of the spirituality of God's word, we are at a loss what to say to this reproach, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?" O fools! aye, and how much more now. "Have I been so long with you, and yet have ye not known me?" Was this the reproach in days when the Holy Ghost was not yet given, in times when the New Testament was not written? and are we necessitated to ask the same question of those who talk of the power of divine teaching, of a finished salvation, of the unconditionality of eternal life, of comparing spiritual things with spiritual, of the Bible being "foolishness to the natural man, because it is spiritually discerned?" Is it come to this? while at the same time these very persons, who thus betray their ignorance, will pity us as being in error, or even condemn us for unbelievers! It is written, and it is well that it is written, for it is glorious, *experimental* truth, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord."

During this intermediate state, Christ gave to his Apostles their extended commission. He had called the twelve unto him previously, as we have seen from Matt. x., and had sent them forth, as he had sent the seventy, to preach the kingdom of heaven, and to prove their

preaching by signs and wonders, in power over unclean spirits, and healing all manner of diseases. "He ordained twelve, that they might be with him;" and for what purpose they should be with him, we learn from the Gospel of John, "Ye also shall bear me witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." Now at the time when the twelve were called to their apostleship, he restrained their ministry to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; a restraint which remained in force till long after it was virtually removed. It was virtually removed when he said unto them, "Go ye into all the world (empire), and preach the gospel to every creature; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end, consummation, or perfection of the age." This was an unlimited commission, accompanied with a particular promise. But these words were not addressed to Judas, only to the eleven. Judas had obtained part, or shared in the lot, of the ministry, (compare Acts ii. 17, with Acts ii. 25, 26,) but from his lot he by transgression fell. He had neither part nor lot, no interest whatever, in the extended commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" if he had, he would have inherited the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the age." So that we observe from this, that the old cry of a Judas among the Apostles, is an idle sound. There was a Judas among the Apostles, when they wist not what manner of men, nor of what spirit, they were. There was no Judas in that company which could say, "God hath given unto us the spirit of a sound mind, for we have the mind of Christ." The Lord delivered unto the eleven their extended commission, and his promise. This promise was, that he would be with them even to the end of the world, which end of the world was akin to the end of the old world, not a dissolution of this visible system of things, but an end of the Jewish economy and nation; an end corresponding to the preceding end at the deluge, in more respects than one; for as Noah and his family alone found favour in the eyes of the Lord, and were saved alive, so an inspired Apostle writes of Israel, "Even so *now* there is a remnant, according to the election of grace." And again, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" The commission, with the promise, is recorded in Matthew's Gospel. Now, for the nature of the promise, we refer to Mark, where we read, "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

This brings us, in due order, to the last of the four states, the Ascension Kingdom of Christ; for it is immediately added, "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." Now we are not to understand by this, that on the instant after Jesus had spoken, and after he had ascended, the Apostles so went forth. No, we search the Scriptures, comparing one portion with another, and though we find recorded that Jesus opened the understandings of his apostles, and expounded unto them the Scrip-

tures, yet we do not confound this understanding with that of the day of Pentecost. Be the understanding never so great, it did not qualify the Apostles as preachers of Jesus and the resurrection, for the Lord accompanied it with this warning, "Behold I send the promise of the Father unto you, but tarry ye here at Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." Be the understanding however clear, it was compatible with ignorance, such as the following, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" for this question appears to have been put immediately before the ascension. Let the understanding be what it may, Jesus himself intimated its weakness and inefficiency, when, in reply, he said, "It is not for you to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put into his own power." After having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, it was for them to know the times and seasons. Peter discovered this knowledge, when, on the day of Pentecost, he proclaimed the last days of Joel's prophecy; and Paul writes, in his Epistle to the Thessalonians, "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I should write unto you." (1 Thess. v. 1.)

We have now examined three Evangelists on this matter of Apostolic commission, and we find that their testimony agreeth together; they bear witness to these Apostles, that they were designed by Christ to be ministers indeed. The eleven having been appointed, as we have seen, did wait at Jerusalem for the promise of the Father. Previous, however, to the fulfilment of that promise, they must needs (if I am not mistaken) busy themselves with doing, as usual, a little work on their own account. The ever-forward Peter counselled his brethren to choose one who should supply the place of Judas, who had fallen from his lot in the ministry, according to prophecy in Psalm cix. Peter stood up among the rest, and said, "Of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, *beginning at the baptism of John*, until that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." (Acts i. 21.) Peter's suggestion, no doubt, had its origin in the remembrance of what the Lord had said to the twelve, "Ye also shall bear me witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." Whether Peter was now acting with or without authority, I do not undertake to decide, but I am inclined to think that the choice of an Apostle was unauthorized, and it appears to me that the Lord Jesus afterwards set aside the choice, in calling the persecutor, Saul of Tarsus, to supply the place of Judas as one of the twelve foundations of the spiritual temple not made with hands. Besides, I do not find that an Apostle could elect an Apostle: these first-rank officers in the church were commissioned directly from the Lord: moreover, there was at this time no promise to the disciples that they should be led into all truth, and therefore, as they had always been in error hitherto, it seems most likely that the present was no exception: and again, we can find no Scripture warrant for their strange proceeding in casting lots in a matter of such momentous importance. And, be it observed, it makes nothing against this view, that the proceeding was conducted with solemn prayer, "They continued with one accord in prayer and supplication," it may be for the Holy Ghost, according to the promise,



“How much more shall your heavenly Father give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him?” Their prayer at this time was, most unquestionably, not prayer in the Holy Ghost; it had nothing whatever to do with this subsequent exhortation of an Apostle, “Praying alway in the Spirit,” or with that scripture of deep meaning, Rom. viii. 26.

But to proceed with our history. The Apostles waited at Jerusalem, and “when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance,” &c.

We are now arrived within the last of the four states, the Kingdom of Heaven, in considering which, I propose, for brevity's sake, to confine myself chiefly to Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost. The subject is so vast, that it is impossible to give more than a mere outline, and for our present purpose this must suffice. This state is called

#### THE MOUNT ZION STATE,

and was prophesied of in Isaiah's second chapter, “And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow into it; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” The law here mentioned is, as we shall hereafter have occasion to show, “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.” This went out of Zion, of which Zion it is said in Psalm cxxxiii., “There the Lord commanded the blessing, even *life for evermore*.” Now, that these prophecies were fulfilled in the Apostolic dispensation, is evident from Paul's word to the Hebrews, “Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.” This the Hebrew believers would well understand, being acquainted with the Old Testament Scriptures; and I suppose that it will be admitted on all hands that when the Apostle here writes to them of Mount Zion, it is a spiritual mountain which he has in mind; that here, at all events, Zion and Jerusalem, the city of the living God, are not literal, as under the dispensation of the law, in the land of Palestine, but, as under the gospel, entirely of a spiritual nature. And this being admitted, I leave it for the consideration of those who believe that the Jews (so called) will be restored to literal Palestine, whether they are not by this belief inverting with a vengeance the work of God, and really maintaining that the Church of God, having thus, in the Apostle's day, borne the image of the heavenly, that church is to be brought back again, by some inconceivable process of inversion, certainly far from divine, to bear the image of the earthly. The notion is preposterously absurd; and were it not that, if we might follow the bent of nature, we are always for looking upon God as even such an one as ourselves; were it not for this propensity, it were wonderful how ever such a fond delusion as a future Jewish restoration should ever possess any who call themselves Christians.

It appears that the name which has been affixed to this fourth state is scriptural. I shall now proceed to discuss the glorious things con-

nected with this Zion, the city of God, out of which God then clearly shined, and shineth for evermore. As already stated, I will begin the examination with a glance at the wonders which were revealed on the day of Pentecost. This glance will suffice to prove the great object now in view, and that is, that the ministry of this Mount Zion state was prophesied of in the Old Testament, and that, as we have seen in preceding ministries, these prophecies were all fulfilled.

This position is proved at once from the opening words of the history of the Pentecostal day. We read, "There was a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." This is an exact fulfilment of what was predicted in Psalm civ., "He maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire." We say, a fulfilment of this prophetic verse, not from our own fallible interpretation, but because the Holy Ghost so speaks in Heb. i., when treating of the kingly pre-eminence of Christ in that day of the Apostolic dispensation, "And unto the angels (or messengers) he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." The Apostles, these angels of the churches, are at least numbered in this company, as is evident from the following question, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be (are about to inherit) heirs of salvation?" And again, "Unto angels he hath not put in subjection the world to come (about to come) whereof we speak." (Heb. ii. 5.)

The like prophetic announcement of the Apostolic baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire, is given in 1st and 10th of Ezekiel, where, I conceive, the members of the Apostolic Church are shadowed forth under the figure of wheels. I will quote the 13th verse of chapter x., in connexion with verse 17, "It was cried unto them in my hearing, O wheel!—for the spirit of life was in them." Now what we are to understand by the spirit of life, we are informed in the following chapter, which is only a continuation of the same subject. We read in chapter xi., concerning the house of Israel, "Although I have cast them far off among the heathen, and scattered them among the countries, I will even gather you from the people, and assemble you out of the countries where ye have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel, and I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God." (Ezek. xi. 16—20.) There is so much important matter in this connexion of the chapter, that I will, for clearness' sake, discuss this connexion at some length. And first, I would observe, that the wheels are addressed in a collective form, as constituting one wheel, "It was cried unto *them* in my hearing, O *wheel!*" Now I conceive that we have here a beautiful prophetic figure of a glorious reality under the gospel dispensation. Christ prayed for the eleven before his passion, and not for them only; "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one." From this I might call you again to notice how sound and scriptural is the view which we take of prayer, in its dispensation character. Christ petitioned

for a oneness; and to this oneness, to the prevailing power of Christ's petition, the Apostles, in their Epistles, bear abundant witness. Paul writes, "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body; baptized, as on this pentecostal day, with the Holy Ghost and fire." This passage is in 1 Cor. xii. When we read, "so also Christ," we see an emphatic meaning in Paul's question, in the first chapter of this Epistle, "Is Christ divided?" When we read, "we are all baptized into one body," we cease to marvel at an otherwise very marvellous scripture, "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." And when we understand Paul's argument, in this chapter, we recognize the magnificent series of oneness which he lays before the Ephesian believers, "There is one God and Father of all; one Lord, one Spirit, one faith, one baptism, one body," the church, of which this one resurrection Lord was the head and Saviour; a temple for a habitation of God, through the Spirit; and yet in that body, temple, or church, there are many members, just as Ezekiel's one wheel was yet many wheels.

These observations will lead us into a large field of enquiry. Suppose that we put on one side the comparison of spiritual things with spiritual just instituted, we are not left without abundant proof that the inference drawn from it is correct, viz., that Ezekiel's prophecy respects the Apostolic dispensation and ministry. In chapter xi, verse 15, we read, "All the house of Israel *wholly* are they unto whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem have said, Get you far from the Lord; unto us is the land given in possession." Now I remember that Ezekiel prophesied among the first-fruits of the captivity of Judah, the body of the nation being yet in their own land, and therefore I conceive it is this body, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who are thus taunting the captives. But is there no meaning in the word "wholly," attached to the house of Israel? It matters not for our present purpose, whether there be or no, only if there be—if the word *wholly* extend the persons spoken of beyond the tribe of Judah, then we conclude that the promises in the two following verses must be taken in their most comprehensive application. The promises read thus: "Although I have cast them far off among the heathen, and although I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them as a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall come. Therefore say, thus saith the Lord God, I will even gather you from the people, and assemble you out of the countries where ye have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel." (Ezek. xi. 16, 17.) Now, as I have said, I conceive this to be prophesied of the whole family of Jacob, and the promise annexed to the above, in the 19th verse, strengthens this view; "I will give them one heart, (here is the one wheel,) and I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh." I take this to be a New Testament promise. Though we could allow, for the sake of argument, that this new heart and new spirit might receive a fulfilment at the end of the seventy years' captivity, yet other portions of Ezekiel's prophecy are decisive as to its being a New Testament blessing; and, above all, being here connected with the wheels, it must of necessity be carried

to New Testament times, as we shall show when discoursing of the wheels, from Daniel's prophecy. To prove what is meant by a new spirit, in Ezekiel's prophecy, I quote a passage from his 37th chapter; "I shall put my spirit within you, and ye shall live, and I will place you in your land." Now concerning whom the prophet is here speaking, is evident from the verses immediately following; "Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel, his companions; and join them one to another, into one stick, and they shall become one in thine hand." Then we read, verse 18, "When the children of thy people shall speak unto thee saying, Wilt thou not shew us what thou meanest by these? say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before thine eyes. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." (verse 18—22.) Evidently this is a prophecy of the restoration of the ten tribes. That such restoration is to be found in the sacred records is universally admitted; there are, however, great differences of opinion as to the time when the restoration should be brought about. The subject is vastly important in a proof of the past second advent; and as it now occurs in the course of that proof, I shall consider it with somewhat of the attention which is due. Omitting the history of the cutting off of the ten tribes in the reign of Rehoboam, I shall quote a prophecy of the rejection of these tribes; "Within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people." (Isaiah vii. 8.) Ephraim is here mentioned as the head of the ten tribes, as also in the prophet Hosea. This prophecy records that Ephraim, or Israel, should, within sixty-five years, be no more a people, *i. e.* should be cut off from the privilege of the Jewish covenant, should be no longer recognized on the earth as the favoured portion of the Lord, the people of God. When Judah was sent into captivity, it was not so. At the expiration of the seventy years, they were brought back to their own land, to the rebuilding of the temple, and the re-establishment of their worship; so that it was true of these in Christ's ministry, 'They sit in Moses' seat.' The tribes given to Jeroboam (who made Israel to sin,) were never designed of God to be restored to the privilege of being his people, under the Jewish economy. They never have been so restored. We believe, and we shall prove from Scripture, that the restoration was to be, and did come to pass, under the power and glory of the house, not of Moses, the servant, but of Christ, the son; that along with that restoration were fulfilled all the promises made to Abraham, the heir of the world, made in connexion with a spiritual

land, flowing with milk and honey, the glory of all lands, even this, "Thy land, O Immanuel!"

That the restoration was promised under a spiritual covenant, is evident from the quotations which have already been made out of Ezek. xi. and xxxvii., respecting the new heart and one spirit. This will appear further, if we connect these scriptures in Ezekiel, with their parallel passages in Jeremiah xxiii. and xxxi., where we find that this one heart and one spirit is attached to an everlasting covenant; "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah;" and writes Paul, "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old;" so that there are but two covenants. What, then, is the tenor of the new? "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." (Jer. xxxi. 31—34.) The everlasting property of this covenant is expressed (as religious systems must say,) by the everlasting continuance of this visible system of things. "If those ordinances, the sun for a light by day, and the moon and the stars for a light by night, if these depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever." (verses 35—6.) Will all religious systems agree with this statement of the restoration of the tribes, so far as we have now proceeded? No, for they believe that the sun, and moon, and stars will depart from before the Lord; therefore they believe that the new covenant is everlasting, and yet not everlasting; or, in other words, religious systems do not believe in a new covenant at all. They will admit, in words, that the covenant which the Lord made with his chosen people, when he brought them up out of the land of Egypt, hath long since disappeared, and is no longer, as in Paul's ministry, "waxed old, and ready to vanish away." (Heb. viii. 13.) They will admit in words, to which they can attach no meaning, that all restoration expected belongs to a new and better covenant—words, we repeat, to which they can attach no meaning; for what, in wonder, it is asked, do they mean, by asserting that the land of Israel, so often mentioned, as in the passages above quoted, is literal Palestine; how can they believe such contradictions, except they take the new covenant to be another appearance of the old? But this by the way. We have seen, from Jeremiah xxxi., that the restoration was to be, not according to the covenant that God made with the fathers of the house of Israel and Judah, when he brought them out of Egypt. I will parallel that scripture with another out of the same prophet, in his 23rd chapter, 5th and following verses; "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign, and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days, Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely." This is the restoration of the tribes, without a doubt, even if we had not the 3rd verse, which plainly declares that event; "I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them," &c. And what follows after the promise of a righteous Branch? "Therefore, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth,

which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, but the Lord liveth which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all the countries whither I had driven them, and they shall dwell in their own land." If I were to linger for a moment, for the purpose of illustrating this passage out of the New Testament, I would offer the following: The days come when they shall no more talk of the glory of the old covenant, which was but a ministration of condemnation and death, but of the glory of the new covenant, which is a ministration of righteousness and life, the rather glorious; so that that which was glorious had no glory, by reason of the glory which excelled. Now here is great mention of days,—“the days come,” “in those days,” and so forth; but observe, all the days of the Bible have an appointed time; all the days of the Old Testament Scriptures have their bounds, which they cannot pass. “These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.” O if objectors to the past second advent could but blot that faithful saying out of the Bible, or if they could but twist and turn it as they think they can other scriptures, what a relief it would be. But “*littera scripta manet.*” There the record is, and, there remaining, the days in which the Lord God would make a new covenant must be sought for prior to Jerusalem’s desolation. The days when the Lord would bring his people, as he did some time, from the depth of the sea, and cause them to dwell in their own land, must also be sought for on the other side of the year 70, and not, as is the fashion, on this side.

But further: we will examine the Scriptures, and see whether or no they fix any temporary epithet to these days, by which to determine their fulfilment. I open the prophecy of Hosea, and refer to his third chapter; “Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness, in the latter days.” Here, again, is the restoration of the ten tribes, a restoration after having been many days without a king, or prince, or sacrifice—image, ephod, and teraphim: and, if modern doctrines are true, when their still future restoration takes place, it will be to sacrifice, ephod, image, and teraphim, to the old covenant of beggarly elements and carnal ordinances. To the restoration, in this passage of Hosea, there is a time fixed,—the latter days.\* I cannot here stay to examine minutely into the scriptures connected with the last or latter days; to do this would require a volume. I should have to begin with Jacob’s dying address to his twelve sons, “Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you what shall befall you in the last days;” (Gen. xlix. 1) and proceed from this to what Balaam said unto Balak, “Come, and I will advertize thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days;” and so on throughout the whole Bible. Sufficient for our present purpose, to have discovered that the return of the captivity of Israel was to be in the latter days; for, having discovered this, I think we may find the restoration in Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost. How read we? “This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith the Lord, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.” Peter fixes the date of the last days to the time when he was thus

\* See Note H.

speaking. In Acts iii. 24, he styles that time "these days," saying, "Yea, and all the prophets, from Samuel and those that follow after, have likewise foretold of these days." Now, that the restoration of the tribes is intimately connected with Peter's quotation from Joel, is evident on a reference to Joel's prophecy. After the words, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered," we read, "for in Mount Sion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call; for, behold, in those days (the last days), and in that time (the last time), when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people, and for my heritage, Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land." The systems of the day are looking for all this yet to come, for a bodily gathering into the literal valley of Jehoshaphat, thereby subverting the new covenant, and forgetting, when they think of Jesus, as David, king of Israel, that he is the root as well as the offspring of the first David, the resurrection Lord and Christ, in whom there is and was a blessing, with all spiritual blessings, in the heaven of heavens. We recognize the children of Israel, seeking David their king, in the three thousand devout Jews, from every nation under heaven, from the north country and all countries, who were of the remnant whom the Lord would call; the remnant according to the election of grace, as Paul writes, when exhibiting the antitype to the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. We realize, in the conclusion of Peter's sermon, the fulfilment of the magnificent language of the prophets, when telling of Messiah's kingdom, "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are *afar off*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

But while thus believing, and thus persuaded, I am content that an objector shall deny that the Jews, out of divers countries mentioned in Acts ii., were of the dispersion of the ten tribes. If it be any advantage to an objector, he may take the full benefit of an admission that all these, out of every nation under heaven, belonged to Judah, and were not strangers to the commonwealth of Israel, but devout men, coming up, according to the law, to worship with their brethren, after the manner of their fathers. What then? Is there aught gained by such an admission in the matter of the restoration of the tribes? Nothing whatever. The restoration is equally clear as taking place in Apostolic times, without the testimony of Acts ii. as with it, and Peter himself is our authority for this statement. His first Epistle is addressed to the strangers *scattered* through divers countries. Let us see what Peter writes to these strangers, by way of discovering who they were, and what their name. I find the object of my search in the 10th verse of the 2nd chapter; "Which in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." Now I do earnestly desire to be guided into the truth. I am contending for nothing but truth; truth is the sole object which I have in view; and I believe that in this verse I read the fulfilment of prophecy, which said that the children of Israel should return and seek unto the Lord their God, and David their king. With-

out adverting to the prophecy already quoted, ("Within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken that it be *not a people*,") I will give you the grounds of this belief, from the marginal references in the small Bibles which are in almost every one's possession,—I mean the marginal references to 1 Peter ii. 10. One reference is to Hosea i. 10, "It shall come to pass that instead of that it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God;" (compare Rom. viii. 19—21.) Here is the very word of Peter to the strangers. Another reference is to Hosea ii. 23, "I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy, and I will say unto them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God." Here again are the very words of Peter to the strangers. How then can we conclude that these are other than of the dispersion, Hosea's prophecy being allowed to be concerning the outcast of Israel, under the name of Ephraim? But there is still another marginal reference appended to the 10th verse of Peter's 2nd chapter; the reference is Rom. ix. 25, which is the quotation out of Hosea already mentioned. I refer you to the following, the 27th and 28th verses of that chapter, "Esaias also, as well as Hosea, crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved; for he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness, because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth." Who are meant by the remnant is evident from the 11th chapter, "Even so then, at this present time, there is a remnant according to the election of grace." This remnant contained "all Israel," as Israel then denoted Abraham's true seed, but according to the common interpretation, there is to be a time when there shall not be one unbeliever in the family of Jacob; a conclusion as preposterous as the universalism which rests for support on passages like that out of Corinthians, wherein the Apostle is discoursing of none but the church, viz., "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

So much then for one verse from Peter's Epistle, in order to prove who and what were the strangers to whom he was writing. I will now proceed to another, from the last verse of the same second chapter; "Ye were as sheep going astray, but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." There is a class of religionists who talk much of sheep, of Christ's laying down his life for his sheep, of sheep knowing the voice of the good Shepherd. Calvinists will tell us, that the sheep will not listen to the voice of a stranger, (Arminian,) for they know not the voice of strangers. Calvinists will descant by the hour on the nature and disposition of sheep; what silly, innocent creatures they are, how prone to wander; and then Calvinism will lay this flattering unction to the souls of its experimental hearers, as a description of themselves, God's elect family, his sons and daughters, for whose manifestation, we are to suppose, the whole creation is waiting, in earnest expectation, as in the Apostle's day, of mighty signs and wonders. What would Calvinism say, if it were told that all this is little better than wood, hay, and stubble? What would Calvinists say, if it were denied that any beside the descendants of Abraham, any but Jews, were ever spoken or prophesied of, at least in the Old



Testament Scriptures, by the figure of sheep? Calvinism, being thoroughly self-satisfied, can hardly be expected to condescend to a reply. But, supposing that a reply should be vouchsafed, would it be after the quiet manner of Nicodemus, "How can these things be?" I have searched even the New Testament, and can find no direct application of the term sheep to any but Jews, though I am willing to allow, that as Israel, in Apostolic times, signified the company of believers, so also sheep, was used to designate the same company, as in Paul's address to the Ephesian elders, "Take heed to all the flock." But I do, at all events, deny the use of the figure now, if for no other reason than that the office of shepherd, whether applied to Christ or his ministers, has been vacated, and therefore the preaching of Calvinism, in the use of this figure, may well be styled old wives' fables. Peter's strangers are addressed as sheep; they must, to say the least, be included in the dispersion of the tribes. This will open up the scattering mentioned in 1st verse, which agrees with the language of the prophet, "I saw all Israel scattered on the hills, as sheep that have no shepherd." The only other Epistle where a direct allusion is made to sheep, is that to the *Hebrews*, which again is an apparent confirmation of our exclusive view; "Our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep." (Heb. xiii. 20.) Then, again, if we go back to the parables, if we examine the ministerial work of the Lord Jesus, we see that it is written as with a sunbeam, that by sheep, in that work, we are to understand them of the house of Israel. In the parable of the sheep-fold, there are these words, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Peter and Paul tell us, that in their days there was one fold and one shepherd, the Great Shepherd of the sheep. All religious systems will allow, that the lost tribes are at least among the sheep, and this is all that I need contend for. Have they not then heard the voice of the Shepherd for the space of 1800 years? and if they have, where is the Jewish restoration men are now dreaming about? especially if, as I shall prove hereafter, the office of Chief Shepherd hath long since been vacated by our divine Immanuel. Then, once more, connect Peter's Epistle to the strangers, with Christ's parting exhortation to Peter, bearing in mind that Peter was the Apostle of the Jews, as Paul of the Heathen. What said the Lord to him, who had denied with an oath that he knew him? "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep." (John xxi. 15—18.) And so the Lord asked the third time, and a third time received his answer; corresponding with Peter's three denials. If these things suffice not, search further. Let us open the prophets; let us take, for instance, Ezekiel's 34th chapter, wherein there is great mention of shepherds and sheep. We read in the 12th verse, "As a shepherd seeketh out his flock, in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered, so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all

places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day." In the following verse we learn somewhat further of this deliverance; "And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land," &c. In 16th verse, we are instructed in the character of those whose deliverance should be effected; "I will seek that which was lost, ("this my son was lost, and is found again," "if a man have a hundred sheep, and lose one of them." Luke xv.,) and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick." (Compare Ezekiel xxxi. 8, and Luke xiv. 13.) For the time when these things should be brought to pass, we refer to the parallel chapter, the 23rd Jeremiah, where we read in 3rd verse, "I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds." This should be fulfilled in a given day, as we read in the 5th and following verses, "Behold the days come," &c. The same period of fulfilment is to be found in Ezekiel xxxiv., "I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David." The fulfilment is under the Gospel. We repeat the limit, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." These are the last days, which, by the proper principles of interpretation must be limited by the scripture just quoted, but which are not left without their limitation in other scriptures; "Little children," writes John, "it is the last time," or hour, the eleventh hour, as we read in one of the parables, an hour which is interpreted in the parable of the ten virgins; "At *midnight* there was a cry made, Behold the bridegroom cometh." The ingenuity of religious systems is at fault here, for the little expressive word with which this parable is introduced, incontrovertibly proves the time and season of fulfilment; "*Then* shall the kingdom," &c. When? In the life-time of some standing around the Lord; "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come."

This is our testimony, from Peter and his Epistles, to the great Scripture prophecy of the restoration of the ten tribes. Bearing in mind the character of the strangers, we recognize their interest in the writings of the prophets. We can understand that they should be appealed to from these writings. These observations will give us a key to that much-abused chapter, the last of the 2nd Epistle, wherein it is supposed we have a prophecy of the end of this visible system of things. Without stopping to prove that such supposition is false to true philosophy, and therefore can never be true to true faith, we may just remark, that those whom Peter was addressing, being of the families of Israel, knew better, as understanding the symbolical language of Scripture prophecy. They were not willingly ignorant of that language, any more than the devout men from every nation under heaven would be at any loss to conceive the symbolical meaning of the wonders in heaven and earth, the blood and fire, and pillars of smoke, connected with the great and terrible day of the Lord. Bearing in mind that Peter was addressing Jews, we expect to read of Jewish terms and phrases, and this, it is conceived, is especially the case with respect to

the heaven and the earth passing away, there being no mention in any of the Apostolic Epistles but those of Peter, and that of to the Hebrews.

I have one more prophecy to consider, in connexion with the lost tribes, before I return to the 10th Ezekiel, the chapter which rise to this discussion. I direct your attention to the 89th Psalm. Psalm shows the paramount importance of a right division of the of truth. The former part of the Psalm relates to the spiritual blessing of the new and better covenant, which was ordered in all things sure to all the seed. This is down to the end of the 37th verse. there is a break off, marked by the word *Selah*, which, saith the *Clerical Paraphrast*, signifies that there is no ceasing of that thing to which is affixed. Truly, we would say, this is no mistaken signification, *Selah* is set to a testimony like this, "His seed shall endure for ever and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." And here I observe, how these verses alone completely overthrow the absurd doctrine of an end and destruction of this globe on which we live. In the 37th verse we read, "But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed. Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant; thou hast profaned his crown to the ground, thou hast broken down all his hedges; thou hast brought his strong tower to ruin." This is under the first covenant in the land, and respects the temporal kingdom. It is a lament for the separation of the tribes from the house of David, a prophetic lament. Now suppose we search for other prophetic witness, for something bearing upon the lamentation of David. We discover the object of our search in the prophet *Zechariah*. In his ninth chapter we have the following: "In that day will I hedge up the tabernacle of David, that is fallen, and hedge up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of the heathen upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who shall do this." And again in the 14th verse, "I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them," &c. This is the testimony of *Amos*, whose prophecy especially to the tribes of Israel, as *Joel's* was to Judah. The testimony has an appointed time, "In that day;" we want to know what and whither shall we go for our knowledge? To this popular sentimentator, or that writer on prophecy, in this our day? No indeed, not while memory retains the glorious truth, that there is nothing new in the Old Testament which is not to be found also in the New. Therefore we have recourse at once to the New Testament Scriptures for an explanation of this prophecy in its appointed time. We wish for an infallible Holy Ghost commentary, and we have our wish. We have a desired commentary on *Amos* recorded in Acts of the Apostles, chapter 15. In that chapter, we read of a discussion stirred up in the matter of circumcision, by the old adversary, the Jewish house. Peter gave his opinion touching the matter in dispute; then Paul and Barnabas rendered an account of their ministerial, Holy Ghost mission; afterwards rose up the Apostle James, and quoted the prophecy of *Zechariah* as above, affirming that it was fulfilled in God's visiting the Gentiles.

to take out of them a people for his name : which visiting was by the instrumentality of Peter, and is declared by James to comprehend the return of the lost ten tribes. How absurd are the carnal, literal views of prophecy, now so generally entertained, when viewed by this judgment of an inspired Apostle. James declares, that in visiting the Gentiles, God builded up the tabernacle of David. Impossible! say religious systems, Jerusalem was then, and is still, trodden under foot of the Gentiles.\* James affirms, that in his day of the gospel administration, the ruins were builded up by him whose name was "the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in." I cannot believe it, cries the stickler for future fulfilments. James makes proof of his ministry, by shewing that the residue of men had sought, and were seeking, the Lord. This contradicts the evidence of our senses, replies one who is promoting Christianity (Judaism) amongst the Jews, and seeking for the lost tribes in the four corners of the earth. It is preposterous, say these, for James to preach the gospel after this fashion, for does not the prophecy of Amos, which he quotes, declare that the tribes shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them, and plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof, and make gardens, and eat the fruit of them? Such is a specimen of the absurdities of modern Christianity. As we have often said before, we repeat, "Let God be true, though every man be found a liar." "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." The Lord's thought, we believe was, in this matter, the thought of James, and the Lord's way, was that described by him who proclaimed, "I am the way;" and who also, we conceive, proclaimed, "I am the resurrection and the life," in opposition to the carnal conceptions of carnal minds.

Now, as with Peter's sermon in Acts ii., we instituted a comparison with his Epistle, so also here, in James' sermon, in Acts xv., we can follow the like method with his Epistle. We have proved from internal evidence, that Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, wrote for the especial benefit of the circumcision. The like proof appears in the Epistle of James. I need only quote the first verse,— "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting." This is so plain, that there is no necessity to examine the greeting, to see if it sustain the address. There is one verse, however, which I may mention, the 18th, in which James speaks of himself and the brethren as "a kind of first fruits of God's creatures." The marginal reference to this verse, in the small Bibles, is Rev. xiv. 4, where we read,— "These are they which were redeemed from among men, the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb." Who are these, and whence come they? "I looked, and lo a Lamb stood in Mount Zion, and with him an hundred and forty-four thousand, having his Father's name written on their foreheads." This is the possession of the mountains of Israel which was promised to the scattered tribes. Perhaps there is a connexion between James' first fruits and the three thousand devout Jews, out of every nation under heaven, who received the word on the day of Pentecost, when the law of the spirit of life went out of Mount Zion; and it may be, that there is some light thrown upon James, by what Peter said when he was preaching beside the

\* See Note I.

beautiful gate of the temple,—“ Unto you *first*, God having raised his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.” And here let me observe, that the advocates of personal second coming of Christ cannot maintain that this second mentioned by Peter, was personal and visible, for who of his audience saw him after his resurrection? Why, then, should not Peter’s hearers have rejected such preaching as being contradictory to the evidence of their senses? And yet it was not so. “ Many of those which he had said the word believed.”

I will now conclude the subject of the restoration of the tribes. We must believe, from the brief examination which has been made, that the restoration future is without Scriptural foundation; that it arises from the common error of all systems which deny a past second advent, or error of comparing spiritual things with natural. I believe, that what the Bible, which is the testimony of Jesus, speaks of a restoration means no more a literal and carnal restoration, than did Christ mean a literal and carnal second birth, as Nicodemus supposed, when he spoke of the regeneration. I believe that there is as much absurdity in the notions of those who are now ignorantly engaged in “ promoting Christianity among the Jews,” as there was in the notion of the master of Israel, when Christ said to him, “ Ye must be born again.” I do not doubt but the same surprise would be expressed by our present restorationists, when told of a past spiritual second coming, as expressed by Nicodemus when told of the second birth:—“ How can these things be?” Such a mistake as this of Nicodemus and the learned doctors respecting the first advent, and doctrines there connected, gives to me a plain and intelligible solution of the mistake now prevalent, among the learned and the unlearned, respecting the second advent and its accompanying events. We are almost inclined to ask how it can be wondered at that the adherents to any of the religious systems should be ignorant of the spirituality of the second advent, when we see that those who sat in Moses’ seat—those who had the law and the prophets read in their synagogues every Sabbath-day—those who were most intimately acquainted with the Testament prophecies—those against whom the reproach was justly urged, “ Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?” that these were, as all religious sects will allow, utterly ignorant of the character of the promised Messiah, and the nature of his kingdom. There is, to my mind, no comparison between the advantage of the Jews of Christ’s day, to whom were committed the oracles of God, and those religionists in our day who read the Bible in ignorance of the times and seasons: no comparison, I repeat, between the advantages of the two parties, so far as a right interpretation of the law and the prophets is concerned. Knowing the entire distinction between the two covenants, I cannot, from the Scriptures, believe that the restoration of the Jews was ever intended to refer to that Jerusalem of which Paul wrote, “ Jerusalem which *now* is, and is in bondage under her children;” but I am persuaded, from inspired apostolic testimony, that the restoration was to Jerusalem of which Paul likewise wrote to the Galatians, “ Jerusalem, which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all,” to which they were to come, blessed with all spir-

blessings in Christ Jesus. Knowing the difference between the law and the gospel, it is surely needless to tell a spiritually minded person that we do not imagine such an absurdity as a bodily movement, a flesh and blood restoration to an earthly, corruptible, defiled, and fading inheritance (for such it must be, according to modern doctrines of an end of the world), but as Peter writes to his strangers, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. They who are now called Jews, may go back to that which is now called the Holy Land, for they, like their forefathers, are still looking for a Messiah. In the lapse of ages such a thing may be, but this going back will never be as the people of God—is not spoken of in the Bible—is a matter upon which Scripture is altogether silent; in fact, we defy any man, or any body of men, to prove that Scripture says one word by way of prophecy of any historical event subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem.

One word more, and I leave the subject. While I believe the doctrine of a future restoration is an absurdity, yet, at the same time, I can respect the attempt at consistency made by the advocates of such restoration, when compared with certain classes of religionists, certain Calvinists, and others who disbelieve the future restoration, and yet hold that the second advent is not past: who maintain that when Christ said, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled," he included the restoration of the Jews, and excluded the resurrection of the dead, or the end of the world. This is miserable inconsistency, and reduces such systems far below the level of those which they are so prone to condemn and hold up to ridicule—ridicule, however, of none but the very few who are equally inconsistent, and labouring under a similar infatuation. I could have desired to insert in this place a diagram of the restoration of the tribes, which would have proved the view I have taken so plainly, that a child might understand it, and thereby confound the views of those who are looking for a restoration yet future. The diagram, however, would render the present little work too expensive for its purpose, and, as I may perhaps, at some time, devote a volume to the subject of the restoration in its relation to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, the diagram may for the present be excused.

I return now to the 10th chapter of Ezekiel, from whence this digression upon the tribes proceeded. In that chapter, as we have seen, the Apostles and their fellows are prophesied of under the figure of wheels. "It was cried unto them in my hearing, O wheel, for the spirit of life was in them." I proceed to compare this with Daniel vii. 9, "I beheld, till the thrones were pitched down (till the judges sat, see Matt. xix. 28, compared with 1 Cor. vi. 3), and the ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire." This agrees with Ezekiel's vision, and the description given of the wheels in both prophets is much the same. "Wheels, as a burning fire," is Daniel's vision. "The spirit of life, or the living creature, was in them," writes Ezekiel; and explains, in his first chapter, "As for the likeness of the living creatures, their appearance was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance of lamps."—(Ezek. i. 13, compared

Rev. i. 14—16, and i. 20.) For our present explanation of the burning fire, as applied to the angels of the churches, I may be permitted again to refer to Psalm civ., as prophetic of the ministry of reconciliation. "He maketh his angels winds, his ministers a flaming fire." This is paralleled in Daniel, "A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him." And having thus compared Ezekiel, Daniel, and David, we will bring the comparison to bear upon the day of Pentecost. The figure of fire is applied to the apostolic baptism, "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, being baptised of the Holy Ghost and fire."

Our next inquiry is into another comparison of prophecy with the events on the day of Pentecost, which will also further shew the correctness of the interpretation of "the wheels" which has been suggested. Daniel's vision of the wheels was connected with one who sat on a throne, like a fiery flame; so, also, Ezekiel's vision is connected with the same personage. "And above the firmament, that was over their heads, was the likeness of a throne, and upon the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above it."—(Ezek. i. 26-7.) Both prophets speak of a person in the throne. We search another prophet, and discover what is the name of the person. In Isaiah's 6th chapter, we read, "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lifted up." The word "also," here connects the passage with what has gone before. We may look back till we come to the first verse of Isaiah's prophecy, where we read, "The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem," &c. Observe the words, "concerning Judah and Jerusalem." Suppose we read them in the two opening verses of the second chapter, "The word that Isaiah, the son of Amoz, saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass, in *the last days*." What is the inference from this? That the last days concern Judah and Jerusalem, and are not the last days of England, France, or of any country in America, which never could be included in the term "all the world" (empire), "Go ye," &c. They are last days connected with the sceptre departing from Judah, and a lawgiver from between his feet: last days, bounded by this express Scripture, "These be the days of vengeance, that all," &c. It was for these days, and it was in reference to Judah and Jerusalem, that Isaiah saw "the Lord sitting on a throne high and lifted up." This word "Lord," as here used, is in common characters; not so, however, in the fifth verse, where the prophet speaks of the LORD of Hosts. It need hardly be mentioned, that this latter is Jehovah's name, and that the former is the resurrection name of Jesus, as we shall have to shew presently, when we come to that part of the subject. We find, then, that he who sat upon the throne was Christ; but this is not sufficient of itself to establish the connexion between Isaiah's prophecy and those of Daniel and Ezekiel. However, the concluding portion of the verse in Isaiah vi. will supply the lack: "I saw also the Lord, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple." What we are to understand by "his train," will soon appear, from a comparison of spiritual things with

spiritual. The words, "his train," are rendered in the margin "the skirts thereof." This is opened up in Psalm cxxiii. The first verse of that Psalm describes the blessing of brethren living in unity, or even together. This is explained by the observations offered upon the circumstance of the wheels being addressed only as one wheel; and no doubt but the prayer of Christ, "that they all may be one," is shadowed out here. The second verse enters into a description of the unity: "It is like the precious ointment upon the *head*, that ran down upon the beard, Aaron's beard, that went down to the *skirts* of his garments." This verse is in connexion with the priesthood, and if the testimony of Jesus be the spirit of prophecy, then, from this mention of Aaron, we carry the fulfilment of this Psalm to times following the death of Christ, when he was priest by one offering of himself, once offered. Observe also, the word "head"—like the precious ointment upon the head. Is there here no intimation of the Head and Saviour of the body, which is described in the first verse to be brethren in unity, and in the present verse under the figure of "the skirts of the clothing?" We must remember Paul's question, "Is Christ divided?" and the answer, "As the body is one, so also Christ;" and recollect also, that believers were kings and priests in apostolic times. The last verse of the Psalm bears out all that has been said, "As the dew of Hermon, that descended upon the mountains of Zion." This is paralleled in Hosea's prophecy of the restoration of the tribes, "I will be as the dew unto Israel"—"There the Lord commanded the blessing, life for evermore." This is paralleled by Isa. ii. 3, "out of Zion shall go forth the law," not the ten Sinai commandments, but the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

Such, then, is the comparison which we have instituted between four prophets. We have established that they all speak the same thing, and that their prophecies must be fulfilled at the same time. We will now, in due order, proceed to investigate their fulfilment from the Apostolic writings, having proved that they belong to a new covenant. We have recourse at once to the day of Pentecost, hoping to discover, in the records of that day, a revelation of the prophetic testimonies we have just been considering. The prophets, we are told, prophesied of grace that should come in gospel times. This reminds of a glorious passage in Peter's first Epistle. Peter speaks of salvation ready to be revealed in the last time, and says, "Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and THE GLORY that should follow." (1 Peter i. 10, 11.) 'Searching!' And does not this agree with Christ's word to his disciples, "Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them?" And do not both scriptures agree with what we read in Corinthians, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him?" This is a quotation from Isaiah; but, saith the Apostle, "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." Thus we see a beautiful correspondence with Peter's saying, "Unto whom it was



revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." We will now examine Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, and see what report he gives of the four prophets under consideration. The first passage quoted shall be the 33rd verse of Acts ii: "Being by the right hand of God exalted." Without at present examining into the nature of Christ's kingly and priestly office, let me merely notice the fulfilment of the prophecies which spake of a throne, and the appearance as of a man upon the throne. This is Ezekiel's, and also Daniel's testimony, but I will take only the prophecy of Isaiah, that being sufficient for our purpose; "I saw, also, the Lord, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up." Now how does Peter reveal this mystery? "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ;" and being made Lord and Christ, he must have the pre-eminent place of Lord. So Peter likewise says, that he was by the right hand of God exalted, according to David; "The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool." Isaiah's prophecy was to come to pass in the last days, which concerned Judah and Jerusalem, and Peter says, of his days, "These be the days of which all the prophets, from Samuel and those that follow after, have spoken." These be the days which concern Judah and Jerusalem, for I say, saith Peter, let all the house of Israel know assuredly. These be the days in which Isaiah saw the Lord sitting on his throne; for I tell you, saith Peter, you dreamers of an earthly Messiah, you worshippers of a kingdom that is of this world, that Messiah is now exalted at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, is now a king entered upon his dominion. These be the days when Isaiah prophesied, "The law shall go forth out of Zion," the law of grace and faith, excluding your law of works; for I warn you, saith Peter, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, into the name of Jesus Christ. God hath raised him from the dead, whereof we all are witnesses; and if you shall confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in your heart that God hath raised him from the dead, you shall be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. x. 9.) This is the law of Sion, which the Apostles preached. The feast of Pentecost was appointed in commemoration of the law of Sinai, so likewise the same feast is the appointed time for the law of Sion. So much, then, for Isaiah's testimonies, as explained by Peter. I will take another of the prophets, Daniel, respecting another particular of the Pentecostal day. Daniel writes, "A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him that sat upon the throne." Jesus, being made Christ, as the Lord's anointed, received the promise of the Father, the promise of the Holy Ghost and fire; and, saith Peter, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. Compare the word "shed" with the "fiery stream," and there is established a connexion between the two portions. This brings me to another prophet, in reference to the Pentecostal day—David, in the Psalm already quoted, "Like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard." This ointment was

prefigured in the circumstance of the woman with an alabaster box of ointment, coming to Jesus to anoint him. They that stood by lamented the waste, and thought the ointment might have been sold for so much, and given to the poor. What was the answer? "She did it for my *burial*. And verily I say unto you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, which this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her." O what a precious memorial, when we can understand it as it was intended, and witness the memorial on this Pentecostal day! We can behold a beautiful correspondence between the ointment running down, and Jesus, shedding forth the Holy Ghost, the oil of joy, the unction from the Holy One; that anointing of which John writes, "*Little children*, ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth." Surely this is the tenor of the new and better covenant, "They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, (as under the law,) saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least (little children), even unto the greatest (fathers), of them. This anointing is a vast theme. It is shadowed forth under many figures: "The dew of Hermon," or, "I will be as the dew unto Israel." Peter quotes Psalm cx. in his Pentecostal sermon, and was not this portion of that Psalm fulfilled at that time, "Of the womb of the early morning, to thee the dew of thy youth, seeing that then a nation was born at once, and the earth was made to bring forth in one day."

---

In the preceding section, we have stated that fire is an emblematic figure of that preaching of the gospel which was with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. I might go on at great length, shewing the continual application of that figure through various scriptures of the apostolic epistles; *i. e.*, how we may understand that it is the word of God, or the New Testament in Christ's blood which is signified, when the figure of fire is used. The Apostles, according to a prophecy before quoted out of Daniel, were to judge on thrones as a fiery stream, by their fire ministry. So we find that immediately before the Lord delivered to his disciples the parable of the faithful and wise steward, in Luke xii., he had said unto them, "Let your loins be girded about, and your *lights* burning." How peculiarly applicable was the figure of light, we learn from the sermon on the mount, "Ye are the light of the world: a city that is set on a hill cannot be hid." After the Lord had delivered the parable above mentioned, he proceeded to say, 'I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled.' 'I have a baptism to be baptised with;' surely a baptism of the Holy Ghost, as he was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, through the operation of mighty power wrought in him when raised from the dead. The kindling of this fire is a dissension in one house:

*five* in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. This house is, without doubt, the house of Judah, as the description exactly accords with the words of the rich man,—‘I have *five* brethren.’ The dissension is exhibited in the history of the Acts of the Apostles, wherein we find the opposition of Judaism and Christianity; the gospel being the fire and sword which brought discord among those who had hitherto lived together as brethren in the house of Moses, the servant. In the same book of Acts, we find the Holy Ghost preached gospel, a fire, in pricking to the heart the multitude on the day of Pentecost: in causing a Felix to tremble, and an Agrippa to confess himself almost persuaded to be a Christian: in discovering the deceit of Ananias and Sapphira, and from the mouth of man, yet that man an inspired minister, sending them to their doom. In the apostolic epistles, the figure of fire may be read in that powerful description of the word which Paul delivers in Hebrews iv. — the word of faith which he preached—“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” The latter clause of the verse is equally applicable to the figure of fire, and, indeed, so is the whole description. The like figure is elsewhere expressed, as in 2 Cor. iii., where we read the marks of a real evangelist,—“Who 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.” And then, once more, in the consummation of all things, in the end, let that end be what it may, we still behold the word of God signified by the same figure, as in 1 Corinthians iv. 5, “judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart.” What is meant by the light—what is this making manifest? I go back a little way, to third chapter of that Epistle, wherein it is written, “Every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it: for *it* is revealed in fire, and the fire shall try every man’s work, of what sort it is.” What other connexion need we seek for this verse, than that of the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire? What other interpretation is required, than that of the two covenants, the one as a fire, consuming the wood, hay, stubble, gold, silver, and precious stones of the other: for the trial of faith should be more precious than that of “gold which *perisheth*,” equally with the stubble. And instituting such connexion, and receiving such interpretation, what difficulty should there be in concluding with certainty respecting “the day” and the judgment thereof? What difficulty, except in minds which have been nurtured from earliest infancy in the nursery tales of hell-torments, and are resolved to adhere to such follies to their dying hour? Quotations illustrating the gospel under the figure of fire might be multiplied. When Paul tells the Thessalonians that “the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with the angels of his power, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ;” I take that scripture and compare it with another, in Romans ii., in which he writes of “a day when God will judge the secrets of men, according to his gospel.” When I read

in Peter's last chapter of the heavens being reserved for fire to the day of judgment: of the heavens being on fire and dissolved: of the elements melting with fervent heat, and the earth and the works therein being burned up: and when I know that these heavens, earth, and elements resolve themselves into the simplicity of the two covenants, then here also, hitherto, I can bring the Pentecostal baptism: this, also, I can see to be the fire of that word, of whose Author the Apostle to the Hebrews writes, "Our God is a consuming fire," and writes, moreover, immediately after he had signified a removing of an earth and a heaven, as of things that could not remain, in the establishment of a kingdom that could not be moved. (Heb. xii. 26—29.) This comparison alone satisfies me so much of the true meaning of the last chapter of Peter's Second Epistle, that it would not move me for one moment, if I stood alone in my opinion.

Having thus proved the Apostolic ministry, under the figure of a baptism of fire, our next step is to prove the same thing under the figure of a baptism of water. In the 14th chapter of Zechariah we read, "And it shall be, in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem." That day, is the day of the Lord. Without inquiring into the day, we are at once satisfied upon the meaning of the living waters, from infallible testimony; "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." How invaluable is the commentary which follows in a parenthesis, "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii. 38, 39.) The Holy Ghost was given on the day of Pentecost. Then were the prophecies fulfilled which spake of pouring water upon him that was thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; which water and floods are explained by what immediately follows in the prophet; "I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring, and they shall spring up among the grass, as willows by the water-courses." (Isaiah xlv. 3, 4.) Then, indeed, was the invitation given with effect, the invitation which depended upon the sure mercies of the resurrection David, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." "I am the *root* and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star. And the Spirit and the bride say Come, and let him that heareth say Come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life *freely*." (Isaiah lv., compared with Rev. xxii.) And when we compare Zechariah's prophecy of living waters going out of Jerusalem, with Christ's commission to his disciples, that repentance and remission of sins be preached in his name, *beginning at Jerusalem*, do we not see the application of these living waters to the day of Pentecost, (which we have made from Isaiah and Revelations,) further confirmed? It would require a volume to open up the glorious things spoken of Zion, which are connected with this similitude of water. Bearing in mind the comparison which we formerly instituted between the journey through the wilderness, and that through the trials and tribulations of the Apostolic state, what a magnificent figure we have in the typical record, "He smote the rock, and the waters gushed out, and the streams flowed withal." And again, we read, "When the poor and

needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of valleys. I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and dry land springs of water." (Isaiah xli. 17, 18.) When we read this glowing description, and take it to Apostolic times, and apply it to the poor and needy, the weary and heavy laden, to whom the ministry of Immanuel was directed—when we apply it to the refreshment afforded to these in preaching the glad tidings of the gospel of peace—when we witness the prophecy fulfilled in those Jerusalem sinners praising God, and living together in gladness and singleness of heart, then indeed the Bible does exalt itself above the word and the testimony of man. Then, truly, we can pity the poor, enquiring souls, who now-a-days are tormented by the title of poor and needy, weary and heavy laden, for we can give this title its proper time and place. And if we should allow, as indeed we do, that there are hundreds of our day who answer to the above character, who are fast bound in the bondage of Moses, and his covenant of works, we ask here, as in former cases, Who is to blame for this? Religious systems, again, is the answer. And if we were willing that this character of poverty and need should be diverted out of its true place, still we should most strenuously deny that the experimental preachers, who are so fond of descanting upon that character, could direct to this living water, seeing that we also know from experience, that these their waters are as little like the gospel streams, as were the waters of the Nile when running with blood like her waters when overflowing the banks; seeing that such waters are so destitute of any refreshing or reviving power that I can compare them to nothing so well as to this, "The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." I have a lively recollection of having been once asked by a dear friend to preach from the text, "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none;" &c., but speaking on such a text was then out of the question. And why? because I was myself seeking water, and there was none. I was looking for the living among the dead, expecting to find the desired object among the dogmas of religious systems; and thus, like as Saul, when seeking his father's asses, met with a kingdom, so, pursuing that which was no better than the morning cloud and early dew, I have lighted on a kingdom that fadeth not away. This is the kingdom—"The gift of God is eternal life,—and this is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent;"—and this is the knowledge—not in part, as it was during the dispensations, but to know as we are known; that which is perfect being come, and that which was in part being done away.

Before I leave the subject of the Apostolic ministry, as signified by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, (Titus iii. 5, 6, with Acts ii. 33,) the new birth of water and the Spirit, I have one or two important observations to offer. As, in speaking upon the baptism by fire, we brought that figure to bear upon the consummation of all things, at the close, as we believe, of the Apostolic dispensation, so now I shall bring the figure of the baptism of water to the same conclusion. In discoursing upon Christ's ministry, we

directed attention to the fact of his going back to the end of the old world, in the deluge, by way of warning to the Jerusalem sinners of the world that then was, in the end of which Paul tells us he appeared to put away sin. Christ referred to Noah's preaching, so did Peter in his first Epistle. After having discoursed of the long-suffering of God, in the days of Noah, when the ark was a preparing, he speaks of few, that is, eight souls, who were saved by water, and then adds, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God." Now compare this with Peter's discourse on the day of Pentecost; "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, he hath shed forth this." Shed what? The baptism of water, the promise of the Holy Ghost. Now then, let us revert to Noah and the deluge. We read, "The same day all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the flood-gates of heaven were opened." The same day of Pentecost the heavens were opened, and, as Isaiah writes in his 55th chapter, when speaking beforehand of the resurrection of Christ, and the glory that should follow, the sure mercies of David descended from the throne; the rain came down, and watered the earth, making it bring forth and bud, which rain was the word out of the mouth of the resurrection Lord, which word was the gospel preached in demonstration of the spirit and of power. But further. In the account given of the deluge, we read, "The waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth." The parallel appears to me to be found here; "So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed." Again—It was prophesied of in Habakkuk ii. 14, "The earth or land (Judea) shall be filled by knowing the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea;" which scripture is paralleled by one out of Joel, who prophesied only of Judah and Jerusalem, "It shall come to pass in that day that all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord." (Joel iii. 18.) Habakkuk's prophecy is of the gospel overspreading Judea, for that only is the earth or land here signified, and explained by a word which fell from Christ, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of man be come." But further still. In the history of the deluge we read, "The waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills and the mountains were covered, and the ark went upon the face of the waters." We compare this with a glowing prophecy in Micah iv. 1, "In the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it."

Another comparison might likewise be instituted with Ezek. xlvi., wherein I conceive we have a beautiful figure of the successive dispensations, each increasing in glory, in a description of the gradual rise of the waters. The prophet has a vision of the house of the Lord. "And behold, says he, there ran out waters on the right side. And when the man that had the line in his hand went forth eastward, he measured a thousand cubits, and he brought me through the waters; the waters were to the ankles;" the next thousand these waters are to the knees: at the third measuring of a thousand, they were to the loins; and in

the fourth and last period of a thousand, the waters were risen, waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over." Without saying anything of the first thousand, the beginning of the rise of the waters, further than that I am inclined to think that they have a reference to John's ministry; ("The law and the prophets were until John; since then the kingdom of God is preached;") passing by this, how beautifully illustrative of the Holy Ghost dispensation of the Gospel, is the description of the waters, as waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over. How gloriously this appears in the light of scriptures like the following: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him; but God (says Paul) *hath revealed them unto us* by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the *deep things of God.*" How magnificent is the expression of the prophet, "As rivers that could not be passed over;" when again we find an interpretation of that figure in such spiritual manifestation as is afforded in Ephes. iii. 18, "That ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." This is sweetly told in one of our hymns:—

"Stronger this love than death or hell,  
Its riches were unsearchable;  
The first-born sons of light  
Desired in vain its depths to see;  
They could not reach the mystery,  
The length, and breadth, and height."

This brings us to the fulness of Peter's comparison of the Holy Ghost Baptism with the waters of Noah. As the natural waters, in the days of Noah, covered the earth, and exalted Noah and his family in the ark above the hills, so also the spiritual waters, in the days of Peter, covered the earth or land of Judea, and exalted Peter and his fellow-believers, in the true ark, in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, above the eternal hills. And again, as in the days of Noah, those only who believed God, through that preacher of righteousness, were saved, and the rest perished, so, in like manner, in Peter's day and generation, those who obeyed his gospel endured to the end, and remained God's house by that enduring, these were saved,—some saved so as by fire, so also saved as by water,—while those who counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, those who alway, as their fathers, did despite to the spirit of grace, (see Gen. vi. 3,) and resisted the Holy Ghost, hardening their hearts, were condemned. The day of salvation to them in the ark, was a day of perdition to ungodly men; or, to apply our figure, the very same knowledge of the Lord, which, like water spreading over the land, bore believers in safety to the haven where they would be, was a flood wherein to drown the world that then was; wherein to cast them as into the depths, with a millstone round the neck, in which floods and in which depths, the deep things of God, they are still suffering vengeance, according to the awful sentence, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

I now conclude the examination of the Apostolic dispensation,

under the figures of fire and water, in which I have been obliged to anticipate a little, or rather forced to our grand conclusion by a necessity over which there is no control. I shall now proceed to speak of the same dispensation more plainly, and with more express application to the ministry. Let it be remembered that our leading object is a discussion of the ministry, in a proof of the past second advent; and while we are discussing some of the glorious things of which this was a ministry, it will be well to weigh these things as they were ministered by the Apostles, with the same things as they are pretended to be ministered by the hireling labourers of the day.

The first prophecy to which I shall refer is Isaiah lii. 7, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth. Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye when the Lord shall bring again Zion." This prophecy is the line which I would draw from the square so often mentioned, running up into this, which I believe to be the last dispensation. It is the prophecy from Isaiah, whereby we prove the Apostolic ministry. We show the fulfilment in an express application to Christ's Apostles, from the testimony of one who said that he was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the Apostles. Paul writes, in Romans x., "How shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." This is an inspired declaration, quite as comprehensive as one which is so much used and abused by modern missionaries, "The earth shall be filled with knowing the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Our point is gained. We have learned that the Apostles and their fellows were the very watchmen of whom Isaiah, being moved by the Holy Ghost, did speak. Suppose we take the several particulars of Isaiah's prophecy in order. "How beautiful upon the mountains;" and how beautifully this corresponds with a prophecy already quoted of the last days, wherein the mountain of the Lord's house should be established on the top of the mountains; so that from this comparison, and this mention of the last days alone, we might arrive at a true conclusion as to the time of fulfilment. But to proceed. What is that which is beautiful upon the mountains? "The feet of him that bringeth good tidings." There is a sweet passage parallel to this in the Song of Solomon; "How beautiful are thy feet with shoes, O prince's daughter." Both scriptures are clearly opened up in their application to the Apostolic ministry. Christ so applies the figure in the parable of the prodigal son; "Put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet." Paul explains the shoes in Rom. x., as also in his exhortation to the Ephesian Church, "Having your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace." All these scriptures are crowned by a verse in Psalm cxix., "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path."—Again, passing by the publication of peace as obviously applying to the preaching of Him whose name is "our peace," the



Prince of peace, we come to the title of the publishers, "Thy watchmen." This title, likewise, is to be found in the Song; "The watchmen that go about the city found me." This title clearly attaches to the Apostolic ministry. Christ in the parables reiterates the word, "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find watching." And, as Isaiah writes, "Thy watchmen, Zion," so, corresponding to this, Paul exhorts the Hebrews, whom he addresses as having come to Mount Zion; "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account." (Heb. xiii. 17.) Paul enumerated this watching among the signs of his apostleship; "In watchings often, in fastings often." This also he enforced upon his beloved Timothy, "Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." There were other feet than those which were beautiful upon the mountains, as it is written, "Their feet are swift to shed blood," which was true of her who was drunk with the blood of the martyrs, and upon whom in that generation came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. And here let me remark, that if in Jerusalem was found the blood of all the prophets, is not this decisive enough as to the duration of the ministry; for he gave some prophets, as well as some apostles; and it could not be that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem. There were other watchmen than those who stood on Zion's walls; "His watchmen are blind; they are all dumb dogs, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber; yea, they are greedy dogs, which can never have enough." Every word of this description will be borne out by facts, if applied to those who sat in Moses' seat, in the days of Christ's ministry. The prophet speaks of blind watchmen: so Christ says to the Pharisees, "Ye blind guides; if the blind lead the blind, shall not both fall into the ditch?" The prophet speaks of ignorance. How often does Christ say, "Thou fool!" Isaiah has it that these watchmen were "dumb dogs," and Christ parallels that with "Ye make void the law of God by your traditions;" dumb enough, when they had reduced the word of God to silence. And then that these watchmen should be sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber; how just the description of those who laid heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, but who would not touch these burdens with one of their fingers. And then, once more, that the watchmen were greedy dogs, never having enough; this is none other than the Pharisee to the very life, who devoured widows' houses, and for a show made long prayers; and as it was in the beginning, is now; there is nothing new under the sun. But further—Zion's watchmen were to see eye to eye. The promise of Christ at once applies this to the Apostolic ministry; "He, the Comforter, shall guide you into all truth." They to whom these words were addressed had the mind of Christ: they were able ministers of the New Testament; they preached the gospel of peace, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, and consequently there was a divine necessity that they should see eye to eye. And it was so. John writes, in his first Epistle, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life. This then is the message which we (who sit on thrones,) have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God

is light, and in him is no darkness at all." Peter is quite as decided as John on the subject of his preaching. He writes, "I will that ye be able, after *my* decease, to have these things always in remembrance; for we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. Peter testifies to the truth of John's preaching; when speaking of the Book of Revelations he says, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." Peter likewise makes approving mention of Paul's Epistles—that same Paul who had withstood him to the face for his cowardice in presence of the Jewish house. Paul shall close our proof of Zion's watchmen seeing eye to eye. How read we his parting address to the Church of Ephesus? "I am pure from the blood of all, I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God." And again, "If we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." So much for a brief exposition of Isaiah's prophecy from the Apostolic Epistles. To do anything like justice to the subject would require that a volume should be written. Have I ended all that I intended to say on the prophecy? Oh no. I remember a hymn which begins thus—

"How *beauteous* are their feet  
Who stand on Zion's hill,  
Who bring salvation on their tongues,  
And words of peace reveal."

From this hymn, it would appear that there are watchmen now; but after the examination just instituted into the character of a watchman in Apostolic times, I leave the question in the hands of a child, to try whether modern watchmen be the very successors of the originals or no. We have noticed two classes of watchmen, judge you which of the two modern watchmen most resemble. The Apostles and their fellow servants published peace. Numbers of our modern watchmen say even of their brethren, "No peace with Rome," but a determined and deadly hostility—for what?—for the momentous principle of the difference betwixt 'tweedledum and tweedledee.' The Apostles and their companions did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God. Now, one part of that counsel which Paul declared to the church at Ephesus was, "Predestination according to the good pleasure of the Father's will;" but yet have we never heard of modern watchmen, who hate and abhor the very sound of predestination? The Apostles could speak with Holy Ghost assurance,—"If any man preach any other gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed." We are now told to believe that fifty or a hundred different doctrines are one and the self same truth. Where, then, is the gospel, and what becomes of the curse? The ministers of the day may tell their hearers that they watch for their souls as those that must give account: let the people ask them to prove their watchings to be real. "Show me thy faith by thy works, for faith without works is dead." Canst thou say this,—"In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often?" Ah! methinks, if you test the watchmen of the day by such a talisman, they would rather abjure the title. Like the accusers of the woman taken

in adultery, you would have to say of them, "they went out one by one," and left the title of watchman alone. As is recorded of the disciples in their treatment of their suffering Master, you would have to tell a tale of our watchmen, in their treatment of this much loved title, when suffering is to be attached to it, "they all forsook it and fled." They will be watchmen in laying on of hands, forgiving sins, conferring the Holy Ghost, administering ordinances, presiding over religious meetings and tea parties, leading captive silly women and a few sillier men, and so forth, but they will have none of the doctrine of Apostolical succession in this or any other title, when poverty, persecution, and scorn is the only temporal benefit they are to derive. The Apostles, in *their* character of watchmen, could say, "God hath set forth us the Apostles last, as the death-doomed;" or, as it is in the margin, as the last Apostles. If they were the last, where are their successors: and that they were the last, is it not evident, in that in Babylon, where the Lord was crucified, there was found the blood of all the prophets and righteous men slain upon the earth? If we are to have successors of the Apostles, let them be no mockery, let them be no "men of straw," no ludicrous effigy of the originals, like a Guy Fawkes on the fifth of November. This is the substance:—"A spectacle, a theatre, an exhibition, unto the world, and to angels, and to men; fools, weak, despised, defamed, naked, buffeted, reviled, the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things." (1 Cor. iv., throughout.) It is very hard to think how an Archbishop with £15,000, or a Methodist preacher with £50 a-year, can answer this description.

Having examined the apostolic title of Watchman, I will now proceed to another name whereby these men of God were known. We read in Jeremiah iii., "I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion: and I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." So also in Jeremiah xxiii., when the Lord had said that he would gather the remnant of his flock out of all countries, whether he had scattered them, he added, "I will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them." Now, David prophesied of this in the 68th Psalm, "The Lord gave the word, great was the company of those that published it." In the parallel explanatory passage to this, which we have in 4th Ephesians, we find pastors among the company: "He gave some pastors." These pastors, says the Spirit in Jeremiah, were to be according to the Lord's own heart. How did the Lord manifest this? "By signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds, the Lord working with them." How did they themselves, in their preaching, bear witness to this? by proclaiming, "We are labourers together with God: we have received a ministry of the Lord: we warn every man, and teach every man, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." These pastors were to feed with knowledge and understanding. So Paul prays for the Colossian Church, "that they might be filled with the knowledge of God's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding;" and how necessary was the prayer in that day of knowing in part and prophesying in part, when it was neither clear nor dark—how necessary, we learn from the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which Paul writes, "Ye are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat,

for every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness, being a babe." So also Peter, having been commissioned, "Feed my lambs," follows out the commission in his Epistle, wherein he exhorts to desire the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby. There are pastors, so called, now, as there are watchmen. But

If men, thy pastors do appear,  
O Lord, we claim the signs that were  
Of old by thee bestowed.

Pastors were for the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till all came into the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man. When all were come to the designed end, to a perfect man in Christ Jesus, pastors would be no longer needed, they would be useless, their name would be a nonentity, and their office a sinecure. If this state of the perfect unity of faith, and the perfect man, have not come, then pastors are needed. There are pastors: then comes the unanswerable question, Where are the marks of a pastor whereby to prove them true? These marks, evidences, signs, are, as we showed in our first diagram, not forthcoming, therefore we are obliged to conclude, that the work for which the originals were ordained and sent forth is a finished work. If it be not, if there are pastors, or even the shadow of any such character, then let us throw down our arms of opposition and join the Roman Catholics, for there can be no question whatever but that they approach the nearest in their pretensions to the originals. But the witness of our conscience, and the plainest declarations of God's word, tell us that Romanism is a system of falsehood, a rebuilding of an accursed Jericho. Therefore, if we are to have pastors, we cannot find them. Are we then to reject the Bible? No; we stand by the testimony of the Apostles, the authorized interpreters of the word, who alone can prove to us the absurdities of religious systems. I will proceed no further with this proof of the ministry, for fear of repeating matter which has been already advanced. I have merely glanced at the Old Testament names of the Apostles, and their fellow ministering servants. Time and space will not allow to examine the title of Ambassador, a title which even some who claim that of minister are compelled to abandon. We forego the pleasure of descanting upon the high dignity of an Apostle, as a ministering spirit: a steward of the mysteries of God: an angel of the churches: a king on a throne of judgment: a branch in the true vine: one of the twelve gates, and twelve foundations, shadowed out in Elisha's twelve yoke of oxen, and the twelve oxen supporting the molten sea in Solomon's temple. We forego all this, for the purpose of instituting a brief examination into some particulars of the preaching of these men, to whom such magnificent titles are given. We read that they had not shunned to declare all the counsel of God, and therefore we at once have recourse to their writings, rejecting the counsel of those who style themselves their successors. We quarrel not with the honours, the worldly advantages, which modern ministers enjoy, but because they obtain these under false pretences, because, as the present Bishop of Chester affirmed in his charge for 1841, they say that "they sit in the Apostles'

seat, and hold the office which they held." \* ' *They say;*' yes, like certain of old time, ' they say and do not.' Let them put off these assumed titles, and appeal to the world without these supports, which do not belong to them, and let them call themselves expounders of, or lecturers upon, a finished work of God, and then, let us see what will become of them, what will become of their systems, what will become of cant, hypocrisy, and fanaticism—then we shall be agreed, but not till then.

In considering some particulars of this counsel of God which the Apostles declared and fully preached, I shall return to Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost; and the first subject concerning which a few observations shall be offered is the resurrection of Christ. The resurrection of Christ! exclaims one, why, is not that a doctrine which requires no comment: is it not perfectly plain and intelligible to all? So far from this being the case, it is my persuasion that there is no doctrine which has been more perverted by religious systems, nor is there any less understood. The Jews, in Christ's ministry, sought a sign, "What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Now did the Jews understand him? Far otherwise: they said, "Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body." Now observe what is written immediately after this; "When, therefore, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them." (John ii. 22.) But before that he appeared unto them after his resurrection, they understood not the Scriptures, that he should rise again from the dead.

I have already commented upon the important position which the doctrine of the resurrection immediately assumed in the ministry of the Apostles. Peter, as we have seen, was anxious that one should be chosen who should supply the place of Judas. For what purpose? That he might be a witness with them of his resurrection: and in his sermon, the moment that Peter comes to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, he couples it with his resurrection. The doctrine is *the* doctrine of Apostolic preaching. Whence its importance? Because the resurrection of Christ was a pledge of the resurrection of our bodies of clay? But we shall soon see that no such pledge is anywhere to be found in Scripture. Because the resurrection of Christ proved him to be the Christ, the mediator of a new and better covenant? Granted. I am persuaded that the true solution of the question, Whence the paramount position which the doctrine of the resurrection occupies in the sacred records? is to be found in Peter's declaration, that God, in raising his son Jesus from the dead, had made him both Lord and Christ. Let us examine. Peter related the fact, "God hath raised up Jesus of Nazareth, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." Peter, having received power from on high, could reveal things which had been kept secret from the foundation of the world, and, preaching to Jews, of course he goes back to Moses and the prophets, convincing, out of the Scriptures, that the same Jesus whom they had crucified, was he of whom Moses and the prophets did write. He quotes the 16th Psalm; "David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is

\* See Note K.

on my right hand, that I should not be moved." When we read, "David speaketh," we are to understand it of David speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, because the words, "I foresaw the Lord alway before me," are not David's words, but Christ's. So Peter immediately declares, "He, seeing this before, (seeing it afar off,) spake of the resurrection of Christ, that *his* soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Paul, in Acts xiii., delivers himself much to the same amount; "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." These commentaries of Paul and Peter must be understood exclusively of the resurrection of Christ. Of the body of which it is here prophesied that it should rise, it is also predicted that it should not see corruption. But this, as Peter shows, could neither be said of David, nor yet of the great mass of the human race. Their bodies do see corruption. They must adopt the language of Job, and "say to corruption, Thou art my father, and to the worm, Thou art my mother, and my sister." Let the resurrection of Christ be a pledge as it may, still it is no pattern, of the resurrection of dust. There is a wide difference, an immeasurable distance, a kind of impassable gulf of separation, between the case of a body that has the breath of life breathed into it again on the third day, and while it remains in substance unimpaired, and a body that has been dissolved for centuries, that has been burned by fire, that has undergone a countless series of new combinations of matter, both animal and vegetable.

But it is said, in opposition to this, It is not argued that the material body of the Saviour arose from the grave—it was a spiritual body. To estimate the value of this statement, I will examine the arguments which have lately been brought forward, in a work written in denial of the resurrection of the human body, and in affirmation of the resurrection of a spiritual body. The work in question is by Mr. Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University, and contains much of Scripture interpretation that is very valuable. The Professor, speaking of the resurrection of Christ, (see *Anastasis*, p. 151, *et seq.*), says, "It seems to be a fair presumption that the same body which rose also ascended. But the evidence is certainly conclusive that it was not a material body which ascended." Granted the presumption, what evidence have we to prove that it was not a material body which ascended? was it a material body in the case of Elijah's translation, and if so, what Scripture warrant is there for concluding differently in that of Christ? Again—Mr. Bush writes, "The circumstances of Christ's appearance, in repeated instances subsequent to his resurrection, are far more consistent with the idea of his possessing a spiritual body, than the reverse." So let it be; but then the like circumstances of appearance are recorded before as well as after the resurrection. "The body of Christ," it is affirmed, "was endowed with power of entering a room when the doors were closed." This is pure assumption, but, supposing that it were fact, was there not the self-same evidence of a body "divested of conditions of matter," when Jesus came to the disciples, walking on the sea, and they thought they

had seen a spirit ; or, when he went through the midst of his enemies unscathed, while they were purposing to throw him headlong from the hill? But further—The disciples came, and held Jesus by the feet, and worshipped him : he commanded them to handle him, to see that it was himself, flesh and bone, and not a spirit divested of conditions of matter: he told Thomas to reach his hand and put it into his side : he did eat in the presence of his disciples a piece of broiled fish, and an honeycomb, (see Acts i. 4, margin.) All these are facts which scatter to the four winds the indefinite notions generally entertained of a spiritual body, of the human body undergoing some sublimating process of change. How are these facts met in the work to which allusion has been made? Mr. Bush maintains that these facts were “miraculous adaptations of the visible phenomena to the outward senses of the disciples;” and then he goes on to say, “that the wisdom of this miraculous adaptation is apparent, from the effect which his sudden appearance among them produced, even while his form and aspect were predominantly human. They were terrified and affrighted; how much would their terror have been increased had he appeared a pure, spiritual entity, were that possible.” Surely there is, or there need be, no body at all, on Mr. Bush’s own showing : surely we are not far disagreed when we find him putting the supposition of the Lord Jesus appearing a pure, spiritual entity ; a spirit, say, in the form and likeness of humanity. But again—Our author supports his miraculous adaptation scheme by the circumstance of the three angels who appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre. It is said Abraham set meat before them, and stood by them, and they did eat. Mr. Bush says that this eating was doubtless an optical act, and so he evades the question which is very naturally asked concerning these angels, What became of their bodies after they had eaten, and departed? But to conclude these remarks—Mr. Bush, in his third section, sums up his examination of the resurrection of Christ in the following words :—“As our Lord did not ascend in a material body, he must have put it off either at the ascension itself, or at some time previous, during the forty days of his sojourning on earth.” Now, of this latter hypothesis he says truly, that we have no proof. Why not take the former, without begging the question, as is done by saying, “As our Lord did not ascend in a material body.” Where is the proof of this? where is there not proof to the contrary? What becomes of Enoch’s and Elijah’s translation? Did Elijah put off his body before parting from Elisha? I ask, If the material body of Christ did not rise from the grave, what became of it? for it was not found in the grave, only the clothes were left there. Mr. Bush attempts to reply to this; he says, “It must be maintained that the body which hung upon the cross was miraculously dissolved, or resolved into primitive elements.” Facts already stated plainly contradict this : such dissolution could not have taken place till the Lord stood in the position of Elijah, that is, till he ascended up to the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. Mr. Bush labours to prove that Jesus often ascended during the forty days, but the proof to me is entirely unsatisfactory. What can I think of such an hypothesis, supported by such testimony as the following? After having quoted Jesus saying, “All power is given unto me in heaven,” &c., Mr. B. observes, “This language,

and his breathing upon them, in token of his imparting to them the Holy Spirit, supposes a previous ascension." But the same language would prove an ascension prior to the crucifixion; for Jesus prayed before his passion, "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." (John xvii. 2.) Mr. B. supports his previous ascension by stating, that it was after our Lord's ascension that he was to give gifts to men; but does not the verse just quoted from John xvii., contradict this? and besides, is it true that Jesus *did* give gifts during the forty days? Certainly not, in the sense in which these gifts were prophesied of. The gift was that of the Holy Ghost—but the Holy Ghost was not given till the day of Pentecost, because, till the expiration of the forty days, Jesus was not glorified. Mr. B.'s great mistake, in the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, appears to be wrapt up in one short sentence, which he has printed in Italics: "*He died in a natural body, he went into heaven in a spiritual body.*" It is from the expression "spiritual body," that the whole of what I believe to be his errors, and those of the commonly received views of the resurrection, have arisen; being in ignorance that the Scripture never speaks of the human body of Christ, either before or after the ascension, when it speaks of a spiritual body, or a being made like unto the body of his glory.

That our way may be cleared as we proceed, I will now give a summary of the conclusions which are deducible from the foregoing examination.

1. The common doctrine of a resurrection of our bodies falls to the ground, when attempted to be established from the resurrection of Christ, there being no similarity between the two cases.

2. Supposing the commonly received doctrine to be true, and that the resurrection of dust depends upon and follows after the resurrection of Christ—what then? Why, having proved that no change had taken place in Christ's body, a spirit not having flesh and bones, as he had, does it not follow that no change will take place in our bodies; that they will likewise be flesh and bones? Is it not an inevitable consequence that we also shall have the capacity of eating a piece of a broiled fish and an honeycomb: that, according to the supposition of a Rev. Gentleman, lately preaching on the Millennium, there will be the pleasure of eating and drinking in that Utopia miscalled heaven? And this being the case, what becomes of this, among other scriptures? "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal, or like unto, the angels;" that is, have no distinction of sex, are neither male nor female; as Paul writes, "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." In Christ Jesus! that is, in the resurrection, in the born-again dispensation, in the regeneration kingdom; for, saith the Spirit, "Ye are all one, and every one members one of another;" one new man, following on to come into the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ, or to be made like unto the body of his glory. This alone is sufficient to scatter the commonly received notions of the resurrection to the four corners of the earth; inasmuch as, if there be neither male nor female, neither marrying nor giving in marriage, the resurrection of which Christ spake to the Sadducees cannot be attached to this body of dust and ashes; for where, in such case, could



there be, by any possibility, a resurrection of the same body as was laid in the grave? This view is strengthened by a reference to the passage in Luke's Gospel, parallel to Matt. xxii. 30. In Luke xx. 35, we read these very remarkable words, "The children of this world (age) marry and are given in marriage: but they which *shall be accounted worthy* to obtain that world, and the resurrection (that is) from the dead ( $\tau\eta\varsigma$  ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν,) neither marry nor are given in marriage." The phraseology of this verse is very peculiar, as regards the expression "accounted *worthy*," as well as "the resurrection that is from the dead." This would seem to denote a special and select resurrection. The double article in the Greek, in addition to the preposition *ἐκ*, *from out of*, strongly marks a speciality. The same construction is to be met with in Acts iv. 2, xvii. 31, 32, and Phil. iii. 11. This speciality will, we conceive, admit of an easy solution, when we come to speak of the first resurrection.

3. We have established that if our bodies are to be raised, in accordance with the resurrection of Christ's body, they must be of the same nature; then, as a further inference from the subject, we ask, How is this to be reconciled with Paul's language to the Corinthians, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." The word in the original does not signify change, by way of alteration, but of substitution. Our raised bodies, according to the common view, must be of flesh and bones. Is flesh changed, or is there a substitution of another kind of flesh? Possibly; but still that which is born of the flesh is flesh. Are bones changed? and does this constitute a spiritual body? Then where is the change; and what is the meaning of the Scripture which saith, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed?" This passage, be the meaning thereof what it may, plainly indicates that there should be some believers animally existing at the time of the event of this change; and this agrees with Christ's words, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." The common doctrine is sadly self-inconsistent; the same body is to be raised, and yet it is to be changed; the same body is to be deposited in the dust corruptible, and the same body is to be raised incorruptible. This "change," spoken of in 1 Cor. xv., is a difficulty in the way of Mr. Bush's theory of the resurrection. He says, "Here we encounter a great difficulty in view of our previous position, that the true resurrection takes place at the death of every individual believer, when he emerges from a material into a spiritual body." The difficulty lies in this question, "Is it not implied, not to say expressly asserted, that the resurrection of all the righteous in this passage, and in 1 Thess. iv. 17, is simultaneous, and that the event is still future, to occur at the epoch of the second advent, and in conjunction with the translation of the living saints?" The answer which Mr. B. vouchsafes to this question, is, to say the least of it, somewhat startling. He maintains that the Apostles were mistaken in regard to the time of the second advent. This opinion will be noticed hereafter, in its proper place.

4. We shall now bring forward a crowning evidence that there is no connexion between the resurrection of Christ's body and the presumed resurrection of dust, or that if the resurrection of Christ be a pledge of

our resurrection, this last resurrection can have no concern with the human body. Suppose the contrary. Then I ask, How was Christ the first fruits of them that slept? How was he the first that should rise from the dead? How was he the first begotten from the dead? How will any who hold the common notions of the resurrection answer these questions, in accordance with such notions? How, it may be asked, will an objector dispose of these and other similar Scripture evidences, in opposition to the facts of the Shunamite's son, the young man of Nain, or the case of Lazarus? Paul writes to the Hebrews, "Women received their dead raised to life again: others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection." The preachers of the day will tell us that this better resurrection is still in prospect, still to be obtained, a resurrection at the last day, to a spiritual body like Christ's; but then we have already concluded that no change took place in Christ's body, consequently another interpretation must be sought for Paul's better resurrection. Christ was the first fruits: this clearly demonstrates that his resurrection teaches no such thing as a resurrection of dust; because we are in possession of Scripture testimony that natural bodies of clay were raised before him. But the resurrection of Christ was, as we have seen, *the* doctrine of Apostolic preaching. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain," every word that we utter against the covenant of works is false, it is neither waxen old nor ready to vanish away. "Your faith is also vain:" "we are of all men most miserable, and ye are yet in your sins." But then again, that the Apostle was not of all men most miserable, is evident: he was always rejoicing in hope of the resurrection of the dead; and that the Corinthians were not still in their sins, is equally clear from the mention of the "exceeding greatness of God's power toward them that believed, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead." This conjunction of spiritual things proves once more the vast importance of the doctrine of the resurrection. It is clear that such importance attaches not to a resurrection of dust. We are constrained, therefore, to seek for it elsewhere; and, as already stated, I think that we shall discover the object of our search in the following passage of Peter's Pentecostal sermon:—"Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." An examination into the meaning of this scripture will give us a view of the resurrection totally different from those views which now generally obtain. The word "therefore," it will be observed, connects this verse with the preceding portion of the chapter; and the verse itself suggests a wide distinction between the character of Jesus before, and after, his death and resurrection. For the purpose of our inquiry, we look back into Peter's sermon, as far as 22d verse; "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you." We observe particularly this title, Jesus of Nazareth, and we ask, Why does the Apostle introduce the subject of his preaching in these lowly terms, in this humble guise? The reason is obvious, because it was only thus that his hearers had known him, or been accustomed to recognise him in the midst of them. "Is not this the carpenter's son, of Nazareth, of

Galilee, and are not his mother and brethren with us?" "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" These were common sayings in the days of the Lord's personal ministry. Ignorance of the times and seasons, in a right division of the word of truth, has hindered from noticing the difference of manner in which the Son of God is mentioned during his own ministry, and the succeeding ministry of the Holy Ghost. He is simply Jesus, in the records of the four gospels; this title, however, is changed for Christ in the Acts and Epistles, or Jesus Christ, or the Lord Jesus Christ. But it is objected, Was he not Lord and Christ during his personal ministry? Certainly not; Peter's testimony is decisive upon that point; for, says he, God hath made a crucified Jesus, Lord and Christ. But it is objected again, Does he not in his ministry ask his disciples, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" and did not Peter answer, "Thou art the Christ?" Yes, all this is very true. It was the Lord's own answer to the woman who said, "I know that when Messiah cometh, which is called Christ, he will tell us all things." Jesus answered, "I that speak to thee am he." Messiah he undoubtedly was, but only in a prospective point of view. He was now under the arrest of death—under its power, reign, and dominion, and had yet to submit to the stroke of divine justice on account of the transgression of the first Adam; for, "in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." The assertion may safely be ventured, that Messiah he undoubtedly was, not in anything at all approaching to such manifestation as was given on the day of Pentecost, after he had fulfilled the Messiah's character, as given in Isaiah liii., or in Daniel, where it is written, "After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself." Peter responded to the Lord's question, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" but it is quite evident that Peter wist not what he said, or of what manner of spirit he was, any more than on the Mount of Transfiguration, when he said, "It is good for us to be here!" The rejoinder made by the Lord was this, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; flesh and blood have not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." O no! this was a name abhorrent to flesh and blood, and beyond the comprehension of the carnal mind. This was a resurrection name, which belonged to the kingdom of heaven, and flesh and blood could never enter that kingdom; therefore it was well said that this was none of Peter's confession.

The whole of that conversation is worthy of the closest study. Immediately after the Lord had blessed Peter, he gave unto him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Now we know that Peter used one of these keys on the day of Pentecost, in opening the mysteries of the gospel to the Jews. Is it not then highly probable that there is an intimate connexion between that very Pentecostal day, and Peter's confession of the Messiah? a connexion which the Apostle exhibits, when he tells the house of Israel that the crucified Nazarene was honoured with a name above every name, Lord and Christ.

But further—It is recorded that Jesus, in this conversation, charged his disciples that they should tell no man that he was the Christ. Wherefore, whence the necessity of this? Because his hour was not yet come; as he said, "Your time is always ready, but mine is not

yet." So we may very well suppose it to have been the case here. Bearing in mind the carnal notions of the Messiahship which the disciples, in common with the rest of their countrymen, entertained, they would no doubt be prepared to proclaim abroad that name upon which such mighty things were thought to depend. But Jesus anticipated this consequence of Peter's confession; and it is somewhat remarkable, that in the two other places (in John's Gospel,) where we read of confessions made concerning the Messiahship,—one by Martha, and the other by the disciples,—the narrative breaks off, and the conversation comes at once to an end. Again—to make known what and what manner of time was signified in Peter's confession of Christ, we are told in three of the Gospels, that "from that time Jesus began to show unto his disciples that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and raised again the third day." This at once brings Peter's confession to the day of Pentecost for its fulfilment. And in what immediately follows we see a confirmation of the remark which we ventured to offer upon Peter's ignorance. When Jesus spoke of persecution, suffering, and death, this was so foreign to Peter's carnal notions, so utterly repugnant to his temporal kingdom scheme, that he took Jesus, and began to rebuke him; "Be merciful to thyself, Lord; this shall not be unto thee." I cannot refrain from observing here, that it would seem strange, how it could enter the heart of any man to imagine that Peter, or any of the disciples, had so much as a glimmering of Christianity at this time. Peter was a thorough Jew, and as the Christianity of systems is only a mixed Judaism, no wonder that the Peter of Christ's ministry is mistaken for the Peter who preached the gospel in demonstration of the Spirit of power. However, the wisdom of God corrects the mistake; "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God;" thou no more speakest that which is revealed of my Father in heaven; no, thou savourest those things that be of men, and this thy speech is a revelation of flesh and blood.

We will glance for a moment at one more particular of this conversation, by way of showing how the exposition thereof revolves round the day of Pentecost. Jesus, having for the occasion changed Peter's name to Satan, proceeded to speak of that which had given offence to Peter, telling him, in the spirit of prophecy, that it was ordained to be his own lot; "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me;" let him leave house and lands, wife and children; let him cut off a right hand, or pluck out a right eye; let him leave all the worldly good which attached to a worldly covenant, and let him follow the fortunes of him that should suffer many things of the ministers of that covenant, and be killed. After this intimation of his disciples' trials, Jesus comforted them with a glance at the bright side of things, saying, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom;" thus connecting Peter's confession with the tribulations of the Apostolic ministry and the time of the end, and so signifying what and what manner of time Peter did speak of, when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." We have then

established, as it were, the day-dawn of this glorious title; and be it observed, that it militates nothing against this view that Jesus is oftentimes addressed as Lord in the Gospels, that name so used there being merely a title of respect, equivalent to the expression Sir, so often to be met with in the Gospel by John. They are the same word in the original, and want of attention to this, or ignorance of the original, has given rise to many a foolish controversy. One such controversy I remember, in a correspondence which appeared in a Calvinistic Magazine, upon the woman taken in adultery. The question was this, Whether or no this woman was, to use the Calvinistic phraseology, "a child of God, or a quickened vessel of mercy." On one side it was stoutly contended that she must have been "one of the living family." Why? Because she called Jesus, Lord, and it was argued, "No man can call Jesus, Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." And this is called gospel; this, we are told to believe, is a trying of the spirits whether they be of God; this is an interpretation of scripture by those who maintain that it is not they who speak, but the Holy Ghost! Alas! alas! what a day we live in! as certain of these interpreters would exclaim, on hearing or reading of *our* views of divine truth.

We shall now proceed to show the connexion between another conversation recorded by the Evangelists, and the day of Pentecost, in order to discover clearly the significant meaning of Peter's words, when he says, "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." The conversation to which I allude is recorded in the latter part of Matt. xxii. In that chapter we find three several personifications of Satan coming to Jesus and tempting him: the Herodians, the Sadducees, and the Pharisees. The Sadducees' temptation was in the form of a question concerning the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. They appealed to Moses, to the five books of the law, which alone they received to be from God. They appealed, saying, "Master, Moses said." They imagined Moses spake nothing of a resurrection, which therefore they denied. They supposed that this resurrection was to be found only in the writings of the prophets, who were of no estimation among them. By a single appeal to Moses, their own strong-hold, the Lord put them to an ignominious silence, and showed the falsity of their position, be that position what it may. Jesus said unto them, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." As touching the resurrection of the dead, and "that the dead are raised, Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." (Luke xx. 37.) How marvellous is this answer, and how we do here indeed see that it was well said in the prophets, "His name shall be called Wonderful." Let me ask, for one moment, of those who are stumbled at the novelty, as it is called, of our views of divine revelation, Would you, would any one, ever have imagined that there was written the doctrine of the resurrection in the words, "I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob?" Surely it is not too much to beg for a patient hearing, and to entreat that our fundamental position of the past second advent may have a careful investigation; an investigation from the Scriptures of unerring truth, to which alone almost all parties

acknowledge an appeal. Surely it is not too much to ask this among innumerable other questions, calculated to exhibit a difference between popular doctrines and Scripture, Was it a resurrection of dead bodies of which Jesus spake to the Sadducees? There is not one word said about a resurrection of dust, and if the answer of Jesus at all related to such resurrection, it was no answer whatever, for how does the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are now living, prove the resurrection of their bodies? This question is such a difficulty to the advocates of the resurrection of dust, that they are obliged to leave this conversation out, in a proof of such resurrection, and to make a confession as follows—a confession from which I entirely dissent. “The most that this argument proves is the immortality of the soul; that the souls of the patriarchs did not die with their bodies, as the Sadducees believed.” (*Resurrection of Same Body Asserted, by Dr. Hody.*) We must seek for a meaning to the resurrection of the dead, different from the commonly received opinion in this passage, at all events. Professor Bush maintains that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must have been raised when this conversation with the Sadducees took place, and must have been living in resurrection bodies. The Professor is again at variance with the plainest declarations of Scripture, for if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were then raised, what becomes of this scripture, “Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first-fruits* of them that slept?” Mr. B. is quite correct in maintaining that the conversation with the Sadducees teaches nothing of a resurrection of dead bodies, any more than does the scripture which says, “Behold this child is set for the fall and resurrection of many in Israel.” But Mr. B. is, I submit, altogether wrong many times, when he strays from that one grand object of his work. What can we think of his opinion that the patriarchs were then in the resurrection, when we read in Job, “Till the heavens be no more I shall not awake, nor be raised out of my sleep;” and when the Holy Ghost witnessed, some time after the conversation in question, “David is not yet ascended into the heavens?” Job was not awaked, David was not ascended, the patriarchs were not raised *then*; but let me here observe, it does not follow that they are not *now*, as we shall hereafter have occasion to show. When Mr. Bush quotes Paul, “If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,” he appends to this a note from Mr. Noble’s “Appeal,” to the following effect: “The Apostle speaks of this resurrection as something attainable in this life—what can he mean by attaining to the resurrection of the dead, but a state of complete regeneration; whereas, to make him talk of striving to attain to the resurrection of dead bodies, which all (if any,) are to experience, whether they strive for it or not, and which, strive as they will, they cannot bring on any sooner, this is to make him talk in a strange manner indeed.” There can be no doubt of this; but mark, when it is affirmed that the Apostle spake of a resurrection as of something attainable in this life, is there not here a contradiction to the statement that the resurrection of the dead, in the case of the patriarchs, is tantamount to a future state, and that they must have been raised at the death of the natural body? And then, moreover, how does all this agree with Heb. xi. 35, “Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a

better resurrection?" Paul's exposition is plain and intelligible, from the last verse of that chapter, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us *should not be made perfect.*" And having this, we care for no other exposition, for we need none.

However, to return to our argument. The answer of Jesus completely met the cavil of the Sadducees. The multitude were astonished; the Scribes answered, saying, "Master, thou hast well said." The Pharisees exulted to see the Sadducees put to shame and confusion. In this one particular of Pharisaic rejoicing, coupled with the circumstances connected with it, we have a key to the true interpretation of this discourse, which interpretation will throw a flood of light upon the great scripture of the Messiahship of Jesus, now under consideration. It is of no moment to enquire what was the Sadducean hypothesis on the resurrection. Our concern is with the answer which Christ rendered to their question. We find that the Pharisees triumphed in the discomfiture of the opposite party. Was then the Lord agreed with the Pharisees upon the disputed doctrine? I answer no, by no means; and I ground my answer upon what follows. When the Pharisees exulted, Jesus proceeded to put down their exultation, by silencing them, as he had silenced the Sadducees, and as we shall presently find, on the self-same doctrine of the resurrection. How read we? Jesus said to the Scribes, who had praised him for his dexterous reasoning, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" As it had been with the Sadducees, so it was with the Pharisees, "No man was able to answer him a word." Now I gather from this that the Lord's view of the resurrection was prospective, and not, as Mr. Bush affirms, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were raised at this time. Christ silences the Pharisee, through the possession of the knowledge of a future revelation. He asks them for the interpretation of a scripture, about which it is impossible that either they or his own disciples could give one word of explanation. Why so? Because the Holy Ghost was not given, and the answer to the question, "If David," &c. could only be rendered under the ministration of the Spirit, when that which was spoken by David had come to pass. The answer, as we know, was rendered in Peter's Pentecostal sermon. We couple this with the acknowledged truth, that the preaching of the Apostles was Jesus and the resurrection. But such preaching displeased the Pharisees equally as much as it displeased the Sadducees, for they were grieved that the Apostles taught, through Jesus, the resurrection of the dead. They could not endure the name of the crucified Nazarene, along with the resurrection, for the resurrection belonged to Messiah's day, and they would not have that man, the Carpenter's Son, to reign over them. Holding carnal, earthly views of the doctrine, they might well, indeed, from other causes, demur to Apostolic preaching of Jesus being the first-fruits and the first-begotten, seeing that there had been those who were raised before him. And why, may we ask—supposing for a moment that the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection was the same

as that now generally entertained—why are not the systems of the day equally consistent with the Pharisees on such a supposition? Why do they not substitute the Shunamite's son and the resurrection, or Lazarus and the resurrection? But it is all vanity.

To proceed. We will now connect the conversation in Matt. xxii. with Acts ii. 29. "Men and brethren," saith Peter, "let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead, and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." But yet, though it be said, David was dead and buried, there was the resurrection of David, for God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. Where then was David's existence? David had life in the promise; "These all 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 strangers and pilgrims on the earth." These promises were the promises of life in Christ Jesus, as an apostle witnesseth, when he speaks of the life that now is, (in this dispensation,) and of that which is to come, (in the coming age,) even that eternal life which God who cannot lie promised before the world began. David, as having life in promises yet to be performed, was not yet ascended into the heavens; but when the promises should be performed, then should David ascend. Now if, instead of David, we read Abraham, or Isaac, or Jacob was not yet ascended into the heavens, then I conceive that we shall arrive at the true meaning of the resurrection of the dead, concerning which Christ spake to the Sadducees and Pharisees. Abraham, David, Samuel, and all the prophets, were none of them ascended into the heavens, were none of them raised, or in the enjoyment of the resurrection spirit of life, when Christ entered into this conversation, and when Peter preached on the day of Pentecost. But it does by no means follow, that because they were not then, therefore they are not now ascended; nay, it amounts almost to a demonstration, laying aside altogether the proof of the past resurrection, as connected with a past second advent, that the patriarchs must now have ascended—must have obtained that better resurrection, for which a Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, and to win which a Paul counted the loss of all things as only of so much value as himself was reckoned, even the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things—no more than dung and dross. How so? how does this past ascension appear so self-evident? Simply because Christ is called the first-fruits of them that slept; or, to use Mr. Bush's words, the first in rank; the author, the procuring cause, of the resurrection of the saints. The figure of first-fruits suggests and implies a harvest. Now the harvest, as we find in referring to the worship under the law, began to be gathered in immediately after the presentation of the first-fruits; and surely it would be a very violent construction of the analogy to suppose it to imply that hundreds or thousands of years might elapse between the resurrection of the grand Precursor, and that of the mass of his followers. But according to the commonly received opinion, the first-fruits (Christ) have been gathered in, and nothing more; the whole harvest is yet to follow. This alone is sufficient, one would think, to confine the resurrection within a dispensation limit, to the period of the vanishing away of the Old Covenant. This alone



suffices for a complete overthrow of the popular doctrine : and surely we may here at least adopt an opponent's language, and exclaim, with reason, It is preposterous to imagine such a thing as your gross and grovelling doctrine. There is, however, none of this violence in our view of the whole harvest following the first-fruits, in the period of that generation of men to whom Christ addressed his ministry ; within the compass, and at the conclusion of, the Apostolic age and dispensation.

Having generalized thus far, we will now examine Peter's exposition of the great truth wherewith the Lord put his adversaries to silence in the days of his flesh. " If David called him Lord, how is he then his Son ? " The resurrection of Jesus is, we maintain, the solution of the riddle ; but let us ask, for one moment, how does the theology of our own day help out the silence of the Pharisees, and demonstrate wherein lay their ignorance ? To whom shall we go ? Our minds, naturally enough, have recourse to those whose Biblical attainments are, or are supposed to be, the greatest : to Calvinists, or even such as are advanced beyond Calvinism, and very wisely reject all ' isms.' We love this rejection of ' isms.' We love to hear of party names being set aside. We love, moreover, to hear or to read of a knowledge of the opposition between God and man, in thoughts, ways, word, and work, only let it be knowledge of the right sort, setting forth a Scriptural statement of such opposition. Now, let it be supposed that the question which Jesus put to the Pharisees is the doctrine of divine inversion, as stated by Christ himself : and let it be supposed further, that no sooner is this doctrine understood, than the explanation of the puzzle is found to be at once simple and satisfactory : and having supposed all this, let us examine the account given us of the doctrine in question. Here it is, ready to our hand — " The Pharisees knew what Christ was to be in flesh, but what he was to be in spirit they knew nothing." True, and the reason, we say, is obvious. " They were unable to answer how Christ could be at once David's inferior and David's superior." True again, leaving out the words " at once." " But," it is urged further, " we are not so circumstanced. The solution from the doctrine of divine inversion is as follows :—According to the flesh, or as man, the Messiah was David's inferior, or the superiority of David to Christ arose from David in order of time having appeared first and Messiah second." There needs no prophet to tell us this ; surely if this were carried into the most Arminian free-will assembly, into the midst of any sect (not Unitarian) professing Christianity, it would be immediately acknowledged. But suppose we examine the inversion for one moment. " According to spirit, or as possessing an everlasting existence at God's right hand, an existence which he had before his incarnation no less than subsequent to it, the Messiah was David's superior or Lord. The superiority of Christ to David sprang from the Messiah as Creator having existed first, and David, as the Messiah's creature, having existed only in the second place." Enough ; we will quote no farther. It is affirmed that the above solution was a puzzle to the Jews, but can this really be a puzzle at all ? Might not a Unitarian, who rejects such solution as the above, answer after this fashion ? If there were nothing deeper, nothing more profound, conveyed in the question of

Jesus, it is hard to conceive that there is any difficulty whatever in the way. The ignorance of the Pharisees, at this rate, simply resolves itself into ignorance of the commonly received doctrine of the Trinity. But if that doctrine, as held by religious systems, be erroneous, as I believe it to be; or, to say no more, if religious systems cannot explain this glorious doctrine, as I am persuaded they cannot; then the puzzle, leaving the Pharisees on one side, and taking only the mind of the propounder of the question, must be sought for elsewhere. Now how strikingly opposed to this Creator and creature solution of the riddle propounded by our spiritual Sampson, does the following statement of the general expectation of the Jewish nation, with regard to their Messiah, appear. I speak not of their knowledge of the true bearing and import of that expectation, only of the expectation itself. "The general opinion of the Jews," says Dr. Lightfoot, "looked forward to a period of consummation or restitution, frequently called 'the last day,' 'the world to come,' 'the reign of the Messiah,' when a new order of things was to be ushered in, among which was the event denominated the *resurrection of the dead*. Connected with this resurrection, was the deliverance of the Jewish nation from the yoke of their enemies—their advancement to acknowledged pre-eminence over all other people—the restoration of the Shekinah—the rebuilding of Jerusalem and its temple in renovated splendour—the endowment of the earth with a new and unexampled fertility—the cessation of wars and bloodshed—and an indefinite period of peace, prosperity, and happiness, from the rising to the going down of the sun." A very slight acquaintance with Old Testament prophecies will suffice to shew from what source the Jews had derived their expectations; and a knowledge of the spiritual meaning and application of those prophecies will clear up the point of the Pharisees' inability to answer the question put to them by Jesus, an inability totally independent of any view of the common doctrine of the Trinity. As the Jewish nation overlooked the previous ordained humiliation of Messiah, so they were entirely mistaken in the notions which they entertained of his glory. When he had entered into his glory, when he was set down at the right hand of God, angels, authorities, and powers being subject unto him, all the thought that his own, who received him not, cherished concerning him was conveyed by the reproach, '*That deceiver*.' In the days of his ministry, he testified, "This people's heart is waxed gross, their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed." In the judgment-hall of Pilate this saying was very manifest, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence." But if we enter into a discussion of the mistakes and misapprehensions of the Jews respecting their Messiah, we shall only be repeating what has been already advanced. Let it suffice to have pointed out the "why and wherefore" of Sadducean and Pharisaic ignorance; and having done so, let us proceed with the great matter in hand, our examination of Peter's Pentecostal sermon, the glories of which sermon, I think, will never be exhausted, and of which I can only hope to give an account which shall be little more than the shadow of the substance. It has been shewn that the doctrine of the resurrection does not derive its importance from the presumption

that the resurrection of Christ was a pledge of the resurrection of human bodies. It has been likewise demonstrated, that Christ, during his ministry, pointed to times subsequent to his ascension for an exposition of the things concerning himself, and for an interpretation of the doctrine of the resurrection, upon which the Pharisees were in error. It has been proved, moreover, that these erroneous notions are not corrected by the knowledge of David having appeared first in order of time, and Messiah second. The exposition of the resurrection doctrine, then, is yet to be given from the question, If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? We shall be assisted much in this exposition by a prophecy in Isaiah xi., for I confess that I am well nigh overwhelmed with the vastness of the subject. The chapter referred to begins thus:—“And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.” The next verse explains what and what manner of time the prophet did speak of, when he thus testified before hand:—“And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding.” We have only to compare this with a scripture often before quoted, which Jesus read in the synagogue of Nazareth:—“He opened the book where it was written, The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; and he closed the book, saying, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.” It will be admitted on all hands, that this prophecy relates to Christ’s first appearance in the days of his flesh, as the offspring of David, and of the fruit of David’s loins; as the tender plant, and the root out of a dry ground, out of the dry and withered stock of David, the glory of whose house had long departed from Judah. But in Isaiah xi. 10, we read, “In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people.” The day in question is the day when, as we read in verse 6, “The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them.” I remember being much amused, at the last exhibition of paintings in Liverpool, by a picture actually representing this passage in a literal interpretation. There were depicted all these different and discordant animals, living together in harmony. It is hardly possible to credit the evidence of our senses, when we see such preposterous imaginations concerning Him who is spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. And yet, for aught we know to the contrary, it is as reasonable to suppose that the fierce, carnivorous animals mentioned by the prophet, should become gentle and harmless as the lamb, as it is to imagine, what really is entertained, that a hundred antagonistic religious parties should eat of the same bread, and drink out of the same cup. How gloriously in contrast to the views of systems, stands the exposition which the Lion of the tribe of Judah gave of the above-quoted passage, through the instrumentality of his servants the Apostles. I allude to the vision of Peter, when he saw a certain vessel descend, as it had been a great sheet, upon the which, when he had fastened his eyes, he considered, and saw four-footed beasts of the earth, and *wild beasts*, and creeping things, and fowls of the air; and he heard a voice saying unto him, “Arise, Peter, slay and eat.” Peter’s answer opens up Isaiah’s prophecy; “Not so, Lord, for nothing common or unclean hath at any time entered my mouth.” What follows?

“The voice answered again from heaven, What God hath cleansed, call not thou common. And while Peter doubted what this vision should mean, and while he thought upon it, behold three men which were sent from Cornelius stood before the gate, and the Spirit said unto him, Arise, get thee down, go with them, nothing doubting, for I have sent them.” The issue was, that as Peter preached to Cornelius and his house, the Holy Ghost fell on the Gentiles, as on the circumcision; and Peter seeing this, said, “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons.” He then understood, and could explain, the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the clean and unclean beasts (under the law,) feeding together; the unclean—the wolf, leopard, lion, and bear, representing those who were aliens to the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise; the clean—the lamb, the kid, the calf, and the cow, representing them of the circumcision; and the lying down together prefiguring Jew and Gentile, bond and free, feeding in the same green pasture, and reclining beside the same still waters of the gospel of Jesus Christ, of him of whom it is written, “He is our peace, who hath made both one, that he might reconcile both unto God in one body on the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.” This exposition recommends itself at once to an enlightened mind. There is however to me some obscurity as to the application of the word Gentile. It seems quite clear that the ten tribes are included in Isaiah’s description of the clean and unclean beasts living in harmony, because we read that this root should be an ensign for the nations, and should assemble the outcasts of Israel, and that then should the envy of Ephraim depart, and the adversaries of Judah be cut off; then Ephraim (Israel) should not envy Judah, and Judah should not vex Ephraim; that then, in the last days of Judah and Jerusalem, they should beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation should not lift up sword against nation, neither should they (Israel and Judah,) learn war any more.” I cannot avoid including the ten tribes under the term Gentiles, as I see the passage in Isa. xi. including them among the unclean beasts; and it may be asked, Were they not unclean, as being cut off that they should be no more a people under the old covenant; and does not the description of their uncleanness agree with the description of the ten tribes in the parables; as, for instance, Lazarus full of sores, and the prodigal feeding on swine’s husks? There is something worthy of consideration in this. Israel and the Heathen were undoubtedly on a level, as being neither of them “the people of God;” but still, Israel having once been a people, while the rest, who are included (as we think,) under the term Gentile, never were the people of God, as never having been in covenant; the Holy Ghost marks a difference between them, as in Hosea ii. 18, where is a passage somewhat parallel to that which we have commented upon in Isaiah xi., “In that day will I make a covenant for them (Israel, or Ephraim,) with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground.” The Lord is here speaking of Israel as again “a people,” but under the new and better covenant, and so in contrast with the heathen world; just as in Ezekiel xxxiv., where Ephraim, being addressed as under covenant, or in the everlasting remembrance of the promise to

Abraham, is styled scattered and lost sheep. We may remark, by the way, that in the 25th verse of the same chapter of Ezekiel, there is mention of the covenant with the beasts of the field, as in Hosea; "I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land:" and this should be when the Lord's servant David should be a prince among them. This subject is interesting as a subject for inquiry; but, however, it alters not the time of fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy in chapter xi. If Christ have been lifted up, as a light to lighten the Gentiles, then, as Mr. Wilkin's, in his "Last Days," observes, the wolf and the lamb, &c. have been reconciled, in the new spiritual state, and have been brought to lie down together in peace and amity in the gospel dispensation; for the prophet says, "*In that day* there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people." If the figure of the clean and unclean animals has not been fulfilled, then Christ has not stood an ensign for the nations, and the Gentiles have never sought after him.

But to return from this digression. When we read, "*In that day* there shall be a root out of Jesse," we suppose that it will be admitted that this relates to the gospel dispensation. The question arises, When was Christ the root of Jesse? During his ministry, when he asked the Pharisees, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" By no means. Throughout his ministry, and up to the time of his resurrection, Christ was but the offspring of David, and the rod out of the stem of Jesse. It was in the resurrection that he was the root of David, and so he testifies in the Revelation given to John, "I Jesus, am the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star." Here we have an explanation of that which really is still a mystery to all Judaizing systems, as much as it ever was to the Sadducees and Pharisees. When Christ was seen of John, in the vision, he said, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore:" and John, whose Revelation we believe to have been written at least before any of the Epistles, styles that same Jesus, whom the Jews had crucified, "the faithful witness, the first-begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth." Kings of the earth! How remarkable this expression, and how clear the meaning! In the resurrection, when Jesus appeared the root of David, we behold the fulfilment of a prophecy in the 45th Psalm, "Instead of thy fathers, shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth." This is a solution of the riddle which Jesus propounded to the Pharisees, as we are taught by inspired testimony in Hebrews i., where the Apostle, discoursing of the resurrection glory of Christ, quotes the 6th and 7th verses of the Psalm. How glorious is the harmony of the Scriptures! Christ saith to John, "I am the root and offspring of David; so David, seeing this before, spake of it, saying, "Instead of thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and David, shall be thy children; for a seed shall serve thee; and thy name, thy resurrection name, shall be called Wonderful, the mighty God, the *everlasting Father*, the prince of peace." These children were to be made princes in all the earth; so John, in the Revelation, ascribes the glory unto the prince of the kings of the earth, saying, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath

made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever." These children doubtless embraced all that had fallen asleep in hope of the resurrection of the dead; and thus Abraham and the patriarchs, being the fathers of Christ according to the flesh, became his children in the resurrection. This magnificent subject shines out from almost every page of Scripture. In the resurrection, Jesus was declared to be the Son of God with power; "As the Father," said he, "hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Thus he spake in the time of his personal ministry; and in the same conversation wherein he spake of some coming forth to the resurrection, and of the dead hearing his voice. Now, "this life in himself," was manifested at the resurrection, as Peter bears witness in his sermon; "Having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." As having life in himself, we behold him the root of David; and as the root of David, he speaks of himself and his disciples, in the following beautiful figure: "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Now the branches bear not the root, but the root the branches. In the root is the life, and thus Christ, being the root of David, according to the Spirit, in his resurrection, we understand what that scripture meaneth which saith, "I am the resurrection and the life." Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him; and therefore and thereafter comes in the glorious assurance of faith, "Because I live, ye shall live also:" "yea, though ye were dead, yet shall ye live; for whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." Here, we repeat, (and we dwell with untold satisfaction on the repetition,) here, in the resurrection, was the life. But what life? That of dead bodies? Not so, otherwise David is not yet ascended into the heavens; otherwise the first-fruits have been gathered in, but not another grain of the harvest; otherwise the corn of wheat hath fallen into the ground, and though it were said that it should bring forth much fruit, as yet it hath brought forth none. But thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift, we have not so learned Christ; we have learned to compare spiritual things with spiritual, and dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves. It is the interpretation of the inspired Peter, that David spake of the resurrection of Christ, "that *his soul* was not left in hell;" and we know that the first Adam was made a living soul, but the last Adam, in resurrection power, was made a quickening spirit; and thus it is that Paul speaks of the word which in one place he calls his gospel, and says, that it is a divider asunder of soul and spirit; of the living soul, and the quickening spirit; of the first Adam, and the second. The confusion that has arisen upon the doctrine of the resurrection, is, I believe, to be attributed mainly to a want of attention to these words in the passage above quoted, "His soul was not left in hell." It is generally supposed that the death of the first Adam related to the human bodies of men. So far from this being fact, I consider that the death of the body, or animal death, has no more importance attached to it in the Bible, than in any other history of successive generations of men. Just as is the case with the word time. Death and time are dispensation matters in Scripture: we hold that at the close of the dispensations, in the fall of Jerusalem, there was time

no longer; so, in like manner, we maintain that at the same close there was no more death. But there is time, if we are content to lay the Bible usage of this relative term aside; so also there is death, if we choose to follow the same course of exclusion of Bible meaning. I apprehend that we may take three several views of the word death, as used in the Bible.—There is animal death, or the death of the body; as when God saith, “Moses, my servant, is dead.” There is the death by Adam, of which Paul is discoursing in 1 Cor. xv.; “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” This death was distinct from animal death, for we read, “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;” consequently, if this were the dissolution of the body, Adam must, on the very day of transgression, have given up the ghost; but we read again, “All the days of Adam were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.” I know that it may be said, the denunciation pronounced by God was a solemn prospective judgment; but facts contradict this. The death is clearly shown in the immediate exclusion of Adam from the garden of Eden, which garden was but a type of a spiritual Eden, as Adam himself was only the figure of him that was to come. The death is exhibited in the care with which the Lord God prevented Adam from putting forth his hand, and taking *also* of the tree of life, and eating, and living for ever. This tree of life, finds its exposition in the blessings of a fully revealed gospel, as we know from what the Spirit said unto the churches, “Unto him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God:” “and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” Adam was excluded from this eternal life, which could be possessed by none till Christ our life had appeared: he died to an earthly paradise, and to natural and temporal blessings, to be raised to a heavenly paradise, and to spiritual and eternal blessings. And this reminds of a third description of death, concerning which there is a great account in the prophets—the death of the tribes of Israel. As Adam died in the loss of the good things which at his creation God had given him in Eden, so Israel died in the loss of the good things which appertained to the first covenant in the land of Canaan. This is the death spoken of in the prophecy of Hosea, and in Ezekiel xxxvii. We read in Hosea, “When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel; when he offended in Baal, *he died.*” And yet saith the Lord, in the same chapter, “I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death.” (Hosea xiii.) Now it is in reference to this death in the land, under the first covenant, that we read of such exhortations as the following: “Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die, O house of Israel!” How absurd then do the same exhortations now appear, as they fall from the pulpits of Arminian preachers! And how ludicrous also! “Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die?” is sounded forth still; but the exhortation is not quoted to the full; “O house of Israel,” is omitted. The exhortation, as used now-a-days, should run thus to be faithful, “Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die, O house of England!” O that there were such a thing, in many a church and chapel, as a glimmering even of a knowledge of the times and seasons! Then, indeed, what we are continually advancing would require an excuse for being, what it really is, trite

and obvious, and not for being mischievous and paradoxical. But again—We read in Ezekiel xxxvii. of the dry bones—which were not those of the people of England, but the dry bones were *the whole house of Israel*—we read concerning these, an invitation, “Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live.” If our interpretation of the character of the hearers on the day of Pentecost be correct, we see the life of these bones, in the breathing of that spirit which was like a rushing mighty wind; we witness there and then the opening of the graves, according to the prophecy of Isaiah, in answer to this complaint, “Our bones are dried, our hope is lost!” Thus saith the Lord, “Behold I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and I will put my spirit within you, and I will place you in your own land.” This spirit, as we know, was the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and the land was the spiritual inheritance, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands. But we shall be returning to a subject that has been already briefly discussed. As Israel died, in the worship of Baal, to the worship of the true God, as that was established under the first covenant in the earthly land, to be raised to the true spiritual worship under the second covenant in the heavenly land, so Adam died to his creature integrity and creature communion with God in an earthly paradise, to be raised in the resurrection of Immanuel to the garden of the Lord. “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, in whom (in the first Adam head) all have sinned.” And again—“By one offence judgment came upon all to condemnation.” This is expressed again—“By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” Obedience whereunto? To the law of Moses, as it is often said—Christ hath made up the breach, and repaired the broken law, and made it honourable? Nothing of the kind. That law was only an appendage to the Adam transgression, until the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and to suppose that the obedience of Christ for his people is obedience to the law of Moses, is to maintain that the life and righteousness brought in (not wrought out) by Christ, is merely a second edition of that which Adam enjoyed in Eden. Besides, the law which Christ magnified and made honourable, was not the Sinai, but the Sion law—the law not of sin and death, but of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The obedience upon which the Apostle lays such emphasis is here—“Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became *obedient unto death*, even the death of the cross;” for “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree;” and again, “He learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him;” as it is written, “The mystery which was kept secret since the world began, is now made manifest, and made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.” (Rom. xvi. 26.) In reference to the obedience of Christ, (for Christ’s was the obedience of faith, as well as his people’s,) it is written in Isaiah, “He was numbered with the transgressors;” he was made sin, and so received the wages due to sin, which is death. This was the denunciation, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die”—thou, the



living soul; and so we read, "When his soul shall make an offering for sin;" and again, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." In the fall of Adam, sin had its reign and dominion full and complete, for then death passed upon all, and if there were no resurrection, this death would for ever remain. But there was to be a resurrection, in prospect of which a promise was given; which promise was the mystery hid from ages and from generations, to which, in the Apostle's day, the twelve tribes instantly serving God were hoping to come. This promise was that of a resurrection from the state of death introduced by the Adam fall. It runs like a golden thread throughout the gloom and bondage of the old covenant administration of death. It distinguishes between the two seeds; "I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed." "Love," saith John, "is of God; and whosoever loveth, is born of God;" "he that loveth not his brother, abideth, as Cain, in death. Whosoever hateth his brother, as Cain, is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." It was this promise that was made to Abraham. The promise was, that he should be the heir of the world. We compare that with the scripture of Jesus, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit;" and then we behold this heirship of the world. The promise was to Abraham and his seed, which is Christ, not through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. And thus we see the force of the Apostle's reasoning, "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Abraham was fully persuaded that what God had promised, he was able also to perform; he was persuaded of the resurrection of Christ; he saw that resurrection in a type, when his faith was tried in the offering up of Isaac, accounting that God was able to raise him up from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure. Thus, in the intended sacrifice of Isaac, as it is here expressed by the Apostle, we see the meaning of Christ's saying to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; he saw it, and was glad." This day was not that in which Christ was then ministering; for, said he to the Jews, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness." It was the resurrection day which Abraham rejoiced to see; the same that John calls "the Lord's day," and Paul, in the Hebrews, "the day of salvation." "*Now* is the accepted time, *now* is the day of salvation;" and yet we hear continually this proclamation still sounded forth by those called Arminians, and Calvinists cannot silence them, or prove them to be in error. It was the same resurrection day of which David spake in the second Psalm, according to Paul's opening up of the mystery of that Psalm in Acts xiii. and Hebrews i. Paul testified at Antioch on this wise, "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, "Thou art my son, *this day* have I begotten thee;" and this day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and the thousand years as one day; and this thousand years is the first resurrection. It was, moreover, this day of the first resurrection which Job saw, when he said, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin,

worms destroy this body, yet out of my flesh shall I see God." These, Abraham, Daniel, Job, and all the fathers, died in the faith of the promise of the resurrection yet to be fulfilled, and their faith was counted to them for righteousness; and the same righteousness, saith the Apostle, "shall be imputed to us if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, but raised again for our justification." In being delivered for our offences, he made a reconciliation; "For we," saith Paul, "were reconciled to God by the death of his Son:" and then, looking upon this death as if it were a link in the wondrous chain of redemption, he adds, "much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Daniel testifies very fully to the work of Messiah, as in ix. 24, where we read, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy (holy) people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to seal (or perfect) sin-offerings, and to cover iniquity, and to bring in a righteousness of ages, and to seal (or finish) vision and prophet, and to anoint a holy of holies." This is a magnificent passage, the fulness of which is, we conceive, connected with the fulfilment of the mediatorial character of Christ, when, at the overthrow of the Jewish house, he appeared the second time without sin unto salvation, thereby showing that the necessity for intercession was done away. We quote the passage now, for the purpose of drawing attention to the words, "to bring in a righteousness of ages." Now it is evident that this was not "in being delivered for offences," but in "being raised again for justification of life;" which resurrection was an event with continuous effects, up to a given time, up to the final resurrection at the last day. The resurrection of Christ, in this aspect, may be defined as the fountain-head from whence flowed all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus, or, as a summit from whence to view the wonders of Immanuel's land. It was so in the faith of the patriarchs of old, when as yet the event itself was in the womb of the future. This was the Pisgah promise, in which the fathers rejoiced. It appears that until that day, that glorious resurrection period, had transpired, the new testament in the son of God, with all its divine blessings, had no place, and could not come into operation; "A testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Thus, then, in this view of the resurrection of Christ, we can enter into the meaning of Paul's strong language in 1 Cor. xv., where he tells the Corinthians, "If Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins." Sin reigns still unto death, and the reign of grace has never yet commenced. If the first-fruits have never appeared, it is in vain to expect the harvest; if the root have not revived out of the dry ground, what must become of the branches? Nay, argues the Apostle further, "If Christ be not risen, then they also which are fallen asleep are perished." Abraham is perished, and what then becomes of the promise, "I am the God of Abraham?" what, indeed, becomes of the being of a God "who cannot lie?" David is perished! so then it was a false conclusion wherewith he comforted himself on his dying bed, saying, "Although my house be not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure." "But, beloved," writes the Apostle, "this is not so; now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept."

We have thus endeavoured to exhibit somewhat of the length and breadth of that most fundamental and important branch of the doctrine of the Gospel—the resurrection of the Son of God—which, we again emphatically pronounce, was not a resurrection of dust. Our next step is from the resurrection of Christ, the Father of the age, to that of his seed, the saints: from the first-fruits, to the harvest; and from the first-begotten and first-born, the Head, to the rest of the family, the members.

After what has been already observed, we are, of course, prepared for a resurrection which does not concern the human bodies of men. And being prepared for a view of the resurrection, though not that of our bodies, we are, as has been seen, far from looking upon the resurrection of Christ merely as a great miracle, confirmatory of his mission. There is nothing in this confirmation view, as it is generally considered in Easter Sunday sermons: there is everything in it, provided that it be scripturally carried out. There is nothing in such view, if Christ have not come a second time: there is everything, if he have. There is nothing if Christ have not come a second time, because we have no authorised ministry to enforce and explain the imperfectly-developed doctrine: there was very much in Apostolic times, because such ministry was then forthcoming—such ministry being essentially requisite for the ratification of that which was yet future. How often have we heard the death of Christ discoursed upon as a great event: and then that this death was nothing without the resurrection—and then that the resurrection was crowned by the ascension—and then—no; there we have a full stop. Will it, we ask, be admitted that all these glorious events must go for nothing, without the second appearing? Then, why are we to be harassed by being told that the second appearing is yet future—harassed, because we know not to whom to have recourse as our pastors and teachers—harassed, because we know that the heaven-inspired ministers of Jesus Christ were appointed until the second appearing—harassed, because we must be oppressed with the painful thought, that if the second advent have not transpired, Christ has been unfaithful to his word; and we are necessitated to adopt the prayer of the Roman Catholic (which, in their ignorance, Protestants have so ridiculously abused, in the present intolerant outcry against an act of imperative justice toward the Romanists: we allude to the opposition offered to the Maynooth grant:;) we must adopt their prayer, and say—“Lord, if it be an error which we have followed, thou thyself hast deceived us by thine Apostles, by the pastors and teachers appointed by thee for the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ; for these, thy ministers, were given to the end of the world: till we all should come into the unity of the faith, unto a perfect man.” I am aware that these remarks are only a repetition of what has been stated in a former part of the work; but I believe that the question cannot be too frequently asked, Where is the ministry?

In considering the resurrection of the members as consequent upon that of the head of the body, we leave out the confirmation view of the doctrine, and shall only touch upon the commonly-received doctrine of a resurrection of the human body, as we shall have occasion

to explode the same in the Scriptures, which will come under our notice. Indeed, in the remaining observations which I have to make on this subject, I shall mainly confine myself to an examination of divers Scriptures bearing upon it.

The Epistle to the Romans commences with a declaration concerning Jesus Christ, that he who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." The Son of God being seated on the throne of David, was possessed of the key of David—"had the keys of hell and of death." These keys must not be confounded with the keys given to Peter: this would be to put Peter into the place of Christ, and to confound the root with the branches. The key of David was Christ's investiture with all power in heaven and on earth, by which he opened and none could shut, and shut and none could open. Having the key of David, he opened the kingdom of Heaven to all believers, and none could shut: the gates of hell should not prevail against it. He opened the Gospel dispensation, and shut that of the law, himself being the body from which the shadows of the law proceeded, and none could open. The key of David, as the key of death, is beautifully expressed in the words, "When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of Heaven to all believers." Paul, likewise, in 2 Tim. i. 10, gives us an exposition of the opening and shutting, where he writes—"He hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel"—or, again in 2 Corin. ii., where he speaks of the ministration of condemnation and death being done away, in the ministration of righteousness and of life. These Scriptures establish an immediate connexion between the resurrection of Christ and his everlasting seed in the life, as there was an immediate connexion between Adam and his posterity in the death. Christ and Adam are two heads, two seeds; and, saith Paul, in 1 Cor. xv., "To every seed," or, more literally, "To each of the seeds there is his own body." As the body in the first Adam died, and was judged in his one transgression, so the body in the second Adam lived, and was acquitted in his one justification. And here, I apprehend, is an answer to the objection so often urged, If the second advent, the judgment and the resurrection, transpired at the destruction of Jerusalem, how are we, the people of England, or the people of China, interested in these events? For an answer to this, we might simply refer to Eph. ii. 7, "That, in the ages to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Jesus Christ:" or, again, "Unto him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all generations of the age of ages." But, we ask, how were we interested in the sin of Adam, or the sacrifice of Christ: and why was it not as requisite that we should be present on both occasions—why should we not be present at the judgment in Eden, as much as at the judgment of the great day in Jerusalem? The great mistake is that the family of God will look within themselves, instead of coming out of themselves and looking at the dispensations which God has severally manifested. The effect of the resurrection of Christ was, that thereby he had abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light. This

was true, independent of all understanding of the truth: it was true, whether known to one or one thousand. The sun shines, but because I am in a dungeon, and cannot see it, therefore, I deny that the sun shines. So it is in dealing with the Bible, with God's various dispensations. There they are, a revelation, no matter as to the ignorance or knowledge of that poor earth-worm, man. On the day of Pentecost, Peter declared that Jesus of Nazareth was at the right hand of God exalted. Like the man in the dungeon, who denies that the sun shines, so Peter's hearers might have denied, and many of them did deny, that Jesus was King in Zion, because they did not see him with the bodily eye. This, however, did not alter the truth, any more than if it be denied now that Christ has come a second time, because *every eye* did not see him, can alter the fact of that appearing. To deny that there can be a revelation, without it be a revelation to me, is to deny that there can be a God, unless that God manifest himself to me individually: he may be known to all the world; but if he be not known to me, there can be no God! Now, let us take this and bring it to bear upon the resurrection consequent upon the resurrection of Christ. This resurrection attached to a state or constitution, in my apprehension of it. In this state or constitution all the family of God, who were of the existing generation, were interested, independent of their knowledge. For instance, the Philippian jailor, as he was judged in the first Adam head, so he was justified in the resurrection of the second Adam head. Did his ignorance of these facts, prior to Paul's preaching, absolve him from the judgment any more than it precluded him from the justification? By no means. As he had been in the state of condemnation by the first Adam, so was he then in the state of justification by the second. He was reconciled to God by the death of the Son, and not by the knowledge of that death; and much more, being reconciled, he should be (not he was) saved by his life, when he should appear the second time without sin unto salvation. How infinitely important is this truth, which I have thus feebly, indeed, expressed! O that there were such a heart in believers now, that they would cease to measure themselves by themselves, and consider how much more glorious it is to measure themselves by the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ—to survey themselves, not in the glass which reflects their own natural image, but in the splendours of a meridian and tropical sun, which absorbs within itself all that image, and causes its shadow to disappear!

The resurrection of the members of the body belonging to the second Adam head is scripturally apprehended only in its dispensation character, in its relation to the covenants of Sinai and Zion. This is clearly seen on reference to a former part of this treatise, wherein we discoursed of the vast change of state, accompanied with a somewhat corresponding change of knowledge, which was given to the disciples immediately subsequent to the resurrection of Christ. We say a somewhat corresponding knowledge of the state, because we must not conclude that, on the day of Pentecost, the curtain which had been over the Mount Zion state was entirely lifted up, for that could not be until the end of all things, in the fall of Jerusalem; and, therefore, an Apostle writes, "We know in part." Now, the Apostle testifies to this change in

2 Cor. iii., and last verse, "We all, with open face, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as of the Lord the Spirit." This is a most important Scripture, and will well repay a minute examination. The Apostle, when he writes, "we all," is discoursing of the one body which Christ had reconciled, of which body he has many things to say to these Corinthian believers. The change which he intimates is not any remodelling, any alteration, any glorifying of the natural bodies of these believers, but it is a change from the ministration of condemnation and death, of which he speaks in the former verses of the chapter, to the ministration of righteousness and life; or, in other words, from the first inferior and temporal covenant, which was added because of the Adam transgression, to the second superior and spiritual covenant, which was brought in when that transgression was redeemed. "Now," saith Paul, "the ministration of the law was glorious, though it were the ministration of death, so that we were, O Corinthians, formerly in a glorious state and dispensation. But the ministration of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, setting us free from that of sin and death, is rather glorious. We are changed, translated, raised into that glory; and now such is this our resurrection, of such magnificence, that that ministration in which we formerly were hath no glory whatever, by reason of this which excelleth, in which you now stand: the fine gold is tarnished and dim; ai-chabod is written upon our glorious death state; and now we see that all our righteousness in that state is as filthy rags, which the wind hath swept away." So much by way of comment on the information which Paul was here conveying to the Corinthians. Now, it is possible that certain of the Corinthian believers could not recognize this exceeding glory, into which Paul affirmed that all were changed. It is probable that such might be the case, when we consider the Judaizing inclinations of the Galatian church. But did this put them out of the pale of that changed state? Did Paul compromise the change of state, because of their refusal to acknowledge it? Hear him: "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Did not the Apostle expressly maintain this distinction of state, independent of any and all individual knowledge of the same? Hear him again: "Christ is become of none effect; whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." But the grace state was there still, and they were in it. They were fallen from the privilege of enjoyment, as foolish and bewitched; as having begun in the Spirit, and desiring to end in the flesh; as having made a start with Christ and grace, and falling back to Moses and works; concerning which falling it is that the Apostle addresses the backsliding Galatians in these affectionate terms, "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you." It might well be asked here, What have the notions of the new birth which are now commonly entertained, to say in explanation of that passage? There would be none to answer this inquiry, for the common views of the day look upon Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as having been regenerated — born again, equally with Paul or Peter.

Upon this verse in 2 Cor. iii., we found what we consider to be the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which it pleased God to give to the second Adam head. The resurrection was a rege-

neration ; for these terms I conceive to have the same meaning. The resurrection was also a reformation ; a change had been made in the priesthood, and where a change is in the priesthood, there must, of necessity, saith Paul, be a change of the law ; and where a change is made in the law, there is a change in the constitution. Thus it was with the Church of God ; there was a change in its constitution on the resurrection of Christ, as there was in the constitution of England on the bringing in of the Reform Bill. The change effected through the resurrection of Christ, had nothing to do with the animal existence or non-existence of believers and unbelievers, any more than had the Reform Bill of 1831, any relation to the animal existence or death of those who opposed or favoured such reform. And let it be observed, that it is just as reasonable for a person to maintain that the laws of England were not altered at the time of the passing of the Reform Bill, as it was reasonable for a Jew, in the Apostolic day, to deny the first resurrection—or as it is for Christians, of our day, to deny the final resurrection at the fall of Jerusalem.

To sum up the whole matter. The fact is, that God's *own* established worship is of the first importance ; but this worship has been manifested by Him in various forms, at different times. The worship, for the time being, was the true worship ; the worship must be according to the state of the church, so that it comes to pass that it was just as idolatrous under the dispensation of Christ to abide by the dispensation of Moses, as it had been idolatrous under that dispensation for the Ten tribes to be drawn aside to the worship of Baal. The testimony of the prophet, when speaking of gospel times, is decisive in this case ; Isaiah writes, in chapter lxvi. verse 3, " He that killeth an ox, is as if he slew a man ; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck ; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood." Now, to offer an oblation, to sacrifice a lamb, and to kill an ox, were well-pleasing in the sight of God, under the law. Yes, but the prophet is describing matters as under the gospel, when, the law having passed away, those commendable things had become an abomination to the Lord. We rest our rejection of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper here, as will be seen in the sequel.

Having briefly described the nature of the resurrection, as a dispensation matter attaching to the body of Christ, and not to bodies of clay, we will now proceed to offer a few Scripture evidences of such resurrection during the ministry of the Apostles.

*The Body raised.*

And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.—Eph. ii. 6.

If ye then be risen with Christ.—Col. iii. 1.

*Quickened.*

You hath he quickened who *were dead* in trespasses and sins.—Eph. ii. 1.

Hath quickened us together with Christ.—Eph. ii. 5.

*Changed.*

Ye are changed into the same image, from glory to glory.—2 Cor.

iii. 18. This change was typified in Zechariah iii., in the person of Joshua, the high priest representing the church. "The angel spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment." Zech. iii. 4.

Having hinted at two resurrections, and having, from the above-quoted passages, proved one resurrection to have transpired in the Apostolic age, we will now proceed to give Scripture evidence of the other.

*The Body to be raised.*

And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power.—1 Cor. vi. 14.

Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.—2 Cor. iv. 14.

*To be quickened.*

But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.—Rom. viii. 11.

*To be changed.*

We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.—1 Cor. xv. 51.

Who shall change our vile body.—Phil. iii. 21.

Here are two resurrections scripturally proved. That the believers to whom the Apostle addressed the above-quoted passages were raised, cannot be denied; that they were raised together with Christ, is equally evident; and if Christ's resurrection was merely a resurrection of dust, it may be asked, as it has been and will be asked, How were believers risen *with* Christ, seeing that they had not undergone animal dissolution?

This being raised with Christ, was the first resurrection; and Paul, writing of another to follow, agrees with John in the Revelation, from whom most probably he learned the doctrine. In Rev. xx. 5, 6, we read as follows: "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that *hath* part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." On these verses is founded a doctrine which is very popular with many of the Apostolic succession of our times—the doctrine of the Millennium. And here we would notice for a moment the wonderful impertinence of the dogma of Apostolic succession, when considered in relation to the thousand years' reign. Many who claim to be successors of the Apostles, do not believe in a Millennium at all; and of those who do teach and preach it in a prospective character, there are hardly two that are agreed; and yet, be it observed, these have all the same ordination, (for I speak in reference to the Church of England, "the Holy Catholic and Apostolic" Establishment,) they are all ranged under the same succession, and this is their seeing eye to eye, as Zion's watchmen: this discord, we



are told, is their being of the same mind and judgment: this confusion and discrepancy, is a being led into all truth—you may say of all Ministry, as the hand-writing on the wall said of Belshazzar, “Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting!”

From the statement which has already been given respecting a resurrection during the period of the Apostolic ministry, we are of opinion that an easy and simple solution of the thousand years' reign may be rendered. It is well worthy of remark, that there have been commentators upon the Book of the Revelation who have maintained that all the seven trumpets therein mentioned have been sounded, but who have not seen the sounding of the seventh and last trumpet, as synchronous with the resurrection of the dead, in 1 Cor. xv. It is equally worthy of notice that there have been commentators on the same Book, who have maintained the fulfilment of most matters therein, prior to the fall of Jerusalem, but not of all, because of the obstacle of this thousand years, which they could not expound, in agreement with the like period. Dr. Hammond is a case in point. In writing his commentary on the New Testament, he determined to leave out all exposition of the Revelation: but when he came to the Book, and read in the opening chapter that the time of the fulfilment of the prophecies was *at hand*, (Rev. i. 4.,) and that the things which God gave unto John were *shortly* to come to pass, he was so struck with this express language, that he was drawn by an irresistible necessity to attempt an exposition. The Dr., in the last chapter of 2nd Peter, utterly repudiates the notion of that chapter teaching a physical destruction of the globe. He writes, “This passing away and dissolving heavens, earth, and elements, sounding very tragically, are mistaken for the burning of this globe.” But when he arrives in the course of exposition at the thousand years' reign, he looks to futurity. Had that subject been opened up to him and others, in what we conceive to be its true retrospective meaning, we can imagine that there would now have been spared much of the pains and trouble which must be the lot of all who endeavour to set before Christian people a view of the Bible as being harmonious and self-interpreting, and completely fulfilled and finished. How gloriously self-interpreting does the Bible appear, when we connect the first resurrection with the oft-repeated assertion, that believers, to whom the Apostles addressed their Epistles, were raised, quickened, translated, changed, and born again, so that they should never taste of death! There is no mention of a resurrection, a quickening, a change, translation, or regeneration having transpired prior to the Apostolic dispensation, before the death and resurrection of Christ. No mention, we say, though Jesus affirmed, in his ministry, “He that heareth my word, *is* passed from death to life;” seeing that this he spake in the spirit of prophecy, as he did when he breathed upon his disciples, and said unto them, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” On the other hand, as we have seen, the Epistles and Apostolic preaching are altogether taken up with this resurrection, which had then transpired. Our business is therefore to examine the context of John's declaration concerning the first resurrection, in order that we may discover whether it do or do not bear internal evidence of an application to the Apostolic age. We refer to the commencement of the 4th verse; “And I saw

thrones," &c. Now we understand that there exists the same relation between the Prophecy of Daniel and the Revelation of John, as between a lock and a key; Daniel's prophecy being the sealed book which John saw, and which none but the Lion of the tribe of Judah could prevail to open. We conclude that the judgment described in the opening of John xx. 4, is identical with that of Daniel, as related in his seventh chapter. This judgment of Daniel has been proved in relation to the Apostles, in a former part of our treatise. There is a parallelism in the language in which it is described with that which is employed in the Revelation. "The judgment of Daniel," says Professor Bush, "assuredly commences synchronically with the commencement of Christ's kingdom, and flows on with the flux of his earthly sovereignty during the gospel age." Mede asserts that the kingdom of the Apocalypse, wherein the saints reign with Christ a thousand years, is the same with the kingdom of the Son of Man, and saints of the Most High, in Daniel. If, then, we establish that this kingdom of the Son of Man commenced when he ascended up on high, and sat down at the right hand of God, then it will follow that we have found, at all events, the *beginning* of the thousand years' reign; and then, as Professor Bush justly observes, the inference is obvious, the Millennium of John must be referred to a past, and not a future period of history. It is merely the designation of one illustrious portion of the reign of Christ, during the dispensation that commenced at his inauguration as King in Zion, of which the second Psalm recites the decree. Now, for the proof of the commencement of Christ's kingdom, we may be permitted to refer back to the comparison and correspondences which we instituted and observed in treating of the Apostolic Baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire. Our concern at present is with an exposition of the verses which speak of the thousand years' reign, in connexion, if possible, with the exposition formerly given of Daniel's prophecy in respect to the time of fulfilment. We begin with suggesting an enquiry as to whether Rev. xx. 4, is correctly translated; and here we will append the following valuable remarks from Gipp's First Resurrection, p. 133.

"In our translation, the verbs, *sat, was given, lived, reigned*, are in one tense; but the verbs, *had worshipped, and had received*, are in another. In the Greek, however, they are all in the same tense, the aorist. According to our translation, the time of the "worshipping the beast," and "receiving his mark," &c., is different from that of "sitting on the throne," the "living and reigning." The impression which it conveys is, that the "worshipping the beast," &c. took place in some period antecedent to that during which the persons reign with Christ. I cannot, however, perceive that the original implies this. It appears to me that as all these verbs are in the same tense in the original, so they must all refer to the same time: and that whatever be the time of "not worshipping the beast, nor receiving his mark," the same is the time of "sitting on thrones, living, and reigning." I conceive, therefore, that the time during which the persons described refuse to worship the beast and his image, is that during which they are sitting on thrones, living and reigning with Christ. Having made these observations, I would suggest whether it would not be more correctly translated thus: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon

them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of those who were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not his mark upon their forehead, and their hand, and lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years." With these remarks I concur, and likewise with the following as an outline of the prophecy, "That a body of persons would arise in the kingdom of the beast, who would, in a figurative sense, sit upon thrones, have judgment given unto them, and live and reign with Christ: and that the subjects of this the first resurrection, would be characterized by refusing to worship the beast and his image, and would be exposed to persecution, and to be slain for the testimony of Jesus, and the word of God." This most important exposition is an insuperable bar to the reception of all views of the Millennium as being yet future. The saints, in John's vision, are described as beheaded for the testimony of Jesus; which circumstance is clearly opened up in such histories as Herod's stretching out his hand to vex certain of the church; and killing James, the brother of John, with the sword. "Now, on the supposition that the Millennium of John is yet future, and coincident with the seventh thousand years from the creation, we hold it to be impossible to assign a satisfactory reason why the saints *then living* should be characterized by attributes that pertain to believers of another and entirely different period; for we strenuously maintain that it is the same persons who live, and reign, and judge, and are beheaded, and all too at *precisely the same time*. They live in the midst of, and notwithstanding, their being put to death." The above are Mr. Bush's observations; they might have been considerably strengthened, had he taken what we conceive to be the scriptural view of the beheading. We confine that within the period of Jerusalem's desolation, and we have the most express authority for so doing, as appears from the following passage: "And in her (mystic Babylon, the city where the Lord was crucified,) was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." Now we remember that a prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem, and that Jesus had testified that all the righteous blood shed upon the earth should be required of that generation; and in this remembrance we have a limit put to the beheading in John's vision. We must by no means include among the number of those whom John saw, any who perished after the destruction of Jerusalem, for a plain reason, that though it is true there have been martyrs (there have been no prophets, however,) since that period, they are not the subjects of Scripture testimony. Therefore Professor Bush comes in collision with more than one express Bible declaration, when he affirms that the martyrs in the reign of Charlemagne, or in the fifth century, are alluded to in Rev. xx. 4. However, the inference which he draws against future millennial views, from the fact of martyrdom and kingdom being synchronical, is most just, and suits our present purpose, which is to give what we conceive to be the scriptural doctrine of the Millennium, as confined to the period of the Apostolic ministry.

There is another particular deducible from the above exposition of Rev. xx. 4, which equally militates against the doctrine of a future Millennium. So far as I have heard of or understand modern Millen-

narianism, this future thousand years is to be a period of universal peace, when the wolf shall lie down with the lamb; when there shall be no more death, nor curse, nor barren land; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and when they shall learn war no more. But how does this Judaizing view agree with John's vision? He saw the souls of the saints living in the midst of the slaughter of their bodies, for we maintain that the beheading cannot be separated from the reigning. Let our present millennialists understand the slaughter of the cruelties exercised by the Papacy; let them descant upon the fires kindled around the martyrs and confessors of the Reformation, (have *the Reformers* never kindled fires? *vide Calvin versus Servetus*;) let them describe in glowing colours these fires, the beacon lights towering in the dark ages above the stakes to which martyrs were tied. What then? Their Millennium, on their own showing, is a season of persecution. The reign of the Beast is, on their own showing, the reign of apostasy and death; but most unquestionably this reign is synchronical with the first resurrection, which precedes the destruction of the Beast. The period of the thousand years was, says Mr. Bush, in the main, a period of the empire of spiritual death. It was not a prosperous era, but the reverse; and this agrees with the tradition in the Jewish *Midrash Tillin*, where it is said, that "upon the coming of the Messiah, the world shall be desolated for a thousand years." What will millennialists say to this? But it is all vanity. To attempt to open up and expose the conflicting and discordant views of those who look for the thousand years as yet to transpire, would be something like attempting to sweep away accumulations of rubbish which centuries have deposited in one place; we should run a considerable risk of being smothered with dust. As to examining the expositions of prophecy in regard to the Millennium, which Mr. Bickersteth and writers of the Evangelical school have sent forth into the world, we should think that would be lost labour. The fashionable evangelical class of theologians have no mind wherewith to grasp these subjects; they are deficient in intellectual requirements. Indeed, if there be one phasis of religious opinion more contemptible in an intellectual point of view than another, it is the mangle-mangle Calvinistic and Arminian, now so popular in the land; and which, being so popular, would tell very little in favour of English intellect, were it not that it is a known fact, that the thinking minds of our countrymen care as much for one set of religious opinions as another; or, Gallo-like, care for none of these things; or, if they seem to care, it is only semblance, arising from self-interest, and a hundred causes connected with that predominating principle of human action.

But to proceed with our investigation of Rev. xx. 4, 5. Having established the important truth that these first resurrection saints were living and reigning in the midst of the slaughter of their bodies, the enquiry will naturally be suggested in many minds, "How can these things be?" The answer is at once simple and satisfactory, from a reference to a scripture which has often already been quoted, and can never be insisted upon or examined too frequently. We allude to the words wherewith the Lord met Martha's carnal notions of a resurrection, "I AM the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though

he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." This was the life lived by the millennial martyrs; a life which is exhibited by the Apostle in Rom. viii., in one of the noblest strains of eloquence which ever fell from the lips of man, "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. viii. 38-9.) This was a life, beyond the reach of those who were able to "kill the body, but after that had no more that they could do." This was a life of which the Holy Ghost hath left a memorable record in the stoning of Stephen; "They stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive *my spirit!*" Whether these saints were in the flesh, or out of the flesh; in the body, or out of the body; their living, reigning, and judging was all the same,— was still going on without a moment's interruption. Animal dissolution to them was no more than laying aside at night the garments which had been worn during the day; as Peter indeed testifies, when he writes that he must shortly *put off* his tabernacle. This was life, therefore, which had nothing in common with a resurrection of dead bodies; which involved no implication of the revival of such bodies; but, on the contrary, which rather expressed a rejoicing in an everlasting liberation from the clog of mortality; for, saith one, "To me to live is Christ, and to die, gain;" though yet when that one did die, he was still no more at that time than a partaker of the first resurrection.

In continuing our examination of this subject, there is one more particular connected with the passage in Rev. xx., which ought to be noticed, before we proceed to fix the period of this first resurrection, and that is the 5th verse. "But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished." Let it be observed that here, as throughout the whole chapter, there is not the remotest allusion to dead bodies, though the verse has been usually read and understood with such application. And let it be further observed, that the words "till the thousand years were finished," do not of themselves necessarily imply, that when the thousand years were finished, then, they did live, or live again, but rather, that they never lived at all. The context, however, satisfies me that they did live, just as much as that the Devil and Satan was loosed for a little season, at the expiration of the thousand years. But no Scripture testimony is forthcoming respecting a living *again*. Mr. Bush observes, that there is no authority for the insertion of the word "again," in the text. He says, "We may here remark, that what we deem the false construction usually put upon the passage respecting the living of the rest of the dead, has undoubtedly arisen from a false reading of the original. In the established text of the earlier editions of the Greek Testament, the lection is, *οὐκ ἀνίστασαν*, which properly implies, *lived not again*, and after this our translation was made. But all the modern editions unanimously reject this reading, and adopt, *οὐκ ἐζήσαν*, *lived not*." This gives a new complexion to the passage. Indeed, this makes the passage intelligible, which, with the word "again," it was not, because "to live again" implies previous life. But previous life, in the view

which has been given above of the life of the slaughtered saints, there could be none, inasmuch as such life is equivalent to immortality; or, at all events, we may say that if the words "*lived not again*" signify those who embraced not the testimony of Jesus, the word "*again*" must be interpolated, as it is not predicated of those who held the witness of Jesus, that *their* life was a living again. If not affirmed of one, where is the connexion if it be affirmed of the other. I am inclined to consider the rest of the dead (for I see nothing gained by rendering it, the rest *even* the dead,) as included and comprehended in this passage from Hebrews xi., "These all died in faith, not having received the promises." This view is confirmed from the circumstances of the limit which, as will be seen in the sequel, we are constrained to affix to the thousand years. It may also be mentioned, that it is possible there may be an intimate connexion between "the rest of the dead," and such scriptures as the following: "David is not yet ascended into the heavens;" or, "till the heavens be no more, I shall not awake, nor be raised out of my sleep." Besides, it may be added, where is life predicated in Scripture of any but of those who are in "Christ our life?" There is a resurrection of the unjust, but it is to condemnation, not to life, or living again: it is to condemnation, as opposed to life. As dead they live, as dead they die; as dead in a Scripture sense, they rise; and as dead, they are judged to a second death. It is death all over: "let the dead bury their dead." However, we insist not upon this—upon John's vision of the *dead* standing, small and great, before God; "of the dead being judged out of the books," and so on: let it be granted, that by the rest of the dead, or the rest, even the dead, we are to understand those who had worshipped the beast, or those who had not the testimony of Jesus; still it is evident that the thousand years' reign, and the life of the rest at the close of that thousand years, are events which are staged in this world, and during a *past* period of the continuance of this visible system of things. It is evident, we say, if the two strongest passages on the resurrection, which are to be found, one in the Old, and the other in the New Testament, be any proof and confirmation. One passage to which we allude, is Daniel xii. 2, "which," says Professor Bush, "contains, more emphatically perhaps than any other in the Old Testament, the germ of resurrection doctrine." The verse is as follows: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Now, that this scripture must be confined, as regards a fulfilment, to the present, and not to a future state of existence, will be evident by a more literal version: "And many of the sleepers of earth-dust shall awake; these to the life of the age, and these to the shame and contempt of the age." The age is the age of the Messiah; and thus we see from what source the Jews derived their notion of the resurrection in this world and on this earth, to a life in the world which we have already had occasion to notice. This passage in Daniel occupies much of the attention of Rabbinical writers, when describing the glories of Messiah's kingdom. They, as we well know, stage this resurrection contemporaneously with a period of peace and prosperity, from the rising to the setting sun: and, therefore, tradition, if it be of any weight, is in favour of the fulfilment of Daniel

xii. 2, irrespective of what is now generally understood by an end of the world, and a day of judgment. But we have no need to have recourse to the opinions of any learned Rabbi in this matter. We need not deviate from our well-tried practice of comparing spiritual things with spiritual. Let us examine, for one moment, the context in Dan. xii., in order to discover whether or no that context will afford anything by way of fixing the time when this awaking should transpire. Now, we learn, from a glance at the first verse, this important fact, that the event spoken of in the second verse is to occur at a period when "Michael shall stand up, the great prince that standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Now, as I have stated before, I repeat; I do earnestly desire to know and receive what is truth. How can any man, with such desire, avoid comparing this language with the Saviour's own words in Matthew xxiv. 31? "There shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time—no, nor ever shall be." And having instituted, as the earnest inquirer after truth is bound to institute, such comparison, how is it possible to avoid coming to the conclusion, that Daniel's prophecy is confined within the limit of the fall of Jerusalem? The comparison clearly identifies the periods; for, as has been most justly observed, there cannot be two epochs, both of which shall exclude all parallels in the way here described, as this would be to exclude each other. This awaking, mentioned by Daniel, is assuredly something which is to transpire at a time of trouble, which time will answer to nothing but to the end of the Jewish state, and the destruction of Jerusalem. The language which describes that destruction is exclusive. What then is the consequence implicated in the above settlement of the time when Daniel's prophecy should be fulfilled? Plainly, as all must acknowledge, this awaking or resurrection is not, as is generally supposed, connected with a resurrection of the human bodies of men; for it may be asked, where is there any account of such resurrection taking place at the destruction of Jerusalem, that time of trouble which, if modern doctrines of a literal conflagration of the globe be true, will not even be paralleled in horror by such conflagration! We are constrained, by the force of a question like this, to seek out another interpretation of Daniel's awaking: and we cannot but conclude, from this one evidence alone, that the "awaking from the dead," announced by Daniel, points mainly to a spiritual, and not a corporeal resurrection, according to that emphatic declaration, "I am the resurrection and the life." Professor Bush thinks that "the words of the prophet" may be construed as having respect to a literal resurrection, in the several individual instances of resuscitation of the dead recorded in the Gospels, and in the remarkable display of resurrection power which was put forth upon "the many bodies of the saints that slept, which arose and came out of the graves after his resurrection." We see no call for such construction: but the Professor immediately adds, and with his beautiful sentiment we fully concur, "But this (literal fulfilment) we regard, as in the main, a mere outward and sensible adumbration of a far more glorious work of moral quickening, which

was to be the result of Christ's accomplished redemption in behalf of his people, and in which this prediction was to receive its more complete and signal fulfilment."

But further. We stated above that the thousand years' reign was an event which must have been staged in this world: our proof of which position we would draw from the passage in Daniel, which has just been considered. Let us now revert to Revelation xx., in order to see if there be any connexion between that chapter and Daniel xii. The passage in Daniel suggests the idea of a judgment, as well as of a resurrection. Now, *after* the vision of the living, reigning, and judging saints, John has a vision of a judgment, which judgment, as we learn from Rev. xi. 18, is subsequent to the close of the thousand years, and intimately connected with the sounding of the seventh trumpet, at the period of which sounding it is said, "And the time of the dead is come that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great." This judgment, we cannot but conclude, is referred to in Daniel's prophecy. There is internal evidence which fixes the period of the fulfilment of the prophecies to be the same. We read in Daniel, "At that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." So, parallel to this, we have in Revelations, "Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Now, the common opinion refers this to the last judgment, and makes it synchronical with the parable in the latter part of Matthew xxv. This is correct: but if the judgment in Revelations be the same with that in Daniel, then the last judgment is long since passed, and death and hell have long since been cast into the lake of fire. How so? Because we have already proved that, if words have any meaning, the deliverance spoken of by Daniel was assuredly something which was to transpire at a time of trouble, which time can, by no fair principle of interpretation, be applied to any other event or period than the destruction of Jerusalem. Now, if this deliverance and judgment of the dead must thus, by scripture comparison, be referred to Jerusalem's desolation, and if the judgment be *subsequent* to the first resurrection, and *prior* to the New Jerusalem, which New Jerusalem (as Mr. Bush allows) supervenes immediately or speedily upon the overthrow of mystical Babylon (Jerusalem)—if these be fair positions, and we shall be glad if any one will prove that they are not, then, at once we settle it for an established truth, that the millennium of John must be sought for, must be platformed, previously to the overthrow of the Jewish Church and State, in the year 70, by the Romans. This, one would think, is conclusive against all millennial schemes, whose accomplishment is yet future. We confess to the most intense anxiety, to know by what process of interpretation this result, as to the time of the thousand years, is to be set aside.

But to proceed. It was stated that we should examine two passages on the resurrection—one from the Old Testament, and the other from the New—with a view towards determining the *locale* of the first resurrection. We now come to the New Testament passage, in John v., 28, 29; "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and



shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." It is admitted, on all hands, that our Lord in this passage refers to the prophecy of Daniel, which we have just been examining: the marginal references in all Bibles point out these Scriptures as parallel passages. If so, then the same period which fulfils Daniel's prediction will apply to this also, even though it were (as it is confessed to be) the strongest passage in the New Testament in favour of the common view of the resurrection. We have quoted the passage merely for the purpose of connecting it with that in Daniel, and thereby obviating objections which might, and doubtless would, have been urged, if it had been passed over in silence. Before this Scripture can be adduced as evidence of a resurrection of dust, the positions which were taken up, in a consideration of Dan. xii., 1, 2, must be overturned. With this remark we take our leave of the passage. It does not otherwise come into that part of the subject which now engages our attention, or we might notice the violent strain of language which the common notion puts upon this Scripture. "When we read, 'The hour is coming,' it cannot be questioned (says Mr. Bush) that this is usually the phrase to denote an event, or order of events, just upon the eve of occurring: whereas, if Christ had intended to point forward to a very distant future, it is not easy to perceive why he should not say, 'The hour will come,' not to mention that the word 'hour' seems to imply a season, contracted within narrower limits than those which we should assign to such an event as is usually understood by the general resurrection." These observations are very just, though Mr. B. seems quite at a loss for an understanding of the passage, and is forced to acknowledge that Christ did adapt his teaching to prevalent ideas, which were grounded on the literal record of the Scriptures. This is most painful, and utterly inadmissible, as witness the conversations in Matthew xxii. Had Mr. B. been able to recognise the meaning of the phrases, "*last days*" and "*last day*," he would never have arrived at such a conclusion. The hour that was coming, in the which all in their graves should come forth, was the hour that John had in view when he wrote, "Little children, it is the last hour"—the hour of Jerusalem's desolation, when the Lord would come again to be glorified in his saints, and admired by all them that believed. This construction does no violence to the meaning of words; but surely it is a strange talk to say, "The hour is coming," when eighteen hundred years have gone by, and the hour is still coming—

"Rusticus expectat dum defuat amnis: at ille  
"Labitur et labetur, in omne volubilis ævum."

But it is time to conclude our examination of the first resurrection. From comparison of spiritual things with spiritual, we have been constrained to fix the thousand years to times preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. If this be a correct view, then it will be argued, we must seek for the commencement of this period somewhere in the history of the Old Testament. But this argument proceeds on the supposition that the thousand years were literal years: while we maintain that it is just as reasonable to believe that the silence in Heaven,

mentioned also in the Revelation, was a silence for a literal half hour. As we are persuaded, from internal evidence, that the Millennium must be platformed previous to the overthrow of Jerusalem, so, from similar evidence, we date the commencement of the thousand years from the day of Pentecost. The slaughtered witnesses of Jesus, who worshipped not the beast, "lived and reigned with Christ." So we read, in Rev. xx. 4, and, again, in the 6th verse, "Blessed and holy is he, having share in the resurrection that is the first; on these the second death hath not power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." This is merely a repetition of what had just before been advanced: and we allude to these two passages for the purpose of showing their reference to the announcement of the Apostolic ministry. "Therefore," said Peter, "let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," *i. e.*, King and Priest on his throne; as it is written, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." Now, Christ was not King and Priest till his ascension; for, "if he were on earth," says Paul in Hebrews viii. 4, "he should not be a Priest"—so, neither were any who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, for "they lived and reigned *with* Christ." But on the reception of his own kingly and priestly power, he would confer that same power on his disciples; and surely it is a violent interpretation to think that so many years have rolled away, and "the Kings and Priests" have never yet appeared. This, however, is the construction which modern Millenarianism adopts. How simply and forcibly opposed to all this is the statement of a scripture which we have often quoted, "In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye (my disciples, my Apostles) shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." We suppose it will be allowed that the regeneration commenced on the day of Pentecost: that, there and then, there were those who were born again of water and of the Spirit: "by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost," as we read in the Epistle to Titus: that there and then the desire of the mother of Zebedee's children was answered, "Grant that these, my two sons, may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, when thou comest into thy kingdom." The church, or corporate body of divinely-inspired members, was the sole interpreter, the "pillar and ground of the truth," during this first resurrection state, the Apostolic ministry: but now the word itself, which they preached and left on record, is its own sole and all-sufficient interpreter. Paul, as one of the heads of that body, (for God set forth divers officers in the church, *first* Apostles) declares that Hymeneus and Philetus had erred concerning the truth now under consideration, saying that the resurrection was past already. Now, so far from that being the fact then, the first resurrection was not past, let alone the second; and yet, will it be believed, that after the lapse of eighteen hundred years, we who condemn the error of which Paul spake as emphatically as he condemned it himself—is it credible that we should be quoted as the followers of Hymeneus and Philetus? Such is a specimen of the grossly inconsistent charges which are urged against the doctrine of a past second advent. They who prefer these charges

forget that there were two resurrections, and are therefore ignorant of the "why and because" which led some of those who lived during the first resurrection to believe in fables. They forget, or know nothing of, the important position which the resurrection doctrine held in Apostolic preaching, and, consequently, have no excuse for falling into the comparatively pardonable mistake of a Hymeneus or Philetus, in and during days when it was neither clear nor dark, when they prophesied but in part, and knew only in part. Mr. Bush, whose writings we have so frequently quoted, entertains strange notions of the first resurrection. He allows that the thousand years' reign is past; but, at the same time, he affirms that the Saviour's second advent must be pre-millennial. This is the order of events according to Mr. B. First comes the second advent: then the millennium: then the overthrow of mystical Babylon, whose destruction synchronizes with that of the Beast, the symbolic designation of the fourth or Roman empire; and the passing away of the Roman empire is the result of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, at which sounding there is to be an extensive conversion of the Jews. This arrangement certainly cannot be scripturally accounted for, though Mr. B. may affirm that his theory is scriptural, and therefore irrefutable. He conceives that the second advent *commenced* at the destruction of Jerusalem; but *between* the destruction of Jerusalem and the overthrow of mystical Babylon he places the thousand years' reign. Of course, he assumes that Jerusalem and mystical Babylon are not identical; if they can be proved to be identical, (and that they are so, the fact that on Jerusalem was charged, the blood of the prophets is quite conclusive to me), then the above arrangement presents a disorganized view, a broken chain of scripture events.\* And supposing that, as Mr. B. states, the overthrow of mystical Babylon synchronizes with that of the Beast, then Babylon being old Jerusalem, we must refer the Beast to some other interpretation than that of the Roman empire, or to some other interpretation applicable to the Roman empire. It does not come within the province of this work to discuss these points, or we should be very much disposed to examine whether "the Beast," "the abomination of desolation," &c., do not find their interpretation as connected with Jerusalem, and not with Rome. But to conclude the subject of the first resurrection. As we do not find that Scripture teaches this thousand years to be yet future, so neither are we disposed, after the above Scripture investigation, to agree with any view of the thousand years past, similar to that which Mr. Bush adopts. To imagine a first resurrection after the second advent is to imagine an impossibility, for Scripture declares, plainly enough, a resurrection prior to that advent. A resurrection subsequent to it cannot properly be called a first resurrection, and therefore, this cannot have been fulfilled in the successive rising up of faithful witnesses of Jesus, and sturdy resisters of the Papacy, during the lapse of those ages of darkness and decline which throw their gloomy shadows upon the pages of ecclesiastical history. If a resurrection were predicted of such a period, it can never be proved that it occurred, and for this simple reason, that we have no one to give us the *infallible* proof of such

\* See Note L.

occurrence. In short, and in full, writers on prophecy may, if it so please them, carry Scripture predictions further down in the annals of time than the desolation of Jerusalem, and they may exercise their ingenuity in so doing; but there is one insuperable objection to such proceedings—there can be no *certainty* in their opinions. So long as Christians will wander out of the Bible and Bible times for the date of the fulfilment of any Bible event, no wonder that we have sect after sect springing up to advocate the most monstrous absurdities. We do believe, that to this one circumstance of the dislocation of prophecy alone, is to be attributed the deplorable confusion which now exists in the nominally Christian world. One sect looks upon one particular portion of the Scripture as yet to receive an accomplishment: another sect, another: and the one says to the other, My opinion of a future fulfilment may be the very antipodes of yours, but it is as good as yours; *you cannot prove* it to be erroneous. This is a fair argument: and we are at no loss for a case in point whereby to illustrate the argument. One sect fixes the end of the world to the year 1846: another carries the end some twenty years further down: which can prove the other wrong? Time alone can do this. In the meanwhile, both parties go on wrangling together. It would be a happy thing if time, while discovering the gross absurdity of this one particular of future fulfilment, namely, an end of the world, should also break up the several systems whose fixed periods for that occurrence have been proved false. But alas! it is not so: no sooner is one date worn out than the very same party reviews its calculation tables, and determines upon another; and what is most pitiable, this other prospective date is believed. Surely the word of the wise man is borne out by fact, “Madness is in the hearts of men while they live.” Surely there was some truth in the following exquisite lines of one whom the world looks down upon as an unbeliever:—

“And truth, a gem which loves the deep,  
And all things weighed in custom’s falsest scale;  
Opinion an omnipotence, whose veil  
Mantles the earth with darkness, *until right*  
*And wrong are accidents*, and men grow pale  
Lest their own judgments should become too bright,  
And their free thoughts be crimes, and earth have too much light.”—  
BYRON.

The thought will often suggest itself, that, look what way one will, whether back into the past or forward into the future, we see abundant evidence of the practical infidelity of religious systems. They are unbelievers, inasmuch as they do not credit the express declaration of Christ, that he would come to judgment in the glory of his Father, before some standing near him should taste of death. They are equally and alike unbelievers, as they practically avow their distrust of a coming yet future. Let it be asked, which of all of them, having houses or lands, does not recognize the propriety of the proceeding which grants a lease even for the period of nine hundred and ninety-nine years? And having asked this question, let it be judged whose doctrines are infidel, or likely to lead to infidelity!

Having now considered at some length the doctrine of the first resurrection, we are prepared to take a further step in advance to our great conclusion.

A first resurrection necessarily implies a second; and a second resurrection supposes a period fixed and determined to the first. That period, we undertake to show, was the fall of Jerusalem, because, as we shall endeavour to prove, the second resurrection was synchronous with that grand event. Bush, and other learned writers on prophecy, are completely at one with us in our conclusion that the Millennium, or first resurrection, is past. Mr. Bush writes as follows: "It is within the limits of this (Roman) empire, under its nominally Christian phasis, and during the prevalence of the power of the Beast and his worship, that this grand moral resurrection takes place; as such resurrection was predicted, so it occurred." Now, Mr. Bush holds that the passing away of the Roman empire, in its decem-regal form, was the destruction of the Beast. But we are not aware that the exact period of a thousand years was accomplished at such time, or that it can be shown, on such supposition of the first resurrection, that it was exactly a thousand years. Therefore, the views of this writer do not appear to attach any consequence to the term, a thousand years; and as to the views of Millennarians of our day, who are looking for a Millennium to come, on their own confession, they must, to be honest, acknowledge that those views amount to nothing better than a peradventure: they are, at best, only conjectural, and what is only conjectural, is not worthy of the nature of faith. Perhaps it may be expected that another matter in connexion with the thousand years mentioned in this chapter should not be passed over in silence; because an objection may be raised that this circumstance does not accord with our view of the Millennium. It is written in Rev. xx. 2, "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." The exposition appears to us simple and satisfactory, in exact correspondence with the commencement and conclusion of the thousand years. Of course, we do not, as before stated, believe in a Devil with horns and hoofs, but are content, if we must speak comprehensively, to include under that name every thing that opposed and exalted itself against the Lord, and against his anointed. The angel having the key, will apply to him who affirmed that all power was given to him in heaven and earth, and who had the keys of death and hell. Now, considering the Devil and Satan to receive an interpretation in a knowledge of the two covenants, the law and the gospel, we conceive we have the exposition of the circumstance of this thousand years' binding in a former part of this discourse, wherein we interpreted the opening and shutting of the two dispensations, one whereof was shut, so that no man could open; and the other opened, so that not even the gates of hell should prevail against it. This we proved to have been accomplished on the day of Pentecost. Here, then, we conceive we have the commencement of the thousand years' binding, equally with the thousand years' reigning. On that day, the kingdom of heaven was opened by Christ, through the instrumentality of Peter; and the ministration of condemnation and death was then, as Paul writes in 2 Cor. iii., "done away." Mention of the name of Peter, reminds also of the promise, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatsoever thou shalt *bind* on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in

heaven." Now whatever meaning may be attached to the Devil and Satan, he was bound, and he was shut up: none but the binder could unbind or loosen, and, moreover, be it observed, that this personage *was* loosed at the expiration of the thousand years; and, above all, his "loosing" was connected with gathering all nations to battle, and an encompassing of the "beloved city." Can this "beloved city" be Rome? can any city answer to that description but Jerusalem, the holy city, that great city? Let the beloved city receive what interpretation it may, it is a city in existence before the judgment, and the judgment most assuredly precedes the New Jerusalem: therefore the New Jerusalem is not the beloved city.

We have thus given a consistent exposition of the things which in this chapter are predicated of the Millennium, taking the Millennium to be the duration of the Apostolic ministry, or the first dominion of the kingdom. (Micah iv. 8.) This first dominion, or resurrection, this thousand years, is that, we conceive, which was spoken of by Zechariah the prophet, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear, nor dark, but it shall be *one day*, which shall be known to the Lord; *not day nor night*; but it shall come to pass that at evening time it shall be light." Paul, in his inspired ministry, gives us the exposition, where he writes, "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face;" now, in this one day of the first resurrection, which is known to the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. So also Moses, when lamenting over the children of Israel, in their forty years' travel through the wilderness, makes his complaint in the 90th Psalm, saying, "A thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, as a watch in the night." It has sometimes occurred to us, remembering the typical nature of Israel's wanderings, considering the *to-day* of the forty years, that there is more meant in this verse than usually meets the eye; that this thousand years' watch in the night may have some connexion with the word of the Lord concerning his coming again; "And if he shall come in the second watch (of the night, which was divided into four watches), or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants." But this by the way. We must proceed to investigate the sacred records concerning the final resurrection; and if this be done very briefly, let it not be put down to inability or want of matter, but rather to the necessity of concluding this treatise, which has already far exceeded its intended limits. It must here again be observed, and will, we presume, be admitted, that the second advent, the end of the world, the resurrection of the last day, and the day of judgment, are all bound up together, as being cotemporaneous. Therefore, let it not be forgotten that all scriptures which speak of a resurrection, however difficult of interpretation they may appear, must bow down and submit themselves to the second advent, if that event be proved to be past.

But we have another object in view, in thus adverting to a proof of the past second advent, as connecting itself with the resurrection, and that is to bring all the exhortatory portions of the Epistles to bear upon the fulfilment of the resurrection; so that, bringing the exhortations to bear upon one doctrine, one future event, we shall consequently bring them to bear upon all, though for our present purpose we shall

only make one event the subject of investigation. As an illustration of our meaning, take the following lines:—

Exhortations, and comforts, and threats,  
Were addressed to a church under grace;  
'These are past — she the warfare forgets,  
In thy final and endless embrace.

Now, the exhortatory parts of the Epistles are a bone of endless contention between Calvinists and Arminians. Arminians will have it, that there is no final perseverance, sure and certain, promised in such passages as the following: "Let us labour, therefore, to enter into that rest, lest any man *fall* after the same example of unbelief: fall so that it shall be impossible to renew to repentance." Or again, Arminians cannot credit final perseverance, when they read of some bringing on themselves swift destruction, by *denying the Lord that bought them*. Or again, Arminianism grasps a double-edged sword, when it finds even a Paul confessing, that he is constrained to keep under his body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when he has preached to others, he himself should be a cast-away. Or again, the Arminian glories in his covenant of works, when he reads such necessity to be up and doing as is conveyed in scriptures like this; "Strive to enter in at the strait gate, for many shall strive, and shall not be able:" or when he is exhorted, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him:" or when he is upbraided, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." Or, once more, the Arminian prides himself upon the proclamation, "Know ye not that they which run in a race, run all; but one receiveth the prize. So run, that ye may obtain;" thereby implying, that many might run, and fail of attaining the prize. Arminianism makes her boast of these and such like scriptures, all the day long. Now we do not say that Calvinism, or that which is got beyond Calvinism, does not attempt to meet the boast, but as having formerly been initiated into the mysteries of Calvinism, we do mean to say that Calvinism is very loth to come to the meeting, and is conscious that she makes but a poor affair of it at the best of times, and would have been delighted beyond measure if the all-wise God would only have been so wise as to have omitted such scriptures altogether. Calvinism cannot see that to such scriptures God appointed a certain day; set them their bounds which they could not pass, even the bounds of a church, and a ministry, and service, and ordinances, and preaching, which was like unto a net cast into the sea, enclosing fish of every kind, both bad and good; in short, the limit of a dispensation of the fulness of times. Calvinism cannot recognize this glorious conditionality as having passed away, and consequently must believe that those scriptures, which prove to be Arminian strong-holds, are applicable now; and Calvinism, be it observed, is not alone in the difficulty. There is, what we must call a nondescript Christianity, which professes to reject Calvinism, and all conditionality; which puts aside altogether the exhortations and threats, so much in favour with the Arminian, and so terrific a bugbear to the Calvinist, and which explains that putting aside, by telling us that the gospel was proposed, in the times of the Apostles, under the

form of a law, but is now proposed as a matter of fact, divested of the form of law; bringing out, as we are given to understand, the third grand exhibition of the enmity of man to God. This system, however, forgets to reconcile this matter of fact, this unconditionality, this rejection of such a scripture as "So run that ye may obtain," with its avowed belief in a future resurrection of dust, an end of the world, a new heaven and new earth, *cum multis aliis*, altogether inexplicable, and utterly inconsistent with such unconditional statement of divine truth. However, (we may say,) we are not so circumstanced. We are believers in the finished and complete rest of the kingdom of God, and we affirm as follows: If this rest have appeared, is manifested, and doth now remain for the people of God, a rest in the *finished* work of the Lord Jesus Christ, into which all his ransomed family are ushered at the moment when they enter upon an earthly existence; how then can there, by any possibility, be any labouring to enter in? how can there be the least danger of failing to attain that which is already our own? What is the use of an exhortation to strive for what is already in possession; and why should I ask God for that which he has already given me? Is he a man that he should lie, or the son of man that he should repent? Hath he said, and did he not do it? hath he spoken, and is it not come to pass? Or again—If the race hath been run, and the prize gained, by those specially appointed to the work; if the crown of life which was promised hath been bestowed; if this prize and crown, appearing in the Apostles' day, in the distant prospect, with a weary wilderness and, to many among them, a Jordan of death between, is now the fulfilment of a promise which was then laid up in store—why then (the promise being fulfilled,) are we to be exhorted to look for its fulfilment again and again, and so exhorted to doubt the faithfulness of a covenant-keeping God? Let the words, "So run that ye may obtain," be confined in an application to the resurrection of the dead; if the resurrection of the dead be the end of the race, and if the resurrection have transpired, would it not strike the mind of a child of seven years old, that it is an absurdity to exhort now to run a race, for the obtaining of that which is already obtained; and, if the resurrection of the dead have not transpired, would not the same child perceive at a glance that there must have been some misapprehension in Paul's mind, when, eighteen hundred years ago, he confidently declared that he was pressing toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, if by any means he might attain to the resurrection from the dead? Misapprehension, indeed, there must have been, seeing that Paul, on the common opinion, is still striving for the mastery, still pressing toward the mark, still desiring to be clothed upon with his house that should be from heaven, still groaning being burdened, and groaning as he is now unclothed, but not yet clothed upon, for, according to the common opinion, mortality (this mortal) is not yet swallowed up of immortality and life. It is idle to tell us that we are quibbling by using this argument; the shoe is on the other foot; it is our opponents who are the quibblers. It is equally idle to tell us, that when Paul spoke of attaining to the resurrection of the dead, he meant merely the knowledge of that resurrection; for this exposition does not accord in the least with his expressed wish in 6th Hebrews, that the



Hebrew believers should leave the word of the beginning of Christ; the first principles of the oracles of God, among which is enumerated the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. No, it was not the knowledge of the resurrection as a mere matter of speculative science, but it was this:—"Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ, and be found in him—that I may know him, and the *power* of his resurrection;" for, "being reconciled to God by the death of his Son, *much more*, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life, seeing that our life is hid with Christ in God, and when Christ our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory."

Having developed at some length the nature of the resurrection, under the Apostolic figure of a change, we need not travel over the same ground again, but we may proceed at once to an exposition of the scriptures which contain the doctrine of the second resurrection. The first scripture that we shall examine will be found among the passages quoted in page 93, under the head of the Body to be changed.—"Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto the body of his glory." (Philip. iii. 31.) As a minister of the Church of England, I have read these words many a time at the grave-side of poor perishing dust and ashes. And here let me be allowed to revert again to the wide distance which separates between us and seceders from the Establishment who have preceded us. We do not object, for instance, to the Burial Service, because a minister who may entertain (as the Church of England entertains,) the doctrine of election, is obliged by the law of the land to thank God that he hath taken the precious souls of all whom he (the minister,) inters, to himself, though that same minister may have no hope whatever of the salvation of many of them. No—we object to the Church of England Burial Service altogether, for all and for any; we believe in our consciences that it is a gross perversion of Scripture which reads 1 Cor. xv. over dust and ashes. We protested against this while ministering in the Church of England, from her pulpit, and before her face, and therefore cannot now be accused for repeating the protest behind her back. We abjure and renounce the common practice of employing the sacred word of the Almighty to support that which that word, without man's tradition, condemns. We profess to be Protestants in something like a reality—Protestants against Protestant Popery—Protestants against Protestant idolatry, Protestants against Protestant impiety; and as in innumerable other instances, so here in the passage before us, where we read, "For our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue even all things unto himself." Now it may be thought that strong language has been used in the paragraphs immediately preceding; but let it be remembered that, in the exercise of our judgment, we are only speaking conscientiously of the doctrines of the Church of England, with something of the freedom wherewith the ministers of the Establishment speak of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. We, like

them, may affirm that our charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; and whose charity appears most to resemble truth, would quickly be determined by any unprejudiced man of the world. If any of the clergy of the Establishment should deign to peruse these pages, (and I hope many will, and answer them also, if they can,) I would solicit of them to weigh their Burial Service in the balance of what *may be* (to say no more,) a scriptural exposition of the texts from which that service is compiled. And, first, of Philippians iii. 21. The first thing in this scripture which ought to arrest the attention of the most careless reader, is the remarkable usage in which "body" is employed in the singular, coupled with the plural pronoun "our." We are nurtured from earliest infancy in the dogmas of creeds and catechisms to say, "I believe in the resurrection of the body," or surely, among the numbers who hear and read this verse times without number, there must have been many before now who would have arisen to question the common interpretation. On the common interpretation, we confess our inability to conceive a reason why the plural, "bodies," should not have been employed, as in the passage, "shall quicken your mortal bodies." "This," says Mr. Bush, "may appear, at first blush, a criticism of little weight; but we are persuaded it is one of prime importance, and that we are entitled to demand some rational solution of the problem involved in the phraseology." Nothing, certainly, would be more natural than the use of the plural, if Paul were speaking of the physical resurrection of believers. As it is, we cannot doubt that the term is to be taken in a collective sense, for the mystical body of Christ; so that "our body," in this connexion, is merely another phrase for the body to which we belong, for "we being many members, are one body." If this "our body" be not a collective, corporate body, there is a difficulty, on every other explanation, in accounting for the plural pronoun joined to a singular noun; whereas if the phrase "our body" be taken as applying to a number of individuals incorporated together, then the construction is according to usage, and is correct. Mr. Wilkinson, in his work on the "Last Days," illustrates the usage so appositely, that I shall take the liberty of transcribing a portion of his remarks. He writes—"A few proofs from the Scripture will best explain the meaning of this phrase: Genesis xxxvii. 26, "What profit is it if *we* slay *our* brother?" Matt. vi. 9, "*Our* Father, which art in heaven:" 1 Thess. iii. 9, "Now God himself, and *our* Father, and *our* Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you." If it were admitted that by the term "our body," may be understood *the bodies of individual believers universally*, then "our brother," "our father," "our God," "our Lord Jesus Christ," would mean many brothers, fathers, Gods, and Lords, whereas the contrary is the fact; and the same is true of the passage under consideration, "our vile body:" it does not mean many bodies, but one only, and therefore it relates to the church only, in its collective character, as "one body." (See Ephes. iv. 4.) The same is true of that place, Rom. viii. 23, "Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of *our body*," where the Apostle is speaking, first, of the heathen world, "the whole creation," waiting to "be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God:" he then pro-

ceeds to say, "And not only they (the heathen world,) but ourselves also, (of the Jewish nation,) which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of *our body*." And to this amount is Ephes. iii. 6, "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same *body*, and partakers of his promise by the gospel."—This interpretation of Phil. iii. 21, is substantiated by the context, in which occurs the passage already commented upon, "If that by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." It is not unworthy of notice that the Apostle writes in the first person singular throughout the chapter, until he arrives at the citizenship; and even supposing that the term, "our vile body," did include the believers whom he was addressing, still it could not be proved that the plural "our" was affirmed only of himself, inasmuch as the Epistle opens with these words, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." But it will be asked, How was Christ's body the church to be called a "vile body?" Does not the Apostle say that the church was changed from glory unto glory? and did they not all with open face behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord? This is very true. It must be granted that the body then beheld the glory of the Lord, and was changed into the same image from glory unto glory. But then it must at the same time be admitted that this most important scripture of 2 Cor. iii. is a sword which cuts two ways. Let it be assumed, for one moment, that this passage is an obstacle in our path; is it not equally so in that of an objector? Is it not a fair challenge to call upon those who entertain the commonly received opinion, to reconcile Paul's statement here, that believers *were* changed into the same image, with his apparently counter statement in 1 Cor. xv., "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we *shall* also bear the image of the heavenly?" Do not the popular opinions lead to the adoption of *two* images of the heavenly? and if so, then we ask—for what has never yet been given—for an explanation of this twofold character. And while religious systems are adding the above to the already long catalogue of problems proposed for their solution, we will proceed to unfold our views on the subject in debate.

We conceive that there is much by way of exposition conveyed in the Apostolic description of the nature of the sight which believers then enjoyed, "Beholding *as in a glass* the glory of the Lord." But more especially will this appear, if we compare this with another scripture, where we read, "Now we see through a glass *darkly*, (*ἰσὺς ἀβήματι*, in an enigma,) but then face to face." The result of the comparison will be, that believers in the Apostolic day beheld the glory of the Lord only darkly, and through a glass; that the body of his glory, or his glorious body, according to the likeness of which they were to be fashioned, was then but as a dim and indefinite picture. And this perfectly accords with the language of another of that company, which was led into all truth, seeing eye to eye—the Apostle John, where he records his testimony, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, (and if sons, then heirs,) and it *doth not yet appear what we shall be*; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like

him, for we shall see him as he is." (1 John iii. 2.) Without stopping to notice, that, according to the general interpretation of this verse, it doth not even *yet* appear what we shall be; let us observe that the words, 'we shall see him as he is,' seem to imply that, at his appearing again the second time, they should not only have an altered apprehension, but also that his appearance should be changed; or, in other words, that the image of Christ, into which they were said to be then changed, was diverse from that of the change which was still future, or that the body which then was, was not that body that should be. This would make the glorious body to be then future likewise; or, in other words, it would, if the expression may be allowed, place Christ and the church, the Head and the members, in the same position. And this we believe to be scriptural, and therefore true. It is a view supported by numerous passages, as for instance, "When he doth appear, we shall be like him." Now the likeness is not a likeness to an absent one, but to one present. But Christ was then absent; he was the forerunner entered within the veil; he was hid from believers within heaven itself, exercising his mediatorial office; he was the advocate with the Father, the high priest "touched with a feeling of infirmities." This was his image then; this was also the image into which believers were then changed. They were priests, lifting up holy hands, knowing that the inwrought, energetic prayer of a righteous man availed much; yea, and if the Romish doctrine, or any doctrine of Apostolic succession, beyond the fall of Jerusalem, be true, Romanism has a valid plea for its doctrine of the invocation and intercession of saints. Believers, in the Apostolic day, were thus "predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son;" and in this predestination, as they were then justified, so they were also then glorified, changed from glory to glory, so that the vile body was at the same time a glorious body. This reference to Rom. viii. reminds us that we need not have travelled from Philip. iii. for a view of the 'vile body.' Paul testifies to the vileness clearly enough in verse 10, "That I may know the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death:" that is, that he might be conformed to the death-image of the Son: for, "when we were enemies," saith he, "we were reconciled to God by the *death* of his Son, much more being reconciled, we *shall be* saved by his life," "for our life is hid with Christ in God." And that the Apostle was thus conformable to Christ's image in the fellowship of sufferings, he testifies very forcibly in writing to the Colossians, where he makes mention of "filling up the afflictions of Christ in his flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." (Col. i. 24.) This view of Phil. iii. 21, as considering Christ and the church to be at the same time in the same position, is set forth in many scriptures: Christ was the heir, and Paul speaks of the church as *joint-heirs* with Christ; and then, as though connecting the heir and joint-heir, he proceeds to say, "if so be that we suffer *with* him, that we may be also glorified *together*; for I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." And again, "if we suffer with him, we believe that we shall also reign with him." Let it be said, that Christ was then king on his throne: this was equally true of his people; but that there was a future appearance of the kingdom, and a

further reigning, is evident: "To him that overcometh will I give to sit with me on my throne." This was a second reigning, corresponding to a second resurrection; a second dominion of the kingdom, after the expiration and close of the first. This view of similarity of position between Christ and the church, is clearly illustrated on reference to the first diagram, where Christ, during the Apostolic ministry, was seen typified in Moses, the leader of the children of Israel—that Moses who, in his typical character, "chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." As Moses, and the children of Israel, might be called "a body of humiliation," during the forty years' journey through the great and terrible wilderness; so were Christ and his church a body (the body *is* Christ,) of humiliation, under the wilderness troubles experienced from the Jewish house, during the forty years of the Apostolic ministry; under the persecution, and gainsaying, and blasphemy of the Jews, which proceeded even to the "crucifying of the Lord afresh, and putting him to an open shame." This could not be when all enemies were put under the soles of his feet. Israel fought with Amalek, and Moses' hands being lifted up, by Aaron and Hur, (who thus were typical of the Apostolic ministry, which was a working together with God,) Israel prevailed. But it was prophesied, "though Amalek were the first of nations, his latter end shall be that he perish for ever;" thus typifying the Jews, and their latter end, for it was written of Eber, "he also shall perish for ever," which latter end having arrived, there should be no longer a body of humiliation—no more a cry on the part of Jewish scoffers, "Where is the promise of his coming?" but there should be a coming in the glory of the Father, and the holy angels, on the right hand of power, and in the clouds of heaven, to be admired in all them that believed. Then the vile body should enter into the joy of the Lord, and receive the inheritance prepared from the beginning of the world: that body of humiliation with which the Head showed his intimate sympathy, when he said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me;" or again, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" How beautiful is the harmony of the Scriptures, when, in reading the suffering state of the church, we compare this with Paul's own words, "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it."—Thus we have endeavoured to give an exposition of Phil. iii. 21, which is agreeable to reason and revelation; the commonly received view is not so. It presumes that the body which Christ assumed on this globe, underwent some process of change after the crucifixion, which we have shown to be mere presumption. It presumes that this is the body of which Paul is thinking, when he writes of 'his glorious body.' It presumes that Paul, and the whole family of God, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah, are yet 'waiting till their change come.' The common interpretation is therefore grossly absurd, in that it supposes the Head to have a body, and the members, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah, to have none. Let us ask, If there be this difference and distinction between Christ and his departed people, in the matter of a body, are they in communion together, notwithstanding this distinction? or, are the departed saints in any intermediate state? We leave religious systems

with this addition to their difficulties. We give them their choice of dilemmas; we permit them to choose the lesser of the two evils set before them, and proceed with our examination of other passages in connexion with the doctrine of the second resurrection.

The next scripture upon which we purpose to make a few remarks, is one which we have had occasion to notice already, when denying that Christ's resurrection was a resurrection of dust. It is contained in that great repository of resurrection doctrine, 1 Cor. xv. and reads as follows:

"Behold I shew you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." 1 Cor. xv. 51.

It will have been observed, ere this, that I take every opportunity of availing myself of the opinions of learned and *orthodox* writers, whenever I have the good fortune to agree with them in those opinions. I do this for one particular reason; because I am sensible of the importance that will be attached to the sentiments of such men, even though they may not be borne out by Scripture, and because I am alike aware of the little value which is put upon my sentiments, even though they may be supported by Scripture. With this view I beg to transcribe a general commentary on 1 Cor. xv., for which I am indebted to a note in Mr. Bush's *Anastasis*.

"Confessedly certain as is the corporeality of the risen saints, room is open for enquiring what corporeality it is which is to be understood as transmuted and raised to Heaven. When St. Paul speaks of 'this corruptible,' 'this mortal;' when he says 'it is sown in corruption,' does he refer to the sarkous mass left behind by the deceased? Is the funeral of the fleshly frame the sowing of the seed? Is the sepulchral enclosure the seed-plot? Is the putrescent frame itself the bared but solid, the denuded but valuable, the relatively dead but really living, the seemingly decomposing but actually germinating grain? Or is it, when its purposes, as an envelope, are answered, mere chaff detached by the flail of disease, and blown away by the wind of death?

"Evident it will be, on a calm perusal of his eloquent argument, that the Apostle has no reference to the sepulchre, or the funeral, or the soul-bereft corpse. His controversy was not with any who themselves denied, or with any who imagined any Christian instructor to have ever taught or fancied that the departed frame would again be animated by any but reptile vitality; his controversy was with parties who, if they did not set aside entirely an after life, or deny *in toto* a resurrection of the dead, peremptorily denied a resurrection from the dead, and while thereby excluding the fear of judgment from themselves, cut off from the faithful the prospect of reaching Heaven. Had the re-integration of the dis-integrated corpse been the position denied, the deniers, instead of being indignantly opposed, would have been cordially supported by all the Apostles' authority. Far too positively had Paul decided that he who sowed to the flesh should reap corruption, to allow of his supposing that he who sowed the flesh itself would reap anything else than mere putridity. Not one of his pleas, nor one of his expressions throughout the course of his discussion, can be made to apply to the fleshly frame, then only occasionally mouldering in the ground, but ever, after an interval, mouldering away. Neither *germination* (*ζωοποιήσις*), nor *wakening up* (*ἐγερσις*), nor *standing up* (*ἀνάστασις*), nor *transformation* (*ἀλλαγὴ*), nor *investiture* (*ἐκδύσις*), can be predicated of any subject that is not in an organized and really living condition, however reputedly and relatively dead its state: nor can the word *body* be referred to a system entirely decomposed; or the word 'resurrection' be made to signify re-construction; or 'resurrection from the dead,' be twisted into meaning the re-animated integuments from the superficial soil: or the corpse be defined to be a soul, body, and living soul: or the body, dead and corrupt, be said to be corruptible and mortal. In no part of his argument does St. Paul give the slightest intimation that he is pleading for the re-collection and re-organization of

the anywhere remaining particles, or for the future development of any supposed stamina of the exterior frame, but peremptorily excluding flesh and blood from entering, under any modification whatever, into the kingdom of God, he again and again makes it clear that he was demonstrating the resurrection of the dead, their very selves; and not their laid-aside vestments, but their personal hypostasis, was the theme of his discourse and the subject of his anticipations."—STEPHENSON'S CHRISTOLOGY, p. 164-166.

It is well known that 1 Cor. xv. forms no inconsiderable part of what is belauded by all parties as the magnificent burial service of the Church of England. Now, if there be any ministers in the Establishment (and I believe there are, especially among those who have just joined the ranks of the ministry), to whom "the loaves and the fishes" are not a consideration before which the most vital doctrine must yield, I could beg of them, before they inter another dead body, to weigh well and examine the above extract, to try their burial service in the scale of the above criticism; and if they feel disposed to act honestly, to attempt to answer the objections which are therein propounded. As an additional test whereby to measure the qualifications of the so-called Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and as one who is earnestly desirous that truth should be elicited, at whatever cost and sacrifice, I beg to be allowed to suggest the following for consideration:—

1. Whatever be the intrinsic nature of the resurrection which the apostle discusses in 1 Cor. xv., it pertains exclusively to the righteous. It is by no means a declaration of a general resurrection of all men without distinction. Doddridge writes, that it is "of the resurrection of Christians alone, and not of that of the wicked, that the Apostle evidently speaks in this whole chapter."

2. For the sake of argument, let the popular doctrine of the resurrection be granted; and let it be granted that a resurrection is predicated in 1 Cor. xv. of the unjust as well as of the just; then we submit the following problems, not only to the ministers and members of the Establishment, but also to those of numerous other religious systems.

'How are the bodies of the unjust to bear the image of the heavenly?' 1 Cor. xv. 49. 'How are they to be raised in glory?' Ibid. 43. 'How can the terms, a spiritual, powerful, and glorious body belong to the wicked?' and supposing for a moment such application, is this spiritual, powerful, and glorious body to suffer torment for the deeds done in the old, natural, weak, and dishonourable body? And supposing this to be the case, can such body of Dives be identified in hell by his five brethren as being the same which they once saw in their Father's house? or can there be any measure of justice between the sin and the punishment? Can God, in such case, take righteous vengeance on those which obeyed not his Gospel? for what meting a measure again can there be in such abounding excess of the punishment over the iniquity? The ministers of the Church of England, and others, are in a great strait by reason of these queries. They will not thank us for propounding them, nay, rather with their own lips, if they would but speak out, they will deny themselves and their avowed belief. Out of their own mouth, day by day, and funeral after funeral, they must be contented to stand condemned. And this being so, let us ask, are *these* the successors of the Apostles? Is it to such

that we are to look for comfort and consolation, "in all time of our tribulation, in all time of our wealth, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment?" Are they indeed, and of a truth, entrusted by the all-wise and Holy God with the care of souls, as "they that must give account." Then we ask, and we earnestly desire an answer, What account must such men give, who teach doctrines which, when presented in all their glaring nakedness before them, they themselves are ashamed to own, and but too willing and too happy, if the liberty might be allowed them, of passing by, like the Priest and Levite, on the other side! It must, we think, have been anything but an isolated opinion which was expressed, as we have heard, by a minister richly endowed in the Establishment, who, when asked for a harmony of two conflicting scriptures, is reported to have replied, 'You may make that Book say anything'—meaning the Bible!

3. Suppose that we revert to our first position, it being granted by our opponents that the queries just propounded do not admit of an application of 1 Cor. xv. to the resurrection of the unjust. We assume now that an objector takes his stand for the resurrection of the body, upon the analogy which the Apostle institutes between the resurrection and the life of seeds, plants, &c. We allow him to ask, with an air of triumph, what can the Apostle intimate but the resurrection of the bodies of men, when he points significantly to the earth—to the grave, and uses the words, 'it is sown,' three times over? We grant, for the moment, that the Apostle does teach the resurrection of the bodies of men; but here we stop—we make no further concession; but we affirm, having assumed for the occasion the common ground, that in the full discussion of the doctrine of the resurrection contained in 1 Cor. xv., nothing can be more explicitly asserted, than that man does not rise again with the same body, which he had in this world. On this head we refer an objector back to the luminous extract already given above: he will read that the Apostle had far too positively decided, that he who sowed to the flesh should reap corruption, to allow of his supposing that he who sowed the flesh itself should reap anything else than mere putridity. But, it is replied, does not he say—'To every seed there is his own body?' Yes; but it is here assumed, that the words 'own body' are identical with the words 'the same body;' but then this at once contradicts the assertion of the Apostle, 'Thou sowest not that body that shall be;' and this being so, what becomes of the oft-repeated objection, that if the same body were not raised, the term resurrection would be an absurdity. Now, saith the Apostle, "But some will say, how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" Suppose we read this question according to the common notion:—"How are the dead bodies raised up, and with what body do they (the dead bodies) come?" and then let us ask again of the sticklers for the resurrection of dust, are you not ashamed to own your doctrine? However, the Apostle's questioner had no such old-wives' fable in his mind,—he dreamed of no such absurdity as asking with what body dead bodies should come; but with what body, they, (ὁ νεκρός) their very selves, would come. And here let us observe how the phraseology of this verse agrees with Phil. iii. 21. It is not with what *bodies* do they come, any more than it is 'our vile *bodies*' which are to be changed.



And the reason is obvious, at a glance of the exposition already given of the 'vile body.' The reason is equally obvious, on a moment's consideration of the Apostle's express announcement of two bodies only in this chapter. "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body," not "There are natural bodies and there are spiritual bodies," any more than there are many first Adams and many second. Professor Bush allows, in Phil. iii. 21, that the term 'our body' is to be taken in a collective sense for the mystical body of Christ, as being merely another phrase for the body to which we belong. Now, we contend for the same sense in 1 Cor. xv., where we read, "With what *body* do *they* come?" We contend that the phrase 'spiritual body' has no relation whatever to the individual body of Christ, which he assumed on this globe; and we deny that any doctrine of resurrection *bodies* can be deduced from this, or any other portion of the sacred records. In fact, the 45th verse is the key to the whole chapter. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul: the last Adam, a quickening Spirit." Now the quickening Spirit, or the spiritual, was not first, and so Christ was Adam's son: but the living soul, or the natural, was first, and afterwards the quickening Spirit. The quickening Spirit, or the spiritual, could not be until the resurrection day; and so it might be asked, "If Adam then call him Lord, how is he his son?" because, afterward, the quickening Spirit became first, so it is written, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." He was Omega, or last, as he was the son of Adam according to the flesh in his death: he was Alpha, or first, as he was the Lord of Adam according to the Spirit in his resurrection. Thus, then, we see the intimacy of connexion that exists between the Apostle's argument, from analogy of the vegetable world, and the death and resurrection of the Son of God. What said Christ, in prospect of those events and their glorious consequences? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." The corn of wheat was undoubtedly intended of himself, who was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit, who was manifest in flesh, but justified in the Spirit. So the Apostle writes, "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Who is Jesus of Nazareth, and of what avail, except he die? But he doth die: he became obedient unto death: he died in Adam: he was sown. But how was he sown? a quickening Spirit? No, he was sown a living soul, as he testified, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful:" or again, "He made his soul an offering for sin." He was sown, that which he was not to be, in the likeness of the earthy: as the stone which the builders rejected: in the flesh. He was raised, that which he was to be, as the stone which was become the head of the corner: as the stone that should have many fellows, in that church which should be builded as lively stones, a holy temple unto the Lord. And this was the 'much fruit' which the corn of wheat was to bring forth. This was the body that should be: a body built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone: a body, quickened, raised, translated, and changed, but still progressing under all these particulars, still a body in progress of edification, and in process of arriving at a perfect man, the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ, or, in other words, the body of his

glory. And thus it is we are able to fathom the language of the Apostle, wherein he appears to signify a kind of intermediate state as the state in which believers then were. "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly;" for "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." But, says the Apostle, "As the heavenly, such also are the heavenly;" 1 Cor. xv. 4. 8, so likewise, corresponding to this, we have, "If ye then be risen with Christ, set your affections on things above, and not on things on the earth," Col. iii. 1; not on that which is natural, but on that which is spiritual, not on the first man with his body, which is of the earth earthly, but on the second man and his body, which is of the heaven heavenly.

Thus it will be evident that the gist of the Apostle's eloquent argument lies in the distinction between the two heads, between the two men. We will attempt to set forth the same thing, in adducing as an explanation to the two heads, and the two men—the two covenants, or the two worships. In this respect the grand and momentous truth is clearly apprehended, viz., "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The law was added because of transgressions; and we are informed, in explanation of this fact, that "*death* reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Now we are of opinion that the expression, 'there is a natural body,' may be predicated most justly of the Jewish body of worship, which body was then in existence in all its primitive force, when the Apostle indited 1 Cor. xv., as much as when Moses indited the book of Leviticus. That the Jewish worship was in Scripture phrase a body, is evident, in that we read of "the body of Moses," "of the eagles being gathered together wheresoever the *carcase* should be." We know that the Apostle was a Hebrew of the Hebrews: and we apprehend, therefore, that when he expresses his soul's desire, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death," he is speaking in reference to the Jewish worship, which was the ministration of condemnation and *death*: and that the Apostle was not delivered from that body is evident in every page of his Epistles: is evident in his becoming a Jew, if that by any means he might gain the Jew: is evident in his slaving his head, because he had a vow, and many like things: is evident from the troubles and anxiety which he experienced on account of the Judaizing tendencies of many of the churches which he planted. We apprehend, moreover, that when he speaks of an earthly house of this tabernacle being dissolved, of a groaning, being burdened, and such like, his mind is still upon the worship under the law; for it may well be asked, how can he speak of human bodies of clay as houses builded with hands? This is an absurdity, if applied to our flesh and blood in a literal sense; not so, however, if the tabernacle be of the worldly sanctuary, wherein were things made with hands, as the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, and the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant, and the golden pot with the manna, and the mercy-seat, and the cherubim. But we go further still in our view of the 'natural body.' The Apostle writes to the Colossians, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or the Sabbath-days?" And why? Because, saith

he, "These are only a shadow of good things a-coming, but the body is of Christ." These things were things pertaining to the law, and many such things there were pertaining to the gospel, in that dispensation of the Apostolic ministry. The mystical body of Christ, say we, was a natural body, at that time, as far as its ordinances, its officers, its gifts, prophesying, tongues, healing, helps, and governments were concerned. All these were, if the expression may be allowed, borrowed from the Jewish body of worship, and in these, and because of these, it may well be conceived that the Apostle did groan, being burdened; nay, we have no need of imagination in this case. Paul sets before us the reality, for, says he, "Who is sufficient for these things?" and again, "Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel!" Necessity was laid upon him, because God had a work to perform: his purposes were not complete; his dispensations were not finished and fulfilled; and while there was a work to be done, there must be ministers to do the work, and these ministers must be accredited with outward and visible tokens, under the gospel, just as they had been under the law: and in so far as this was so, there was a *natural* body. But then this body should be done away; "whether there were prophecies, they should be abolished; whether tongues, they should cease; whether knowledge, it should be put away;" and thus, in this respect, that body was corruptible, crumbling, dissoluble, and vanishing. That body was to give way to a spiritual body. Thus, then, there was, in that Apostolic body, "rule, authority, and power," which was to be "put under the feet of the Son," equally with the rule, authority, and power of the exclusively earthly house of the then existing tabernacle. And when these things should be brought to pass, then would the saying that was written receive its grand fulfilment; "God is Spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth." Then, *indeed*, would there be a resurrection wherein they should neither marry nor be given in marriage; for God is a Spirit, and flesh and blood cannot inherit that worship. Then, when the old covenant administration of death, which in Paul's day was shaken and ready to vanish, should entirely disappear—then should be brought to pass the saying that was written, "Death is swallowed up in victory."

The time would fail if we were to attempt the fulness of an exposition of that Scripture, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." Let it suffice that we have shown the truth, in its contracted form, as applying to the first Adam Head, and also in its expansive character as attaching to the law, which was added because of transgressions brought in by that Head. We may add that this view of the word "body" is considerably strengthened by observing the connexion between 1 Cor. xv. and the preceding chapters. That there is a connexion is evident at once, from the wording of the introductory verse of chapter xv.; and then, for the nature of the connexion, we have occasion only to read the concluding verse of the preceding chapter, "Let all things be done decently and in order," and ask ourselves of what and what manner of things and time the Apostle is here discoursing. Evident it will be at a glance, that throughout the whole of the preceding portions of his Epistle he is discoursing of the body, the Church, and

the order of which he speaks is lucidly expounded in chap. xii. 27, and following verses, where we read, "Now *ye* are the *body* of Christ, and members in particular; and God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." This is the decency of order which the Apostle expounds in chapter xiv. as attaching to the miracle-endowed body; and if that decency of order is to be enforced now, as it is, by many of our Apostolic succession, they must show us the self same body. From this exhortation to the miracle-endowed body, the Apostle proceeds in chapter xv., as he had in chapter xiii., to show unto the Corinthians a more excellent way. He had told them, in chapter xiii., that all the gifts on which they set so much account should come to an end, their then existing body being dissolved. He then, in chapter xiv., returns again to a discussion of the things pertaining to the body; and having closed that chapter, he reverts to the superior state and constitution which was to supervene upon that in which they were then standing, even that love which should never fail, but abide with them for ever.

We trust that enough has been advanced to lead the enquiring mind from the beggarly contemplation of perishing dust and ashes; such contemplation being no more like the knowledge of 1 Cor. xv. than is the light of a taper to be compared with that of the meridian sun. If the advocate for a resurrection of dust be not contented with our exposition of Paul's analogy from the vegetable world, we are quite willing to examine his notion of that analogy, as being related to the bodies of men. If it be not sufficient to have expounded the analogy, of Christ himself, the living soul in death, and the quickening spirit in resurrection, then we at once maintain, that on any other exposition the analogy will not bear to be pressed. Taking the Apostle's reasoning to be of human bodies, the following is the exposition. The 'dying,' which the Apostle predicates of the seed, takes place subsequently to the sowing. But this is not true of human bodies. The human body does not die after it is deposited in the dust; it is dead previously to its being closed in the coffin, and carried to the grave. There can be no mistake about this, 'for the body without the spirit is dead.' The analogy fails here. But this is a light matter: there is much more. As there is something in the grain which dies when sown, so there is something which does not die. There is the life; there is a germ, enfolded by a mass of matter, which in dying supports that germ; and if the germ should die, then of course there would be no plant nor body to spring up. Now, if this law of vegetable reproduction is made use of by the Apostle to illustrate the resurrection of the human body, then we must be forced to the admission of some kind of germ, in the decaying and dissolving human body, from which a spiritual, powerful, and glorious body is to be produced. If not, where is the analogy? and of what profit is the illustration? The ancient Jews (as we know,) held that there was this germ, and that it was material. They contended that there was an immortal bone in the human body, which is the germ of the resurrection body. This bone, they held, might be burned, boiled, baked, pounded—it might be put upon an anvil, and hammered with ten thousand sledge-hammers, but all to no

purpose. It was an incorruptible bone, it was an immortal bone, it was an enduring and a glorious bone. Will those who are so actively interesting themselves about the restoration of the Jews, agree with them in this their view of the resurrection of dust? Will they, as they are building them up in one superstition, build them up in another? Will they, while declaring, as they are wont, that the natural man cannot understand the things of God, declare also, in the same breath, that they will have recourse to Jewish Rabbies for a support of their resurrection doctrine? We confess that it passes our comprehension, how they can otherwise press the Apostle's analogy into their service. Or will they once more blush at the gross absurdity of their favourite doctrine, and agree with us that this Jewish fancy about an immortal bone must be staged among Rabbinical fictions, and put on the same shelf with the silly traditions of the Talmudical doctors, that at the resurrection, the bodies of the Jews, in whatever part of the world they died, will be rolled or transported under ground, through secret passages, and all emerge to light and life in the land of Canaan, with those of Abraham, and Isaac, and the fathers? But why do we require this at the hand of dust resurrectionists, seeing that, on their own interpretation of Ezekiel's *dry bones*, they must, though it may be in secret, entertain the fond notion that there is somewhere such a material substance as this immortal bone, of immortal memory? Is this then the doctrine of the resurrection which the Apostles preached, and is this to be a successor of the Apostles, to couple the name of the Lord's anointed with the name of the 'immortal bone'? Is this immortal bone the germ, and if it be not, *what is it?* If it be, then what and *where* is it? What becomes of it when the body is burnt to ashes, and the dust thereof is scattered, like the chaff before the wind, to the four corners of the earth? What became of it in the hundreds of bodies which have been burned of late in the Spa-fields burial ground? Did it escape the fury of the fire? Can it really resist all mechanical pressure, and is there any evidence of such resistance forthcoming? But we will not pursue this childish notion further. If the resurrection of the body which is deposited in the earth depends on the development of a corporeal germ, which no process of reasoning can show to exist, and the body itself is resolved back into its original elements, then the doctrine of the resurrection of the human body falls to the ground. And if it be said that the analogy of the Apostle, in 1 Cor. xv., was never intended to be closely pressed, then we maintain there is no analogy at all in the case. Let it be admitted that the life of the body ceases when the breath has departed, and that it is only after long ages that the succeeding resurrection body springs up from the grave-yard or the *furnace*, then the analogy is completely destroyed, and the Apostle is found a babbler.

But it will be urged, if the Apostle's analogy does not teach a resurrection of dust, what does it teach? Professor Bush puts this question, and attempts to answer it by endeavouring to show that the germ which emanates from the defunct body is a *something* that is spiritual, invisible, impalpable, ethereal—a something that is exhaled with the dying breath; that goes forth from the body before it is consigned to its kindred dust; "for," says Mr. B., "after the body has mouldered away in the grave, we perceive not how any germ is ever to

emanate from it." There are two verses in the chapter which completely set aside this spiritual fancy, verses 25 and 51, where we read, "Every man in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's *at his coming*:" and again, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." This is a complete overthrow of Mr. B.'s resurrection body, because there is here a plain declaration that such body could be possessed previous to animal dissolution. But it will be urged, What then does the analogy teach? We ask this question, here and above, for the purpose of replying that we have already at some length explained. We have already shown, that by no possibility can the analogy be pressed to any body but one, that is Christ's and the Church. He said, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;" therefore, "it was not possible that he should be holden of the pains of death," and thus herein, like the seed, his true life was not intermitted even in the midst of his dying: thus, in short, the living soul that was not left in hell was made a quickening Spirit. We have shown, moreover, many times, in different ways, that Christ being all in all, whatever is predicated of him, the Head, must, by inseparable connexion, be predicated of the members; and, therefore, into whatsoever analogy the Head is introduced, by necessary consequence the body must follow. We have demonstrated, above all, that this 'one body' was then in a death image, according to the saying, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid;" and thus, in the day when the Apostle wrote Corinthians xv., it was sown, to be raised once more; but this further resurrection being entirely spiritual and spiritually discerned, it is much better conceived by a spiritually-minded person than described through the medium of words. Language utterly fails in expression, though the Holy Ghost hath employed in the sacred records the most magnificent and hyperbolic phraseology wherewith to make it known. That phraseology is borrowed from the evidence of our senses—from what we can see with our eyes and handle with our hands; and as the mass of mankind are not reflecting, are only capable of being addressed through the sphere of the sensuous, are unable to conceive an abstract idea, therefore it is, and it is no wonder, that the common notion of the resurrection is the notion of Nicodemus. It is supposed that resurrection is a repetition of bodily life, as Nicodemus supposed that regeneration was a repetition of bodily birth. For certainly, as has been justly observed, it may be said, without offence, the idea that in order to an individual's rising again he is to return again to the body of flesh, is the exact counterpart of the notion that in order to his being born again he must return again to his mother's womb.

After much loitering by the way to taste the sweets of the Hill of Zion, we are now come to our grand summing up of the chapter under consideration. We revert to the verse from whence our discussion set out, viz., "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." In a former part of this treatise, allusion was made to the parallel passage to this verse as being all that was wanted in order to explain the Apostle's meaning. The passage referred to is contained in Matthew xvi. 28, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."

We conceive that those of whom Christ declares, 'They shall not taste of death,' are they of the same generation, respecting whom the Apostle predicates, 'We shall not all sleep.' The same is true of that passage, i. Thess. iv. 17, "We which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep," or which have tasted of death. From this comparison of Scriptures, the evidence is conclusive, that the Apostles and their fellow-believers anticipated the occurrence of the second Advent during their own life-time, or the period of the men of that generation. No one, having the slightest pretension to a claim of dealing fairly by the Scriptures, can venture to deny this position. Mr. Bush, as we have seen, is puzzled by the necessity of admitting this, and can only evade its overwhelming denial of his resurrection doctrine by affirming that the event has shown the expectation to be erroneous.\* This is pure assumption, unsustained by any better attempt at proof than an erroneous view of Luke xxi. 24; unsupported by any other than a carnal interpretation of the magnificent language of the prophets, when describing the kingdoms of this world to have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.—We refer the reader to our note. We cannot for a moment admit that there was any, the least, Apostolical error in this matter of times and seasons; though, at the same time, we can admire the honesty of argument which declares that the second Advent must have transpired, and all its cotemporaneous events be fulfilled, unless such admission be granted. Far too explicitly does Paul state the case with respect to time, to allow of any man in his senses denying that he (the Apostle) intended to confine the event to the life-time of that generation. That man must be the weakest of the weak—and of such is the commentator Scott—who would thus lay himself open to the charge of extravagance so outrageous; and yet this is the practical extravagance of religious systems. For our own part, we have only to carry ourselves, in imagination, back into the days when the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians were indited, and to ask ourselves the simple question, how should we have understood the words, "We which are alive and remain?" and the Apostle's meaning will not admit of a shadow of a doubt; and yet religious systems will not have recourse to this easy method of trying *their* fundamental doctrine of a coming still future. We have no more to do than seek an exemplification of the fact of remaining to the coming of the Lord, and enough will then have been advanced to satisfy, one would think, the most sceptical enquirer. And to whom, or whither, shall we go? To the pages of ecclesiastical history—to a ministry which is not infallible, and therefore never authorised of God? No, but to the witness of God himself; for if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater. We read in the 20th verse of the last chapter of John's Gospel the following:—"Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following: which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, who is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Now, we desire to express our sentiments as plainly as possible, and to avail ourselves of the admissions of

\* See Note M.

objectors whensoever available. As we have before had recourse to the marginal references in the small bibles, so here also we adopt the like expedient. One parallel passage, marked opposite John xxi. 22, is the verse of Matthew xvi. 28, now under consideration. But, it is argued, this latter Scripture was fulfilled in the transfiguration which occurred about an eight days after, as related in the 17th chapter. Then it must be admitted the marginal references are incorrect, even though compiled by the Evangelical commentator Scott, the man after an objector's own heart. They are incorrect on the showing of the common opinion, because most assuredly the coming spoken of in John cannot have been fulfilled in the transfiguration. We should not be surprised at anything, however preposterous, in these days; but this is a flight which we cannot imagine. If the transfiguration were the fulfilment of Matthew xvi. 28, it was likewise the fulfilment of Matthew xvi. 27, for we maintain that the two verses cannot be separated. What then becomes of this transfiguration exposition, but that the day of judgment transpired, according to popular views, before the death of Christ? for when he declared that some around him should not die before he came in his kingdom, he declared at the same time that that coming was to be in the glory of his Father, for the purpose of rewarding every man according as his work should be. (See Rev. xxii. 12.) The popular interpretation falls to the ground; and we maintain that it is impossible to substitute any other view than that which we hold, without denying the inspiration of the Scriptures altogether. We affirm, without fear of being contravened, that Christ must have come again a second time during the life of the Apostle John; and we confess that, judging reasonably of the probable duration of that life, we cannot discover any event which could better answer such second advent than is described in these words, "These be the days of vengeance, for the fulfilment of all things written." Tradition has fixed the date 96 to John's Revelation, and so the popular views of the date of that book tell against the popular views of the second advent. If the second advent transpired at the fall of Jerusalem, then John did outlive that event, and was among the number of those who did not sleep, but were changed. If the second advent did not take place at the fall of Jerusalem, and had *not* transpired when John had the revelation in the year 96 (as presumed), then, we ask, is John still alive, and if he be, where is he? Show us the Apostle, and it sufficeth. Transform the legend of the Wandering Jew into a matter of fact, and we are contented. If this cannot be done, we must come to the conclusion that the second advent is a past event, and that Paul's declaration has received its accomplishment, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." It will be of no avail to tell us that Christ did not *certainly* promise that John should live till his second coming. This is quibbling, and something worse, for it dethrones Christ from his exalted station as the faithful and true witness, and virtually ridicules that solemn asseveration, "Heaven and earth (the Jewish worship) shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." We abide by the simple truth, and according as it was spoken, so we believe that it did come to pass: and we are supported in this belief from internal evidence of John's Epistles. Christ, when discoursing of the signs of the times which should precede the destruction of Jeru-



salem, declared that false Christs and false prophets should arise and deceive many. John, in his first Epistle, exhibits the fulfilment of that prophecy. He writes, "Many false prophets are gone out into the world:" and again, "Little children, it is the last hour; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last hour." Taking into consideration the circumstance that John lived the longest of all the Apostles, and allowing that the false Christs and false *prophets* were to precede the fall of Jerusalem, (and it passes our comprehension how any could think seriously of applying them to any other event or time,) then, religious systems themselves being judges, there is an emphatic meaning in the solemn charge, 'Little children, it is the last hour:' but alas! religious systems cannot, however much inclined, assent to that meaning. The evidence, to one unfettered by human inventions and cunning craftiness, is overwhelming as regards the period of the fulfilment of 1 Cor. xv. 51. The testimony, to an unprejudiced mind, is complete enough, that in the lifetime of John, the Lord did, in the symbolical language of prophecy, descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, which trump is the same with the sounding of the last trumpet, sounded by the seventh angel: all which Scriptures are the same in meaning with that of Christ, when, describing Jerusalem's desolation, he says, "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Compare 2 Thess. ii. 1.) The Apostle announces this grand consummation in these striking terms, "Behold," says he, "I show you a mystery"—"a mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, and is now revealed in this last time." And when we find him introducing this change, in language like this, is it possible to listen to the tale that would set aside the time of the change, by insinuating that the Apostle was mistaken—by aiming a deadly blow at his inspired authority? Impossible indeed. 'Behold, I show you a mystery,' is language that we dare not thus trifle with, knowing that the honour of Christ is therewith intimately bound up. When the Apostle tells the Corinthians that he would show them a mystery, he is telling them in so many words the superiority of his ministry over all that had preceded it. He is repeating what he had already advanced in the second chapter of this same Epistle, where we read, "As it is written, eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him; but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." Eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor heart conceived this marvellous change, as it should be in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. Prophets and kings, Isaiah and David, and Solomon and all the prophets had desired to see these things, and had not seen them: they only died in faith—this change was among the deep things of God into which they, the angels of Jehovah, desired in vain to look. But, saith the Apostle, who had ascended to the throne of fire, "I show you the mystery, for God hath revealed it. I tell you the time and the season: WE shall not all sleep; but WE, whether asleep or remaining, shall all be changed. The Fathers and our brethren, who have fallen asleep in Jesus, Abel and Stephen, Abraham and our beloved James,

we shall all be changed, and Christ shall be changed, and his dominion shall be changed, every man in his own order: Christ, the first-fruits, in his order: then they which are dead or asleep in Christ, in their order: then we which are alive and remain, in our order. Them which sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him, not out of their literal graves, but from heaven, for this their resurrection, you know, hath no concern with their perished earthly body." "We," continues the Apostle, "shall not prevent, shall have no advantage over, shall not outstrip, them which are asleep; and therefore, Thessalonians, ye need not sorrow, as they that have no hope. No, but we shall be caught up with them in clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be for ever with the Lord. Then we shall be absent from the body, delivered from this body state of death, to die no more, as we do now daily: no longer to be in this, our state of captivity unto death, but we shall be present with the Lord, seeing him as he is, and knowing him in spirit and in truth. Then we, the ministers of Jesus Christ, whom he hath appointed in his church, the last Apostles, we that remain not, shall be raised by Jesus, and presented together with you.\* We are in the death image now, alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, bearing about in *the* body (state) the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our *mortal*, but not in our *dead* flesh; for as he hath quickened us together with Christ in this life, we believe that he shall also quicken us in and to the life to come,—us who remain in our *mortal*, not in our *dead* bodies. And for this cause we faint not; for our light affliction is but for a moment, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. The things which are seen, O Corinthians, are the image of the earthy, but as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly; then this earthy image, the earthy house of this tabernacle, this corruptible shall be dissolved; it shall put on incorruption, we shall be clothed upon with our house from heaven, and being clothed, we shall be found in him, not having our own righteousness, for that shall be done away, according to Moses' word; we shall not be found naked, we shall be clothed in the fine linen, clean and white; and the days of our espousals being ended, we shall enter in to the marriage supper of the Lamb.—Then when we shall be presented to, and present with, the Lord; when we shall be clothed upon with our house not made with hands; (compare 2 Cor. v. 1, 2, and Rev. xxi. 3,) when the tabernacle of God shall dwell with men; then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory." Such is a short paraphrase of the Apostle's meaning. The saying that was written, was a mystery hid from ages. It was one of those things which God had prepared, of which, in Isaiah's day, eye had not seen; for, speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, he has left this record, in chapter xxv., "In this mountain (Mount Sion,) shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all

\* See Note N.

nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." (Isaiah xxv. 6, 7, 8.) The Lord God would swallow up death in victory in that mountain, which we have shown to be the spiritual mountain to which believers in the Apostle's day were come, by faith of death being then abolished. Therefore it follows, of consequence, that there having been in Apostolic times a spiritual movement to this spiritual mountain, there might be a like further movement in the self-same times; and then it would come to pass that death, as it had been abolished, in a time state, might also be swallowed up; that sin, as it had been put away, might be so buried that it should appear no more again for ever; that as there had been a possibility of rejoicing alway, there might also be the possibility that here, in this world, God might wipe away tears from all faces. Indeed, the matter is put beyond the shadow of a doubt. A glance at the context of Isaiah xxv. will suffice to show that death must have been swallowed up in victory, independent of what is called an end of the world; for we read, at the close of chapter xxiv, "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and before his ancients gloriously." More than this was prophesied of in connexion with Jerusalem's desolation; for there we read, that "the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven," events which certainly did not happen in a literal fulfilment, but which did as certainly happen in the sun, moon, and stars of the Jewish hierarchy. And then, that death must have been swallowed up in victory during this time state, is evident again from the context following the passage, for we read, "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord, we have waited for him; we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation:" or again, "In that day (the same day,) shall this song be sung in the land of Judah, We have a strong city; salvation shall God appoint for walls and bulwarks." It is evident that these portions of the prophet Isaiah are quoted in 1 Cor. xv., and applied to the grand event of the resurrection of the dead. With the doctrine of the resurrection is intimately connected that of the end of the world and the day of judgment. But nothing can be clearer than that the prophet is not speaking of an end of the world; so neither is Paul. Whatever is the drift and bearing of Isaiah xxv., the same is that of 1 Cor. xv. 51. The Holy Ghost cannot be contradictory. The event which the Apostle is eloquently predicting, must transpire, or have transpired, before what is termed an end of the world. The common opinions of the day virtually arrive at this conclusion, seeing that they take a literal view of the mountain of Sion, and the land of Judah. The opinions of certain Universalists are overthrown, in so far as they are rested here; for while it is maintained that death is only swallowed up in victory, in the total destruction of human nature, which can only eventuate at a physical conflagration of the globe, it is maintained on the other hand by the prophet, that this swallowing up of the natural in the spiritual can transpire without any such catastrophe. According to Isaiah and Paul,

the place wherein tears are to be wiped away, and death swallowed up in victory, is not the heaven of religious systems; so thus it will come to pass, that the New Jerusalem is not that heaven; for it was in that holy city that all tears should cease, and there should be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying, neither any more pain, the former things being passed away. This is a most scriptural conclusion, and we are rejoiced to see that it is a conclusion at which Professor Bush has arrived. He writes as follows: "We are for ourselves perfectly satisfied that in the scheme of revelation the curtain drops upon the human race in the mid career of its evolving destiny. The predictions of Daniel land us in the everlasting kingdom of the saints, established upon the whole earth, and under the whole heavens. The disclosures of the Apocalypse conduct us into the bosom of the New Jerusalem state, equally established upon the earth, and there leave us. Nothing in our view is clearer than that the events commonly assigned to what is termed, by one of the grossest philological errors, 'the end of the world,' *i. e.* as implying the physical conflagration of the globe, do in fact occur at the commencement, and not at the close, of the grand Sabbatism of the world; *for it has no close, i. e. none revealed.* The single declaration of the Apocalypse, 'The leaves of the tree shall be for the healing of the nations, (Gentiles,)' leaves all the common theories of the future at fault, because they afford no solution of the problem, 'What Gentile nations remain to be healed in heaven?' " With these remarks we cordially concur. The concluding question is indeed a puzzle to all the common theories of the future, and there are very many such. We read, "There was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels." It might be asked, How were it possible that the Devil should find entrance into heaven, that holy, happy, sinless paradise of our thoughts? We know that Milton, in his "Paradise Lost," has set forth this war as occurring before the creation of the world; and we know also that nothing can be more preposterous. The angels of Michael overcame by the blood of the Lamb: was then the blood of the Lamb shed before the creation of the world, or four thousand years after? The angels of Michael are the Apostles in their ministry, "wrestling not with flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, the rulers of the darkness of that age, and spiritual wickedness in high places," and these were the dragon and his angels. But it is all vanity. We repeat, that we cordially concur with the above extract, as exhibiting the Bible in the light of a manual, for beings *in flesh and blood, on the earth*, and not as a revelation of matters connected with the world of spirits, and for a simple reason, because there is no medium through which to convey such revelations: these are indeed to us, while enveloped with our temporary bodies of clay, unutterable things. While we are happy to agree with Professor Bush upon this important point, we must confess that we are grieved to read, in connexion with it, sentiments like the following: Speaking of the passage, "There shall be no more sea," Mr. B. writes, "Our own impression is, that under the new earthly economy the sea will no longer exist *as a sea, i. e.* as a separating barrier in the way of the intercourse of nations. Such will then be the improvements in the various arts of navigation, that

the ocean shall be, as it were, *bridged*, and offer no more impediment to travelling than the land!" When one falls in the way of a passage like this, it is time to question ourselves whether we be awake or asleep; whether mesmeric passes have captivated our senses or no. How preposterously absurd! Does Mr. B. mean to say, then, that John saw a literal sea of glass, like unto crystal, before the throne of the Lamb, as mentioned in Rev. iv. 6? How simple and easy the interpretation, if writers and readers would but bring these things to the simplicity of the two covenants; would but remember that there was such a thing as a sea in Solomon's temple; that the heaven and earth of the Jewish world could not be complete without mention of a sea; and that the symbolical sea of glass, in John's vision, was to be done away on the expiration of the first dominion of the kingdom, when there was the pure river of the water of life, which proceeded and proceedeth out of the throne of God and the Lamb. Equally absurd things are written, in Mr. B.'s work, respecting the saying, 'There shall be no more death;' but we have not leisure to criticise further. Evident it is on every side to us, and we trust to every unprejudiced mind, that the whole of the Bible is, or is to be fulfilled, totally irrespective of what is generally termed 'the end of the world;' and this being so, the question will naturally arise, What must become of such notions as the popular doctrines of the resurrection of the dead, and the day of judgment? Plainly enough they must, by inevitable necessity, be counted false. Plainly enough, moreover, it is, that all religious systems, which depend for their existence upon such doctrines, must sooner or later come to nought. Plain enough it is, that if a person ground, for instance, a millennial, or New Jerusalem scheme upon a fancy of this *literal* heaven and earth being made at some (unknown) time new, the whole fabric of his fanciful imaginings must totter and fall; for if there be no making new of a literal heaven and earth, the key-stone of the arch is gone,—“Ye have taken away his gods, and what hath he left?” And here we may observe in passing, if we ask the advocates of future fulfilments to attach a definite idea to their favourite scriptures, such as, 'Behold I make all things new,' they cannot give it. They will repeat to you, over and over again, the assertion of the ultimate subjection of all persons and things to God: but 'all things' is a wide term, if we take it out of the Bible. 'All things' may mean all animals; all the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea, and the creeping things of the ground, and much more; and it may be asked, Are the wolf, and the lion, &c., to dwell together in the New Jerusalem, and is the literal version the truth? 'All things,' on the showing of these same persons, is a phrase of divers meanings, for they will tell us, that when Peter wrote, 'the end of *all things* is at hand,' he meant simply, the end of things pertaining to the Jewish dispensation; but when John writes, "Behold I make all things new," 'all things' there has quite a different meaning. O what miserable inconsistency; what loopholes for infidelity to spy through; what a making void of the word of God, by man's tradition, is this! When will men cease to pervert the Scriptures, and suffer them to speak for themselves? when will they obtain a glimmering of the distinction between Moses and Christ, between that covenant which, when John

and Peter lived and wrote, was waxen old, and ready to vanish, and that covenant, which was and is, as the waters of Noah, a sign to perpetual and never-ending generations of men?

Having established the truth, that the whole of the contents of the Bible was intended to be fulfilled, irrespective of what is known by the name of 'an end of the world,' the only question for consideration is, Have the whole of the contents been fulfilled or not? We are contented to rest our answer on the exposition which we have given of Isaiah xxv. 8, and 1 Cor. xv. 51, in their connexion with Matthew xvi. 28, and their illustration from the life of the Apostle John. We might fill pages with a summary of proofs of past and complete fulfilments, drawn from what we have written, but we are willing to trouble and to be troubled no further, than by simply transporting ourselves in imagination back to the day when Paul wrote, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." We ponder for a moment over our fancied position, and over the letter which thus speaks to us, and the thought steals into the mind, Can the Apostle be writing of a great while to come, and is it of something which is to transpire thousands of years hence, that he predicates a change? Could the fathers die in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them *afar off*? and are we told that the same period of time which is called 'afar off,' having transpired between the promise of Christ's second coming, and the present period, that second coming is to be called '*a little while*?' Could the Lord rebuke the false prophets for saying that the vessels of the Lord's house should *shortly* be brought again from Babylon, when that captivity was only seventy years, (Jer. xxvii. 16,) and is there no rebuke for the prophets of gospel times, for the spiritually discerning Apostles, who spake of a return of the Lord in their life-time, when 1800 years have transpired, and that return appears as far off in the distant future as at the beginning? Can we believe this? We answer No, and our answer is echoed, in tones that cannot be mistaken, in every page of the Epistles. We dwell with delight on the promise made to the writers of those Epistles, that they should be guided into all truth, and we hear them declaring the speedy advent of a grand event: and is our delight the less for this?—yea, it is exchanged, it must be exchanged, for the blackness of darkness and despair, if that advent did not as speedily come, as it was speedily announced. Far too positive are the declarations of the Epistles, to lead us to doubt of what was passing through the Apostles' minds. The time would fail us to transcribe but a tithe of their exhortations which were founded upon the expectation of Christ's speedy coming. Let a few scriptures suffice:—"The Lord is *at hand*." (Phil. iv. 5.) "The night is *far spent*, the day is *at hand*." (Rom. xiii. 12.) "To him who is *ready* to judge the quick and dead." (1 Pet. iv. 5.) "The *coming* of the Lord *draweth nigh*: behold the judge *standeth at the door*." (James v. 8, 9.) "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that *that day should overtake you as a thief*." (1 Thess. v. 4.) "Looking for that blessed hope, and the *glorious appearing* of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." (Titus ii. 13.) "For yet a *little while*, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." (Heb. x. 37.) "Exhorting one another, and so much the more as *ye see the day*

*approaching.*" (Heb. x. 25.) "And now, little children, abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him *at his coming.*" (1 John ii. 28.) "Seal not up the prophecy of this book, *for the time is at hand.*" (Rev. xxii. 10.) We close with the closing words of the sacred volume; "He which testifieth these things saith, *Surely I come quickly*" (Rev. xxii. 20); and the echo of the church was this, "*Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.*" We ask, Can we, with such an array of that word, which is the testimony of Jesus, think that that word hath returned to the Lord void, having failed to accomplish his pleasure, or to prosper in the thing whereunto he sent it? Can we conclude that this evidence, deduced from the Epistle to the Romans, to the Revelation of John, was no evidence whatever whereby to show that Zion's watchmen saw eye to eye? Can we be persuaded that a Paul would leave the feet of Gamaliel, to be counted the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things, for the sake of that which, in the belief of the Christianity of our day, has turned out to be a fable and a delusion? Is it credible that he who was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and the strictest of Pharisees, would suffer such unheard-of trials, persecutions, afflictions, stripes, imprisonments, stonings, deaths—would be contented to labour, working with his own hands—to have no certain dwelling-place—to be in perils, tumults, watchings, fastings, and all for the purpose of being the head and front of the greatest deceit that was ever palmed upon his fellow men, that was ever invented by the father of lies, that ever entered into the imagination of human nature to conceive? Yes—it is possible; yes—it must be so: we cannot help coming to a conclusion like this, preposterous though it be, absurd though it must be counted, yea, so as that the force of absurdity could no further go—if we can for a moment suppose that the declarations then made, and the exhortations thus, with all the energy of that Apostle's ardent mind, expressed, were not verily, and indeed, the truth of the everlasting God. If the truth of God they were, then it is quite clear—it is evident to a demonstration—it is plain as an axiom that is its own proof, that the coming of Christ must have been accomplished, and the counsel of God in Christ fulfilled, within a very short time after these declarations were made, after these solemn warnings were issued. This coming will attach to no event other than the fall of Jerusalem. This event is exhibited in our Diagram at the end of the Zion state: and passing the fourth boundary line, the authoritative ministry ordained and appointed of God, the ministry of the Apostles, with Christ, the Head of their body under that first dominion of the kingdom, was fulfilled: and the kingdom of our God and of his Christ—the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away—the last, the final, the unchanging, the eternal state, whose sun doth no more go down, is established, and established to eternal, never-ending ages of men. Since this coming of Christ there has been no intermediate state, no divinely-appointed ministry remaining. The Apostle John, as we have seen, lived on the earth in the life of the animal body until this coming again. Then prophecy failed, tongues ceased, knowledge which was neither clear nor dark vanished away: and then, John, to whom the revelation of the mystery of Daniel was given, became as another man,

for in Jerusalem was found, and of Jerusalem was required, the blood of *all* the prophets; so that, were it evident that John had written, or taught, or said however little after Jerusalem's desolation, the conclusion would be equally evident, that what he said, wrote, or taught, was not, and could not be, by any divine authority or appointment. In the ceasing of tongues, in the fulness of knowledge, in the vanishing of prophecy, then that Apostle realised his glorious anticipation, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." He received then the fulfilment of the promise on which his mind runs throughout his Epistle, where he declares, "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not:" the promise we mean, which saith, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The light was no longer as it had hitherto been, 'neither clear nor dark,' for then the Lord became the everlasting light: and that city into which John and all that were alive and remained were ushered, had no need of the light of the sun nor of the moon, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb was the light thereof. Then, in that day, when they cried in the fulness of the knowledge of a kingdom established in victory and peace, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him," their hope was no longer laid up in heaven, no longer within the veil, for the forerunner was come out therefrom, and with him their hope, as he was their life. "What a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? and if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." They did see, face to face, they were like him: they were persuaded that they had not run in vain nor laboured for nought. They beheld the astonishing fulfilment of all that Moses and the prophets did testify, when "they spake beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." The Apostle John was an eye-witness of the majesty and coming of the Lord at the overthrow of the Jewish world, as he had been an eye-witness to the glories of the Transfiguration. He was a spectator of, he could set his zeal to, the awful denunciation, "There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down," as, in his ministry during the Zion state, he could tell of the vail of the temple which was rent at the crucifixion. He could thus turn round upon the Jew, who had derided the death of the Nazarene, and ask him if there were no witness *there* of his life—if there was no record of his mission in the total overthrow of 'the holy and beautiful house where their fathers worshipped,' which was burnt up with fire? In a word, he could echo his own Amen, when he cried, "Even so, come Lord Jesus, come quickly, Amen:" and as he and his fellow-believers had already, in their adoption of sons, passed from death in Adam to life in Christ, so their life being hid, and Christ appearing, in that appearance they passed to the fulfilment of the promise of that eternal life which God, who could not lie, promised before the world began. And now to sum up our grand conclusion in connexion with our great subject, the resurrection of the dead—to adopt and apply the eloquent peroration of one who was speaking of another and different subject. How sublime the inference which follows! All the family of God found in the second Adam Head, participants of the divine principle of resurrection life, which they derive from their connexion with him, are passed at once, in the moment they are



entered on existence, from a corruptible to an incorruptible inheritance, and appear in his presence here, clothed in his likeness. At the dissolution of the animal body, their immortality and life are still the same, still going on uninterrupted. No centurial sleep of the soul—no imperfect state of disembodied consciousness—no semi-celestialized condition awaits the heirs and possessors of the ‘resurrection and the life.’ The true Levites of the universe, they are gathered round the celestial tabernacle, the enthronement of the Shekinah, whose light is ever on them, and to whose glory their own is assimilated. By having been translated, they have become eternally transfigured, like Moses and Elias on the Holy Mount; and conscious of that their glory, no supervening heaviness of sleep shall ever interrupt the exclamation, prompted by a rapture which Peter never knew, “Lord, it is good for us to be here.”

---

In conclusion, we beg the reader's attention to a summary of our discussion, and an exhibition of the position which we have taken up. We revert to the different divisions of our Diagram.

The first division of the Diagram exhibits the ministry of John. We have shown that it was a ministry which is the subject of prophecy, and that the prophecy was faithfully fulfilled.

The next division shows the ministry of Christ: the same remarks which apply to John's ministry, apply to this: it was prophesied beforehand, and as truly fulfilled.

The third division of the Diagram presents to our notice the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension; an intermediate state, which was prophesied of, and in which the Apostles were entrusted with their commission, coupled with the promise on which so much depends, “Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.”

The fourth and last division shews the ministry of the Apostles, the last and concluding ministry, which extended to the ‘end of all things,’ or the completion, the finish, the consummation of all the purposes of God in Christ Jesus the Lord, when the veil of Moses, (compare Isaiah xxv. 7, and 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15,) spread over the nations, was taken away, and the curtain which had been over God's counsels was entirely removed; and, passing the fourth boundary line of the Diagram, the final and eternal state is established—all rule, authority, and power, whether Mosaic or Apostolic, is put down, the mediatorial kingdom is surrendered, the first dominion is ended, and God, to his ransomed family of worshippers, whether in or out of the body of clay, is all in all.

We have attempted an exposition of the things pertaining to these four divisions. We confess that we are at a loss to conceive how any one can object to our positions thus laid down. The positions, we venture to affirm, have been proved to be scriptural; and we must be excused if we regard with pity those (if there be such,) who may turn away, and tell us we know nothing of your Diagrams, we care nothing for them, and we will not look at the Scriptures through them.

We are persuaded that we might as well reason with the wind, as with an objector of this class. Some favourite crotchet stands in the way of such objector listening to any opinion which may be suspected of militating against that crotchet.

We repeat, that we think our statement of the separate and distinct administrations will be generally agreed to. Under the last state, we mention, that we have shown the following events did come to pass:—*The Restoration of the Jews; the first Resurrection, or Millennium; the end of the world; the resurrection of the dead; the day of judgment, and the last day;* for now there is no more time. But we will, for argument's sake, place the proof of these past events on one side; and we will propose the following:—Should any one consider that there are other intermediate state, or states before the last—before the all in all state,—let this be shewn by adding to the Diagram other boundary lines, and let that intermediate state be filled up. It must, however, be it remembered, be filled up, not from human imagination, but from Scripture. It must be so filled up that no one shall gainsay or resist its truth. It must have nothing of a peradventure about it. There must be no talk of '*non-essentials*' connected with it. Among other things, let it not be forgotten, that it will be absolutely necessary to prove, that if there be, according to religious systems, this intermediate state, the prophets foretold a ministry that should appear to conduct the people through it; that the ministers of such state should all speak the same things; that they should be perfectly joined together in the same mind and judgment; that they should see eye to eye in delivering their testimonies. But where has such a ministry existed since the times of the Apostles? It will, moreover, be necessary to demonstrate that these ministers were authorized and appointed of God, by an ability 'to show their faith by their works;' 'to heal the sick'; to prove their title to the name of 'a minister of Christ,' by the proof of the possession of miraculous powers, 'signs to them that believe not.' But where does such a ministry exist now? It is a fair question, and claims an answer, aye, and *must* have an answer, sooner or later, let systems cavil as they will, let religious bigotry scorn as it may, the day must come. If any man will show us such a ministry, we will come to it, we will sit at its feet, with the glad docility of a learner who hungers and thirst for instruction more than for his necessary food. But the possession of miraculous powers must be proved, not of an isolated member, but of all the members of the ministry. Romanism, in her fundamental doctrine of Apostolic succession, knows the value of this proof. Romanism, every now and then, attempts to palm off her pretended miraculous tricks upon the world. What then, supposing the pretence were reality? It would prove the 'signs following' of such and such a one. It would only demonstrate the Apostolic succession of this or that individual fraction of the body; but in order to substantiate Apostolic succession, these 'signs following' must accompany all—'all or none'; there is no medium. The whole bench of Bishops, with the whole cathedral establishment, together with the Rectors and Vicars of the Church of England, might one and all be gifted with miraculous powers, but if the curates, or any portion of them, were destitute of these powers,—could not so evince that the

Lord was working with them,—then the Apostolic succession of the Church of England would fall to the ground, and it would only be a childish romance which would presume to speak of holding the office of an Apostle, or sitting in an Apostle's seat.

Where is the ministry?—a perfect ministry—an authorized ministry—a miraculously endowed ministry? *God never sent any ministry other than this.* If there be such a ministry, it is as clearly defined in the Scriptures as any which we have discussed. If there be no such ministry, God's purposes are finished. If God's purposes are not finished, his promise has failed, which said, 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.' We believe what we have written; if we are in error, we are willing, nay, we implore to be corrected, and we will attend to the correction. If a ministry such as an unfinished work of God must require, be forthcoming, we are bound to obey it. If there is a doctrine called Apostolic succession, we are in an awful predicament, for in such case it is strictly laid in charge upon us, "*Obe*y them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account" (Heb. xiii. 17); and "*Woe is unto them* if they preach not the GOSPEL," as well as unto us if we do not obey them.

Objectors will persist; for there are those who may be brayed in a mortar, with a pestle, and yet will their foolishness not depart from them. Let an objector then come forward; let him show us *his* plan of God's dispensations. If he will overthrow our Diagram, it must be by another. It will be of no avail to lop off a branch or two of our scheme; strike at the root; begin with the second advent, and overthrow that one doctrine, and all that we have built upon it must be involved in one common ruin. If the Word of Inspiration can be shown to contain the announcement of any other second advent, coming, or appearing, than that which transpired in the life-time of the generation then living; \* and if this can be proved to be truly a *second*, instead of a third coming, we shall be ready at once to embrace it. In the mean time, agreeing with one with whom we have had much difference in these pages, we must confess our mind to be so constructed as to be incapable of receiving an alleged doctrine of revelation, without adequate evidence that the interpretation upon which it is founded is sound. Inadequate evidence is all such which presumes to speak of a coming yet future; of two second comings; of a distinction between second coming, and second appearing; of three comings, for where, in the name of all that is scriptural, have we any, the least, divine encouragement to build up ourselves in any one of these notions? and if we are destitute of divine authority, we must be constrained to count them, one and all, extravagant and delusive, subversive of the truth of God, and destructive of the very being and existence of Christianity; enslaving the souls and bodies of men, and virtually rendering of none effect that word of which it is written, "It liveth and abideth for ever."

If, on the other hand, our Diagram plan is in its great principles correct, *i. e.* if the second advent of Christ has taken place, and if this doctrine should once seize upon the minds of the people, what then?

\* See Note O.

The priesthood of all denominations, must relinquish a name which does not belong to them—religious establishments must be broken up and remodelled; religious imposture of every description will be effectually opposed. It is, and it will be seen to be necessary to reform the Reformed Religion, with all its countless varieties of doctrine, and with the thousand-and-one differing, yet agreeing parties, which take shelter under its wing. Then the name of a Reformation will be no more, as it now is, a mournful failure, but a substantial reality, worthy of the God of the Bible, and a welcome boon to thousands of priest-ridden devotees, who are “spending their money for that which is not bread, and their labour for that which satisfieth not;” who are the mere tools of a system which, call it by what name we please, has ever shown that it has the will, if there be but a way, to effect a complete prostration and overthrow of civil as well as religious liberty. The people of England, or the religious portion of them, have been much agitated of late on religious questions. First, there was what was called the Puseyite heresy, (although the Oxford Tractarians are the only *consistent* members of the Establishment,) and now the Maynooth Grant has swallowed up all other differences, as Aaron’s rod swallowed up the rest. In the former agitation, there was much discussion respecting the wearing of surplices, the lighting of candles, crossings, chantings, and such like childish nonsense. In the latter, there is an awfully-expressed horror of image worship, and the confessional. The ‘Mother of Harlots,’ ‘Antichrist,’ ‘the Apostate Church of Rome,’ ‘a soul-destroying heresy,’ are common words in Exeter Hall. In both agitations there is ‘a straining out gnats, and swallowing camels.’ In neither is there anything approaching to a precedent truly Apostolic, viz., laying the axe to the root of the evil, by agitating and protesting against the giant principle of all religious establishments—the more than hydra-headed creation—the doctrine of Apostolic succession. This doctrine is the stay and staff of all the sects of our day; and to hope for anything like an exhibition of the true peaceful spirit of Christianity, while such a doctrine stands, that is, while there is such an anomaly as a religious establishment in the land, is to dream. Public opinion has been ever ‘onward,’ since the introduction of that inestimable boon to man, the art of printing, to which, and not to Luther, we owe the Reformation, such as it is. Public opinion is now so far enlightened that it will not bear, at least in England, the grosser developments of the doctrine of Apostolic succession, as exhibited in Tractarian and Tridentine Popery. And this being so, we think we can perceive the little cloud like a man’s hand; we entertain a fond hope that a day is coming, when the same opinion will be as decidedly opposed to the principle itself, as it is now to its glaring developments. While this principle, this doctrine of Apostolic succession, is held at all, in any measure, there will be, and it is not the least of blessings that there should be, various differing parties, for it is the interest of one party to keep down the naturally aspiring pretensions of all others. But if all should be merged together; if a hundred Apostolic successions should, like the sticks of the prophet, become one, we leave it to those who are acquainted with sectarian Christianity to imagine what would shortly be the state of things, for it baffles description:—all, and more than

all the tyrannical dominion of Popery, in her palmiest days, would be revived; the press would be silenced, as it is now perverted, for ignorance is essential to priestcraft; darker ages than those called dark, would cover the earth. Such in point of fact is the real tendency and carrying out of the principle upon which rest not only the pretensions of the Church of Rome, but those of every other church whatever, no matter by what name it be known, whether Baptist, or Brownist, or Churchman, or Wesleyan, or Presbyterian. They are all embarked in the same vessel—aye, and it pleases them sometimes, when in support of their common foundation, like Herod and Pilate, they become friends, to call that vessel the Church of Christ. And in their conduct of this vessel, one says, We will steer this way; another says, We will steer that; and a third party cries out, You are all wrong, and this is the course. This, however, was not the way things were wont to be conducted of old time. There was once a vessel sent out, and she was manned by twelve chosen mariners, and she was equipped with all things needful for her voyage, and she was destined, under the seamanship of the twelve, who were appointed by the owner of the good ship, to arrive safely at the haven where she would be. There was no mutiny on board among the said chosen twelve; the judgment of one was the judgment of all. There are a few despised individuals now, who venture to think that the owner of that good ship, being heaven's High Majesty, would not be less wise, less prudent, less provident than the creatures of his hand. There is here and there one, who is (it is said) mad enough, deluded enough, nay, infidel enough, to entertain the belief that this same owner would not forsake that which was as 'the apple of his eye,' when it had proceeded but a little way on the destined voyage. But this he has undoubtedly done, if we are to believe that those whom he first commissioned failed to execute their commission; and fail they as certainly did, if we are to look for their successors in a mutinous crew, who are determined that a man shall choose a hundred ways to heaven, save and except the King's highway of holiness, the way of the Holy Apostles, and of the noble army of Jerusalem martyrs;—who, like the Pharisees of old, will neither enter into the kingdom themselves, nor suffer those to enter in who would.

There are one or two topics connected with a Past Second Advent, upon which we desire to offer a few separate observations.

The Second Advent being past,—the mediatorial kingdom of Christ is vacated and surrendered.

Perhaps, to speak more correctly, the proposition should be thus stated:—the first, or mediatorial dominion of the kingdom is ended. After the full discussion of the first dominion of the kingdom, which has been given when treating of the resurrection, and knowing that it will be granted that if the resurrection be past, the mediatorial character of Christ must likewise have been fulfilled, therefore we deem it superfluous to do more than merely examine one or two prominent scriptures which are intimately connected with the mediatorship. The first scripture shall be Heb. ix. 26—28, "But now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; 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." Without stopping to notice that it is a very long 'end of the world,' which has not yet arrived, we will give a faithful version of the passage: "But now, once in the consummation of the ages, he hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; and, as it is appointed to *the* men once to die, but after this judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and to them that look for him, he shall appear the second time without sin to salvation." The common exposition of this passage supposes it to speak of a judgment at the last day; but here, as elsewhere, we shall plainly convict modern Apostolic succession of gross ignorance of truth, so simple that he who runs may read —

To apply the passage to a future and posthumous tribunal, does violence to the whole strain of the Apostle's argument throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews. The whole of the Epistle is taken up with warnings and exhortations concerning the speedy passing away of the covenant of Sinai, to which the *Hebrew* convert had a natural affection.

We read, in Heb. x. 27, "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." It will be admitted that this relates to the impending judgment on Jerusalem; this is clear from the verse immediately preceding, "Exhorting, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." The commentator Scott, in his anxiety for the honour of the 'five points,' labours to confine this 26th verse exclusively to the Jewish judgment, and yet, afterwards, in his 'practical observations,' he exhorts Christians now, to exhort one another, and so much the more as *they* see 'the day approaching,' for, saith he, '*The time is short!*'

But further — we come to the passage itself, Heb. x. 27, 28. And we observe, that the Apostle is introducing a comparison of type and antitype: 'judgment' is in the type; 'bearing the sins of many' is in the antitype; but, let it be asked, What relation exists between the two topics, on the common interpretation of the word 'judgment?' None whatever; the Apostle is discoursing nonsense.

We place ourselves, in imagination, back into the day when the Epistle was written: we imagine ourselves among the Hebrew converts. It follows, of course, that we are learned in the law; and as Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, we may well expect him to address us in language and terms with which we are mutually familiar. This transportation, as before insisted, is absolutely necessary in order to understand the Scriptures in any measure; but never is it more necessary than in reading this Epistle, and perhaps not more in reading any portion of the Epistle, than the passage now before us. The exposition in such case is simple and satisfactory. *The Apostle is speaking not of a future judgment, but of the priestly office of Christ.* "The men" are the high priests under the law, referring to verse 25, and their appointment is expressed in these words, "No man taketh this honour upon himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Their death *once* was a death typically, representatively, in their sacrifices, on the great day of

atonement, "once a-year." This is referred to in verse 7. "Into the second went the high priest alone *once every year*." Into the first tabernacle the priests went *always*, or continually, and so, with respect to the yearly and daily repetitions, the sacrifices under the law occurred often: but with respect to each several year, they are considered as occurring only *once* for the purpose of typifying the one sacrifice of Christ, otherwise they could not be typical at all. The judgment which transpires after the sacrificial offering is, in the type, the entering of the High Priest, invested with the breast-plate of judgment, into the holy place. Exodus xxviii. 29—30, where we read, "And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the *breast-plate of judgment* upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually." Having expounded the verse so far, the all-important question to be determined, is the time of this 'judgment,' or of Christ's antitypically fulfilling the shadow of the High Priest's entrance, thus attired, into the holy place. Now, it is evident at once that this could not be while Christ was on earth, "for," saith the Apostle, "if he were on earth he should not be a priest:" and again, "He is not entered into the holy place," which he would have done had he been a priest after the order of Aaron, on earth. But saith Paul, chapter viii. 1, "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens, and we have hope, as an anchor of the soul, sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that *within the veil*, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus *made* an High Priest after the order of Melchizedec." This corresponds with the type under the law, wherein the High Priest was "to bring the blood of the sacrifice *within the veil*, and to sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat." It is evident that the time when the antitype entered within the veil was at his ascension, when "The Lord said unto my Lord, *Sit thou on my right hand* until I make thy foes thy footstool:" and having entered within the veil he disappeared—he was hid, and so it is written, 'Your life is hid with Christ;' and with regard to this disappearance it is that Paul writes, 'Now we see through a glass darkly,' and John, 'It doth not yet appear what we shall be'—a beautiful type of which we have in the answer to Moses' request, 'I beseech thee show me thy glory:' but the Lord said, "*Thou canst not see my face*, but thou shalt see my back parts, but my face shall not be seen." Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, relates the disappearance within the veil, "And while they beheld he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight: and while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him *go into heaven*."\* And again, to mark the significance of the Apostle's language, 'If he were on earth he should not be a priest:' Peter, in his second sermon, recorded in Acts iii., declares of Jesus, 'And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you.' Thus in the 20th verse; and in the 26th verse we read, "Unto you first God having raised up his Son Jesus, *sent* him to bless you." It has

\* See Note P.

been already observed, that the sending, in the 26th verse, cannot be 'personal or bodily,' for who of them saw him after the resurrection? why then should a personal and bodily sending be contended for in the 20th verse? Concerning this sending, the Apostle goes on to state, "Whom *the heaven* must receive until the times of the restitution of all things." (Compare Acts iii. 21 with Rev. xxi. 5.) And again, in said discourse, Peter refers to the same matter, where he speaks of "times of refreshing from the presence (or face) of the Lord." These predicted times evidently relate to his appearing out of the veil within which he was entered; and that there should be refreshing in that appearance is intimated in the verse under discussion, "To them that *look for him* he shall appear the second time *without sin unto salvation*:" or again, "Looking for that *blessed hope and the glorious appearing* of the great God, even our Saviour," language evidently borrowed from and paralleled by Luke xxi. 28, where the forerunner said, "When these things begin to come to pass, then *look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh*." This would at once go very far with one who had some acquaintance with Paul's method of 'comparing spiritual things with spiritual' to establish the time of the re-appearing of the absent one, and to fix the period of the restitution of all things. The Scriptures quoted from Acts fix the time of Christ's entering into heaven; of his assuming his mediatorial character. Heb. ix. 28, and Titus ii. 13, prove that the believers of the Apostolic ministry were then answering the position of the Jews, while the High Priest was within the Holy place; that is, as the people *prayed* (see Luke i. 8—22,) without, waiting for the priest's re-appearance after the acceptance of the sacrifice, so believers, the royal priesthood of the true Israel, were 'praying without ceasing,' 'lifting up holy hands everywhere,' 'looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God;' knowing that it had been said unto them, 'he that endureth to the end shall be saved,' and 'to them that look for him he will appear the second time without sin *unto salvation*.' Thus, then it would seem, that, as the Scriptures from Acts prove the dis-appearing, the Scriptures from Matthew xxiv. 13, Luke xxi. 28, prove the re-appearing: and as there can be no re-appearing without *complete fulfilment*, (for there are but two comings or appearances,) therefore the times of refreshing and restitution must be cotemporaneous with the fall of Jerusalem, for assuredly Matthew xxiv. 13, and Luke xxi. 28, can be applied to no other event or time. This is conclusive: but it will be most decidedly rejected, because it is well known that if the times of refreshing and restitution were fulfilled in the year 70, there is no 'end of the world,' and men will have an end of the world, whether it be God's will or no. If there be one thing clearer than another, it is that the Bible lands us at the commencement, and not at the close of untold centuries, of the world's continuance; and therefore, before an objector can substantiate his notion of a personal coming or appearance of Christ yet future, he must overthrow the established truth, that the Bible promises no such event as must inevitably accompany a personal manifestation. But why revert to a fundamental principle? Let the exhibition of type and antitype above given, and the correspondence of language above noticed, decide this all-important question of



the re-appearing of the Mediator. We have many illustrations of the fulfilment of the type. In Leviticus ix. 23, we read, "And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out and *blessed the people*, and the glory of the Lord *appeared to all the people.*" In 1 Chron. xvi. 2, "And when David had made an end of offering the burnt offerings and the peace offerings, *he blessed the people* in the name of the Lord." In 2 Chron. v. 11—14, "When the priests were come out of the holy place, having brought the ark of the covenant of the Lord unto his place, it came even to pass that the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house." Then (chap. vi. 3,) "*The King turned his face and blessed the whole congregation of Israel, and all the congregation of Israel stood.*" But a greater than Solomon is here, even he of whom it is written, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, and thy dominion endureth throughout all ages." This is the king that turned his face, the prince of the kings of the earth. "If we sin," said one of those kings, "we have an advocate with the Father." But the advocate was *hid*: they saw him not '*as he is*:' they saw as in a glass, as Moses saw only his back parts; his face could not be seen, sin not being then put away; for the sting of death was sin, and death was not swallowed up in victory: the law was the strength of sin, and the law was in operation still: and seeing that these things were so, the face of the Mediator was turned from the people. But it was promised, "they shall see his face," (Rev. xxii. 4,) 'face to face'—to which they were hoping to come, for "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, had shined into their hearts, *unto the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ*;" which light of the knowledge of the glory we conceive is here also, "The times of refreshing shall come from *the face of the Lord.*" Now, as previously stated, the promise in Rev. xxii., 'they shall see his face,' is totally independent of such an event as is generally understood by the 'end of the world.' The question then to be determined from the position of this single Scripture is this, 'When did they or are they to see his face?' We answer, When the King, at whose name it was pre-determined every knee should bow, should, according to Dan. ix. 24, have 'finished transgression, covered iniquity, and brought in a righteousness of ages.' It is allowed that this did not extend beyond the year 70. A time was determined for *Daniel's people*, who neither belonged to the Church of Rome nor the Church of England. This time must be past: for there is no longer such a place as the *holy city*, nor such a people as the *holy people*, under the first covenant. A holy city is a city *set apart*, chosen out of the rest, but is that which is now called Jerusalem, such a one? where is the temple, &c., which alone can constitute Jerusalem a holy city, or the Jews a holy people? It must be allowed that Daniel ix. 24 is fulfilled, and if so, looking at the *fulness* of the passage, what need is there for mediation: what is there to call for such an office as Mediator? But further. If the mediatorial character of Christ is not finished, how comes it to pass that the type has failed? Why have we not to this very day the High Priest entering into the sanctuary with the sacrifice, and coming out to bless the people? How

happens it that the type in the temple service has been completely abolished, if the antitype have not appeared? for we maintain most strenuously that the supposition that Christ has not appeared a second time is false, unless the shadow of that appearance, as it was exhibited in the temple service, is forthcoming. We maintain that the type or typical circumstance (the Mediatorship of the old covenant) never passed away, nor could pass away, without the substitution of the antitype. If, therefore, Christ have not re-appeared, we must have *now* a successor of Aaron re-appearing every year from the Holy of Holies, for saith the Apostle, when addressing the Colossians respecting the things under the law, "These are a shadow of good things *a-coming*, but the body is Christ." If the body have not been manifested, if the substance have not been revealed, we must have the shadow: the shadow must continue until the sun have reached the meridian: if that meridian have been attained, the shadow of necessity disappears, even the shadow of death as *swallowed up* in victory. The shadow has disappeared completely, for we have *neither Mosaic nor Apostolic ministration now*, and yet it is maintained that Christ has not appeared a second time. These things are discordant. We say, either give us the shadow, the body of Moses—or the substance, the body of Christ. The Apostle's argument throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews—the Diagram which he draws in Heb. ix. 26—28, is, on the common opinion, so faulty, that we see no medium between believing that the second appearance without sin to salvation has transpired, or rejecting the testimony altogether; for, on the supposition of non-fulfilment, we cannot see how the conclusion can be avoided, that God began a work and was not able to finish it. Let it never be forgotten that the popular doctrine of the present Mediatorship of Christ requires a ministry, while, at the same time, no answer can ever be given to this question, Where is the ministry? Paul wrote, "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old: now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." The Church of England does not believe that the old covenant hath vanished away, for she reads Moses' ten commandments and the Lord's prayer till her worshippers are weary of the vain repetition. If the new covenant be not fully and finally established as an eternal and unchanging kingdom, the old covenant is still standing, and Paul was altogether deceived, when, eighteen hundred years ago, he said it was ready to vanish away. But if the old covenant have vanished in the appearance of the substance, then the new covenant, founded on better promises, is established. Here is the promise, "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." This is like the covenant of Noah, everlasting as the everlasting God, for when can the promise be exhausted? and if there be this promise in an everlasting fulfilment, what more need of mediation? If sins are cast behind the Lord's back, and buried in the depths of the sea, why should we want an intercession for sin? This is to raise the body of Moses: it is a coming back to bear the image of the earthy. And if there is to be Mediatorship now, after we have borne the image of the heavenly, then must it not be everlasting, as the everlasting covenant? But the popular opinion doth not admit this: so then once more its witness agreeth not together. As in the old covenant there was an end

of the service : it was finished : the blessing was given, and prayer concluded : as it was in the type, so we believe it must have been in the antitype. It will be of no avail to say that though the service was ended, yet it was repeated again. This was true under the law, and the reason is plain, "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, *can* never, with those sacrifices which they offer year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect : for then, would they not have ceased to be offered ? because the worshippers once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins : " "for the law made nothing perfect, but was the bringing in of a better hope," by which hope believers were then drawing nigh to God. The hope of what ? Of that which the law could not do, according as it is written, "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour, who shall appear the second time without sin to salvation." So then, having that hope, believers then could say, ' We are saved by hope : ' but salvation by hope and salvation by sight are as different as walking by faith and walking by sight. In the salvation by hope, and walking by faith in that first dominion of the kingdom, the sons of God were come to the New Jerusalem ; but this was above then. It was to descend upon earth, and dwell with men, according to the promise, " There be some standing here," &c. This descent is quite independent of an end of the world. Do then the advocates for a future appearing of Christ mean to tell us, that all who have died in Christ, from Paul's day to this, are not yet walking by sight, and possessing their hope ? And is it to be believed, that in order to the enjoyment of these privileges, they are to return to this earth ? And, moreover, as in the salvation of faith and hope, there was not a perfect cleansing of the worshippers, there was not a presenting of a ' glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing,'—are Paul, and Peter, and John not purged yet ? Most assuredly they are not, if the orthodox creed be the truth ; they are not yet perfect, neither do they yet see Christ as he is. " If we say that we have no sin," saith John, " we deceive ourselves : and if we sin, we have an advocate with the Father." If the office of advocate hath not been accomplished, this same John *does not know Christ in any higher character than that of advocate yet* : and besides, he and Paul and the rest are with the Advocate, interceding within the veil, or else *they are not in communion together*. There is no medium ; so that if Christ and his departed people are in communion, that must be as he is fulfilling his intercessory office ; and therefore, again we say, the Romish doctrine of the intercession of saints, is *the doctrine of all religious systems*. There is no end to the absurdities which follow upon the supposition that Christ's mediatorial and first dominion has not been succeeded by his second and eternal *rest* dominion. There is perfect harmony in the admission that the Apostolic ministry was the boundary line of that first dominion. The common opinion of the mediatorial kingdom is the same with that of the resurrection ; it is the opinion of Nicodemus. It supposes that he who was the Great High Priest must continually intercede, for generation after generation, as in the priesthood under the law. It virtually makes the Melchisedec priesthood only a second edition of the Aaronical. It

pronounces that as the law made nothing perfect, so neither does the gospel; and that therefore God never provided some better thing for his people, in Paul's day, that the fathers who died in faith, should with them be made perfect. This, however, is not the teaching of Scripture. The Bible sets before us one offering of Christ, instead of many offerings of bulls, and goats, and calves: one atonement, one intercession, one propitiation, one service, and one worship. And this is the conclusion. If our perfection is come, the mediatorial kingdom is ended, for there was no longer a standing *to minister* when the glory of the Lord filled the temple. If the mediatorial kingdom is not finished, there is a standing to minister; there is not yet perfection. David is not yet ascended into the heavens; the temple at Jerusalem is yet in existence; the paschal lamb is still offering; in one word, 'we are without hope, and without God in the world.' But we are persuaded better things of the word of God, and things accompanying salvation. As we believe in the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ, we consequently believe that his mediatorial office is accomplished. As for any distinction between a mediatorship in flesh, and a mediatorship in spirit, we know of none; we can find no traces of any such in the Bible, either in type or antitype, symbol or signification; we discredit the interpretation put upon 'flesh and spirit,' in such distinction; in short, we must repeat a former statement — we confess our minds to be so constructed as to be incapable of receiving an alleged doctrine of revelation, without adequate evidence that the interpretation upon which it is founded is sound.

But it will be objected, What was there in Jerusalem's overthrow to signify Christ's second appearance without sin to salvation? This has already been answered, when speaking of John's waiting till the coming of the Lord. It is referred to now, for the purpose of transcribing the very words of an objector. We parallel Heb. ix. 28, with Luke xxi. 28, "When ye shall see these things come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." It is said, this doubtless referred to the deliverance of the disciples from the tribulation that existed at the time of Jerusalem's desolation, and it is asked, "What correspondence is there between this and Heb. ix. 28? Wars, slavery, death, or flight to the mountains, is *not* the subject Paul was adverting to." It was part of the subject, however, unless an objector can find any other time for Christ's second appearing than the fall of Jerusalem. But it is altogether a mistake to assume, as is here assumed, that this objector's doctrine of Jerusalem's overthrow is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It is altogether 'begging the question,' to conclude that wars, slavery, &c. was *all* that Christ adverted to when he said, 'Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh.' It is, we conceive, (with all deference and respect,) likewise objectionable, to conclude that a *temporal* salvation was all that was intended in such comprehensive and conclusive language as this, "He that endureth to the end, shall be saved." We cannot but object to such a prefix to the salvation as the word 'temporal,' especially when we find Paul writing on this wise, "We groan within ourselves, waiting for the *adoption*, to wit, the *redemption of our body*." Or again, to the Ephesians, "Ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise which is

the earnest of our inheritance, until the *redemption of the purchased possession,*" (Eph. i. 13, 14,) which redemption, equally with that in Rom. viii., cannot, we maintain, be severed from that in Luke xxi. Many of those around Jesus, when he said, 'Look up, and lift up your heads,' would have fallen asleep before this occurrence, for it was only *some* that should not taste of death; and although we allow that the words were properly addressed to all the Lord's disciples, as he was speaking of events which should transpire in that generation, yet we also maintain that the 'looking for and hastening unto,' was equally applicable to them that were fallen asleep, as to those who were alive and remained till the coming of the Lord. We are not willing to allow an opponent any such vantage ground as he would immediately take on the admission of the term 'temporal salvation.' We have no desire that any should be permitted to have any plea of this kind, whereby to affirm, as is most absurdly and ignorantly done, that the 'second advent' is not material, whether past or to come; that it is not 'essential;' that it does not add to a Christian's peace; nay, that if it be past, it will lead to tremendous errors! On the contrary, so far are we from recognising the word 'non-essential' in our vocabulary; so far are we from thinking God cannot take care of his own most holy truth without our help; so far are we from regarding that truth (as it concerns the fall of Jerusalem,) in any such temporal light, with any such thought as that of a mere tumbling down of stone and plaster; we affirm without hesitation, that it is impossible to speak the truth of the gospel with any measure of clearness and consistency, without speaking of the past second advent; that it is impossible to expound half a page of the New Testament without having occasion to proclaim that the second advent, with all its contemporaneous events, is past. Let a minister of the Church of England, who believes in the past second advent, make the experiment. Let him speak *the whole truth* of the matter. He dares as soon, in a literal sense, cut off a right hand, or pluck out a right eye, unless he had previously made up his mind to quit the Establishment; for his 'living' would be worth a very short purchase, and his congregation, having been born to the precious inheritance of the Prayer-book, with its creeds and catechisms, and its *apostolical* services, would be gone, almost in the twinkling of an eye. He would soon find how true it is, that, generally speaking, a man *will* live and die in the faith to which he was born, whether that be the Church of England or the Church of Rome, Protestant or Catholic, Mahometan or Pagan.

But to return. We cannot find the word 'temporal' thus attached to this salvation in the Bible, any more than we read of such a phrase as 'the resurrection of the body,' which is a phrase invented by that most baleful of all evils, a human creed. We agree that believers, who were looking for the salvation, were passed from death to life, for they were risen with Christ, by a faith of the operation of God, and could never die, and in so far as it is with this view the prefix 'temporal' has been used, we have not much quarrel with it. It is, however, an exceptionable expression. To be risen with Christ to newness of life, did not imply a being saved with an everlasting salvation. Salvation was the finish of all the dispensations; and surely it is too much to tell us, as we

are told, that the event which occupied the entire attention of believers of that day, and is the burden not only of all the Epistles, but of the whole Bible, for all the prophets testified of it—surely it is too much to be told that this is only a secondary matter; that it is not important in speaking from any text, or expounding any chapter. It is of such importance that if it be true, death is swallowed up in victory; therefore let not an objector ask what correspondence there is between Heb. ix. 28, and Luke xxi. 28. There is not only a correspondence, but an inseparable connexion, for both equally find their interpretation in the passing away of the old heaven and earth of Judaism, and the possession of the new heaven and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, which is anything but temporal, or of any but primary importance. If Jerusalem's overthrow was little more than a mere historical event, any other city may be substituted, for aught that truth is concerned in that event: not so, however, when we can recognize its inseparable connexion with the fulfilment of all the 'purposes of God in Christ Jesus, from the foundation of the world;' and recognising this connexion, Abraham's 'peradventure' a hundred times told, would not express the weakness and imperfection of all that is, and has been, and will be, said or written respecting fulfilments supposed to be yet future.

There is yet one more passage connected with the mediatorial dominion of Christ, concerning which we have a few remarks to offer. We allude to 1 Cor. xv. 24, "Then the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Scott gives the following on the passage:—"After the day of judgment, the mediatorial kingdom will be terminated: Christ, having executed his commission, will cease to reign over all worlds as mediator, having publicly delivered up the kingdom to God in the person of the Father; yet he will, in *human nature* (!), retain a peculiar authority over his redeemed people; and, as one with the Father, he will, with him and the Holy Spirit, reign one God over all, blessed for evermore." This is the old sickening story of 'divers interpretations.' Scott was entirely ignorant of the all-important truth, that there were not *two or three kingdoms* of Christ, as he evidently would make it appear in the above extract; but that there were *two dominions of the one kingdom*, and that the *first* dominion was of course *temporal*, which was the mediatorial, the period of the first resurrection. We have spoken at some length on this chapter, and have endeavoured to show the limit of the first resurrection to be the sounding of the last trumpet: the same limit is therefore the limit of the mediatorial dominion of the kingdom, if that be spoken of in this chapter. Professor Bush affirms, with a good show of reason, that Christ is not the nominative to the verbs, 'shall have delivered up,' 'shall have put down,' &c., but that these verbs are impersonals used as passives, and are equivalent to 'when the kingdom is made over,' 'when all rule, authority, and power is put

down,' when all enemies are put under his feet.' He maintains that the kingdom so made over, is not his own kingdom to God, but the kingdom of this world to God and himself, agreeing with Rev. xi. 15, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." We agree with him, though it is a matter of very little moment whether we interpret 'the kingdom delivered,' of the kingdom of this world, or the mediatorial dominion, because we look upon the two to be parts of the same thing; that is, we consider the mediatorial office to have been an office essentially of this world, and to have been, so to speak, included in the kingdom made over. It is evident that Christ never ceases to reign; 'for of his kingdom there shall be no end.' Luke i. 33; see also Isa. ix. 6, 7; Heb. i. 8; Dan. vii. 14; Rev. v. 13. But it does not follow that the mediatorial office is never vacated. Now Mr. Bush infers the perpetuity of mediation from the above passages. He writes, "That the mediatorial kingdom is again and again declared to be eternal, there cannot be a shadow of a doubt;" and again, "It must be admitted as very difficult of conception, that the Scriptures are elsewhere (than 1 Cor. xv. 24,) to be searched in vain for proof of an oracle of such transcendent moment, as that which should announce the transfer of the headship of the mediatorial kingdom." Be it observed, this is asserted in the face of Daniel ix. 24; and as we have asked, we repeat the question, When that scripture was fulfilled, what more need of mediation? The Scriptures, so far from being silent about the surrender of the mediatorial dominion, are full of it, as witness the comparisons of type and antitype, which we have instituted. Professor Bush quotes Heb. vii. 21, in support of the perpetual mediatorship of Christ, "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec." But then, Heb. vii. 8, would equally prove the perpetuity of tithes; "And here, men that die receive tithes; but there, he of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." In fact, this passage is the sum of the whole matter — *the perpetuity of the mediatorship of Christ supposes the perpetuity of the Mosaic economy*. Besides, the words 'Thou art a priest for ever,' appear to us to be identical with 'an unchangeable priesthood,' 'abideth a priest continually;' that is, this is one priesthood not transferable, like that of Aaron, which was after the law of a carnal commandment. When Mr. B. writes as follows:—"As to two different departments of this kingdom of Christ, we find no evidence of such;" surely he cannot have read Micah iv. 8, which clearly speaks of a first dominion; and a first dominion, equally with a first resurrection, clearly implies a second; therefore Scripture *does* teach two departments, and so it is most objectionable to assert the following:—"We do not hesitate to maintain that no such idea as the surrender of the mediatorial kingdom falls within the compass of revelation." This remark would lead us to conclude that the author had not a glimmering of a knowledge of the two covenants in this matter, without which knowledge it is an inexplicable mystery. On the whole, however, we agree with his exposition 1 Cor. xv. 24, that the kingdom is the 'kingdom of this world,' connecting, as we are accustomed to do, that expression with Judaism, which was the real kingdom of this world the Bible has in view, and which, being swallowed up in the perfect development of Christianity,

could be no more an enemy and an opposer exalting itself against the Lord and against his anointed. (See 2 Thess. ii. 3—8.) It is idle to look upon this in any other light than that of the covenants, and God's dispensations connected therewith; for it never has been shown, and there is nothing in the Bible to show, that what are generally understood by the 'kingdoms of this world,' ever were the Lord's, in any other way than as there is now no exclusively privileged nation, Jew and Gentile being alike recognized in the constitution of the new heaven and new earth. This is plain enough, in that the Apostle writes, "but now we see not *yet* all things put under him," thereby implying that they expected shortly to see this; and the implication, just as it is, is as justly borne out, if 'the prince of this world,' 'principalities and powers,' 'leading captivity captive,' be, as one day they will, acknowledged to have their interpretation in that which was the ministration of condemnation and death. The Apostle and his fellow believers did not, when he wrote the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, then see all these put under the feet of the Saviour, but they did very soon after. Satan, very shortly after, was bruised, (Rom. xvi. 20,) so that we confess we do not here again see how this interpretation of the putting all things under his feet,—all rule, and authority, and power,—can be rejected, without impugning the inspiration of the Scriptures. This interpretation is consistent throughout. We have no more to observe, than that, when it is said, 'he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet,' this does not imply that when all enemies should be put under his feet, he should cease to reign, but rather, that his kingdom should have no end. The Scriptures would be contradictory unless this were their implied meaning. It may further be remarked, that the words, "then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him," do not convey the idea that previously to this the Son was not subject to the Father, because it is expressly asserted, that "he is excepted which did put all things under him." Their true meaning will appear more plainly by a right position of 'also.' "Then also shall the Son himself," &c., *i. e.* if the Father hath put all things in subjection under Christ, by his own decree, it is equally true that he will continue to have the pre-eminence, after, as before, the fulfilment of that decree. Taking the mediatorial dominion to be included in the 'delivered kingdom,' the words 'then also shall the Son himself be subject,' are weighty, because the second dominion of the kingdom, which is a dominion of glorious rest, might lead to the supposition that then the Son would ascend higher; but the Apostle shows, that all the grandeur and glory which accrued from the putting down all rule, authority, and power, still left him second on the throne, according as it is written, "The throne of God, and of the Lamb."

There is yet one subject connected with the above which must not be passed over in silence. We allude to prayer. It was shown, in treating of the ministries of John and Christ, that there was prayer peculiar to those ministries. It was likewise shown that when those ministries were respectively fulfilled, the prayer that was attached to them was no longer needed, but was done away. The same is true of prayer under the ministry of the Apostles. In that ministry the



mediatorial work of Christ was finished. That alone was the medium through which prayer could find acceptance; and therefore wherever, by whomsoever, and for whatsoever prayer is offered up now, it is an offering with strange fire. If the mediatorial dominion is surrendered, and all the purposes for which it was instituted are answered, prayer is not only a work of supererogation, but it is something infinitely more objectionable, it is presumption—being a plain declaration that the work of Christ is a defective work. The object of this volume is to prove that Christ's work is complete: and that it is a complete work is admitted, incautiously enough, by all *orthodox* denominations, for it is allowed by all that Dan. ix. 24 did not extend beyond A. D. 70: but the work of mediation is wholly contained in that passage, therefore it is allowed that the work of mediation is fulfilled, and consequently it is admitted that 'the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.' Psalm lxxii. 20. The prayers of Christ, the true David, being ended, therefore all other prayers are ended; consequently, every prayer offered up in church or chapel is a glaring inconsistency.

But further.—Not only does the finished mediation of Christ forbid and exclude the exercise of prayer, but the *ability* for prayer, which was one of the gifts consequent upon that mediation, is now no longer forthcoming. A glance at the Epistles will suffice to show that prayer in Apostolic times was inspired, supernatural, Holy Ghost prayer. "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" Rom. viii. 26. There is nothing of this now, nor ever has been since the cessation of the supernatural gifts with which the Lord promised to be with his disciples to the end of the world. The Holy Ghost dispensation has long since come to a close, notwithstanding all that may be urged to the contrary. Any prayer, to be prayer, must be the act of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. This is claimed by the Society of Friends, the Irvingites, and the Plymouth Brethren; but a supernatural claim requires supernatural proof, and if the proof be not evident, the claim is a delusion. No proof will avail but one similar to this, in James' Epistle, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church and let them pray over him, *anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord*: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall *raise him up*, (Query, out of his *grave*.) and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him." If any religious body can prove this power accompanying the prayers offered up by them, we will join them. Romanism, we know, makes an attempt at this part of Apostolic succession, but it is an attempt which looks in the wrong direction. Extreme unction is the *viaticum* of the dying, not the healing medicine of the sick: just as in the Church of England there is the administration of the Lord's Supper, with the absolution of the sins *even of a murderer*, but no raising up of the sick. We never heard such a wonderful thing as a prayer in the *Holy Ghost*, and we are confident that we never shall. Here, at least, the exhortations of the Epistles are inapplicable. Jude writes, "But ye beloved pray in the Holy Ghost;" and Paul, when he exhorts the Ephesians to put on the whole armour of God, enumerates prayer, "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit."

To have exhorted thus would have been a mockery during the ministry of Christ and John, for the Holy Ghost was not then given. We contend that it is just the same now, the Holy Ghost being withdrawn, as the *ministration* of the Spirit is ended. This view throws much light on numerous passages of Scripture, which, for want of a right understanding of the dispensations, are much misrepresented. Take for example Rom. viii. 11, "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." This cannot be applied now. Christians are not now 'temples of the Holy Ghost' as to their bodies, as they were in the apostolic ministry. If they are, we ask for a manifestation such as the following: "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to *every* man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom: to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit: to another faith by the same Spirit: to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit: to another the working of miracles: to another prophecy: to another discerning of spirits, (trying the spirits whether they be of God:) to another divers kinds of tongues: to another the interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." (1 Cor. xii. 7—11.) The Irvingite and the Mormonite pretend to this manifestation of the Spirit, and are so far conscious, that to support the system of a ministry, they must have the outward appointed sign. Orthodox bodies repudiate the manifestation, but hold to the present work of the Holy Ghost "We know," they will say, "that prophecies have failed, tongues ceased, and knowledge vanished away:" yes—but these were part and parcel of the manifestation of the Spirit given to every man that he might profit withal. Are we to be told then that the Holy Ghost has a work now, while he gives no proof, no manifestation? O no! it is said, there is the teaching of the Holy Ghost. We ask—where, and in whom? *The teaching of the Holy Ghost was, visibly and outwardly in the sight of an unbeliever, miraculous.* There is none such now: there is no authority from Scripture to look for any such. The only teaching that we recognise there, is the teaching of all teachings, that of the new and better covenant, according to which all God's family are taught of him who is 'the all things in all,' and know him from the least to the greatest, their sins and iniquities being remembered no more. Heb. viii. 10—13. This, however, is very different from the ministration and teaching of the Holy Ghost. It is teaching which implies a close of all progressive dispensations, all liability to change; and therefore, it excludes the work and office of the Holy Ghost. It is teaching which excludes prayer; for if sins and iniquities are remembered no more, Christ is no more interceding for sin, and his people have nothing to pray for, but everything to rejoice in and be thankful for.

To return to Rom. viii. 11. This passage bears an altered aspect in a knowledge of the distinct and closing ministration of the Spirit. It is a declaration, on the part of the Apostle, of the change which should ensue at Christ's second coming upon those who should be alive and remaining. It has nothing whatever in relation to a resurrection of human bodies. How absurd then is the following specimen of a

so-called Divine inversion : " Here" ( Rom. viii. 11,) " it is asserted as a positive fact, that in regeneration the mind is new-created in the first place, the new-creation of the body (!) following at a subsequent period ; while, from Genesis ii. 7, it appears that Adam's body was created first, and that the vital principle with the mind was imparted afterwards." This needs no comment.

We now bring forward a third and concluding argument for the non-obligation of prayer. Judging from the use of the Lord's prayer in the prayer-book, the Church of England would seem not to aspire to the pretensions of prayer in the Holy Ghost, therefore, we should leave her out of the question here. Most assuredly there was no written form of prayer, no Lord's Prayer whatever, in the Apostles' ministry. Before any one pleads apostolic precedent for prayer, he must show that he has the same object in view in his petitions as the Apostles had. Their object, beyond a doubt, was the second advent. Now, of this event Paul wrote, " What a man seeth why doth he yet hope for?" We maintain that we do see it, and that hope is no more hope, but fruition. But we may read, ' What a man hath why doth he yet pray for?' We maintain that the petition has been granted : prayer is consequently out of place.

Paul exhorts, " Brethren, pray for us:" and again, " Continue in prayer that God would open unto us a door of utterance to speak the mystery of Christ." ( Colos. iv. 3.) This was prayer for ministers ; but there are no such characters now. Show us a minister of Christ, and we will immediately acknowledge the obligation of prayer.

Jesus spake a parable to this end, that men ought always to pray and not to faint. The parable was that of the unjust judge ; " And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith, And shall not God *avenge* his own elect which cry unto him day and night, though he bear long with them : I tell you that he will *avenge* them speedily." ( Luke xviii. 7, 8, with Rev. vi. 10, 11.) The days of vengeance were the days of Jerusalem's overthrow, they are therefore long since past, and consequently the cry or prayer is ended, because it is avenged. The same is true of the illustration of prayer, in the friend who borrowed three loaves. The loaves being obtained, what are we to think of one who continues begging for them ? It becometh the justified to be thankful. It was written of them, " The path of the justified is as the shining light, that shineth brighter and brighter unto the perfect day." The perfect day being come, what more has God to do than he hath done for his people ? Promise is the foundation of prayer ; but not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord promised Israel ; the promises are all fulfilled, and all prayer is now without a warrant.

The same remarks apply to Paul's writing to Timothy, where we read 1 Tim. ii. 1, " I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men ; for kings, and all that are in authority ; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." In the context we read, " there is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Paul's exhortation depended upon the continuance of this official character of the man Christ Jesus. We must repeat that believers were then in the death image, " alway bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord

Jesus." They were treated as those "who did evil that good might come,"—in short, they were as the filth of the world, and the off-scouring of all things; their cause had nothing to shew against the Jew whom they condemned; for as the Jew ascribed their Master's miracles to Beelzebub, so he did theirs. But when the 'days of vengeance' were fully come, it was not so. The aspect of things was altered, and we have only to make that (to most) seemingly impossible effort,—to place ourselves in imagination back to that very day; to know ourselves as forming part and parcel of a vilified, persecuted, and ridiculed sect; to think how in such case we should wish to provide things honest in the sight of all men, as the most circumspect of the circumspect, and the observed of all observers; and then to suppose ourselves witnesses of the fall of that hierarchy, whose doom we had been proclaiming through evil report and good report, and the beauty and applicability of the Apostle's exhortation will be evident. When Christianity triumphed at the fall of Jerusalem, the kingdoms of this world became the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ; all rule, authority, and power was put down; all enemies were under his feet: but when Paul exhorted Timothy, it was, "now we see not yet all things put under him."—Not to enlarge upon this, we may observe, in conclusion, that prayer and the second coming are mostly found in juxtaposition in the Epistles. When Peter declares 'the end of all things is at hand,' immediately comes the word of warning, 'be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer.' This was in accordance with the Lord's oft-repeated exhortation, "Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." (Luke xxi. 36, compare Eph. vi. 12—18.) When the event here spoken of transpired, watching and prayer were alike ended. Believers in such end were called to inherit the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world. In one word, it has been one great object in these pages, to show that the heaven of the Bible is a heaven on earth. We believe that this has been shewn; we believe that we enjoy the blessings, sing the songs, live in that abiding love, which religious systems postpone to the period when we shall have shuffled off this mortal coil. We are in the heavenly state, and it is admitted that prayer would be out of place in heaven. In the heavenly state, as described in the Revelation, there is nothing but unceasing praise. It has been proved that the close of Daniel and of the Revelation lands us not in a time subsequent to a physical conflagration of the earth, but in the earth's everlasting jubilee of victory and peace. It has been proved that that jubilee commenced nearly eighteen hundred years ago. There is now neither faith nor hope, for we walk by sight, and what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for? It is all love. "All things are yours," saith the Apostle to the Corinthians, "whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all things are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." (1 Cor. iii. 21—23.) If this could be said in that day, when death was not swallowed up in victory, how much more now, when there is neither adversary nor evil occurrent. There is no evil can happen to a Christian. He comes into all the ills which flesh is heir to, like other

men, but he knows that flesh and blood have no entrance into his incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading inheritance. He is subject to trials and misfortunes, scorn, obloquy, contempt, and every evil thing; aye! to such an extent that flesh and blood religion would sink under the burden. But none of these things move him. His Christianity recognises these things not as enemies — his religion is a divine alchemy, which turns them into gold. He knows that his Bible, the word of his God, acknowledges no evil present, and with the word of his God he wants no more. He reads, and he rejoices in the thought, that in the new Jerusalem, the perfection of beauty, there is neither sorrow nor crying, neither any more pain, for the former things (of old Jerusalem) are passed away; and he that sat upon the throne, the new and living way, hath said, "Behold I make all things new."

This is the record; and surely if a Christian can gain but a glimmering of this blessedness, his soul will turn away with very loathing — with unutterable aversion — from countenancing, or joining in, or listening to petitions, such as are to be found in the litany of the Church of England, or indeed of any church whatever. Paul saith, death is a believer's blessing, and "to die is gain." The Church of England flatly contradicts him, in that she teaches her worshippers to pray that they may be delivered 'from sudden death:' and again, "suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from thee." Christ saith, "He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die;" and again, Christ saith, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The Church of England calls these comfortable words, and so they are; but what comfort the members of that Church can find in them it passes our comprehension to conceive, when they are taught in the same morning to pray, "from thy wrath, and from everlasting damnation, good Lord deliver us:" US, *whom thy minister has just absolved from all our sins!* If prayer is needed, if the obligation to pray is now laid upon us, we must be excused if we solemnly declare that we cannot force ourselves for all the worldly wealth of all the churches on earth, to the repetition of prayers such as these. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, *to him it is sin.*" (James iv. 17.) We must also be excused for saying, that all or any accusation of us, for believing in the present non-obligation of prayer, comes with a very bad grace indeed, from those at least who assent and consent to such an exhibition of inconsistency as the above. On the principle of choosing the lesser of two evils, we should at once pronounce, that it were better, far better, to have no prayer at all, than to have the prayers of the Establishment, supposing for a moment that prayer was now either a Christian duty or a Christian privilege; but we believe and are thoroughly satisfied that it is neither one nor the other. We wish that Christians did but know their privileges, or were willing to listen to them, when they are set before them. They would then, indeed, find a fulness of expression here, "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." They would then find in the word of God such sweetness and beauty, as that they might cry, 'If our portion here is all, it is enough; he hath given us all things richly to enjoy.'

I know not that anything further may be added on this subject. Nothing appears more perfectly clear, than that in this rest and victory state of a Christian, prayer is utterly excluded. The new and better covenant was established in the passing away of the old covenant; and we know that it is "ordered in all things, and sure." The reasons, therefore, which rendered prayer obligatory and needful, before the establishment of the covenant, do not now continue. Prayer throughout the ministries recorded in the Bible was most essential. In the New Testament, there is nothing more particularly insisted upon; and conscious of the love I have of God and his truth, I feel that if I had lived in Paul's day, I should have earnestly followed his exhortation, "Pray without ceasing." Now, however, the case is very different. An ultra-Calvinist, one who is always going further back than the beginning, might say, that at all times God's unalterable decree was enough without prayer. "I believe the promise," he might say, "and it is certain to come to pass, independent of all pleading and petition." For our own part, we have no sympathy with a view of this kind, and for this plain reason, because Scripture gives no warrant for such a conclusion. God settled the question by commanding otherwise: "Thus saith the Lord God, I will yet for this be enquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them." (Ezekiel xxxvi. 37.)

As to all answers to prayer, which may be objected to our view, the reality of such answers can never be proved. They can amount to no more than remarkable coincidences. It may be said of them, as we say of many occurrences in our worldly concerns, 'How strange;' but this is all. They can never amount to Scripture proof, because the age of immediate revelations is passed away. "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Light." (James i. 17.) Prayer was among those gifts; and it was included when an Apostle exhorted, "Covet earnestly the best gifts." But as there is 'a name better than that of sons and daughters,' so there is a state wherein gifts are useless, for, saith Paul, in the same place, "and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way." For these reasons, we give our voice against prayer; and in so doing we consent to self-annihilation: for if the prop of prayer be taken from the creature, conditionality is really gone, and he hath not a God left. For this cause, our doctrine of the past second advent will meet with the fiercest opposition. The priesthood especially will denounce it, for what is a priest without prayer? He is a workman without tools. We believe, and therefore speak; we will oppose Truth to all the world. We have no objection to apostolical succession, as expressed in this glorious apology, "Herein do I exercise myself, to have a conscience void of offence towards God and men." (Acts xxiv. 16.) Towards God *first*, and men afterwards. Just and true is the order; for a conscience void of offence towards God, is sure to be a conscience blameless towards man. It is a melancholy reflection, that even among the *discerning few*, there should be so many followers of Nicodemus. O, why is it that a Christian can live in a continual contradiction of the principles he professes. Are we "to do evil that good may come?" No, it is not this; the wonder is dissipated here. "*The fear of man bringeth a snare.*" We repeat, "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him *it is sin.*"

One word more. We have been accused of being Arminians ; of saying that every man may understand the Bible who chooses ; of breaking down all a Christian's *hope*, and sending him to sea without compass or chart, &c. &c.

These must be accounted false charges, made in a spirit of profound ignorance, so long as we contend (almost *alone*) for the blessings of the new covenant, whose everlasting promise is, "All thy children shall be taught of me, and great shall be the peace of thy children." (Isaiah liv. 13.) We believe that the common sense of a child may understand so much of our views as to be able to overthrow the systems of the day ; but none save the worshippers in spirit and in truth can really enjoy them. We affirm, that the only medium of their teaching is the word which liveth and abideth for ever, and is to them 'spirit and life.' While acknowledging this teaching with joy and thankfulness, as the happy subjects thereof, we reject the various theories which human imagination has drawn up, of what it pleases to call divine teaching ; we reject the distinction of quickening, enlightening, regenerating, converting, comforting, and so forth ; of a new creation of the will, understanding, and conscience. These things are the theology of the schools. We are contented to know that we are passed from death to life, the process of the proceeding it is idle to aim at delineating. No reasoning can reason us out of what we know, for the most certain of all sure things—the witness of God. We are in the enjoyment of a rich estate, and, therefore, only smile at the simplicity of the man who tells us we are poor and naked. A stranger cannot intermeddle. We earnestly desire that all whom we admire and esteem as members of one great family, should share in our joys. While condemning in the strongest terms all religious systems, we neither cut off nor condemn the members of such systems (we leave that to the word of God) ; not confining salvation to any sect or party, or to any specific amount of knowledge. It was written of Israel of old, under the first earthly and temporal covenant, and notwithstanding repeated rebellion, "He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel. The Lord his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them." (Numb. xxiii. 21.) So with the blessed family of worshippers in spirit and in truth. The Lord God looks upon them in the covenant, and not in their individual capacity ; he regardeth them not for what they are in themselves, nor for what they *appear to others* : but as they are sharers and partakers in the all-glorious and finished salvation of his dear Son. "If we believe not, He abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself." (2 Tim. ii. 13.) nay, "let God be true and every man a liar." (Rom. iii. 4.) It is a sweet thought, our eternal life is not in our own hands ; and it is a thought equally precious, that it is not *in the hands of our fellow-creatures*.

## NOTES.

### Note A.

The Church of England is builded upon the doctrine of Apostolic succession. This must be accounted a sandy foundation, if we examine the writings of Dr. Lee, and contrast them with the writings of Dr. Pusey, who holds a Professorship in Oxford, similar to that of Dr. Lee in Cambridge. These two learned men have the same ordination, are ranged under the same succession, and are so far from being guided into all truth, that their views of Divine revelation are as opposed as possible!

Would that Professor Lee's works formed part of a prescribed course of reading for ordination candidates. I will take the liberty of transcribing one or two passages respecting the fall of Jerusalem, in order to show the correspondency between his views of the fulfilment of prophecy and my own.

"At verse 32, Matt. xxiv., we read, 'Now learn a parable of the fig-tree: when its branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near,' &c. Then, in the next verse, 'This generation shall not pass till all these things (πάντα ταῦτα ΓΕΝΗΤΑΙ, that is, the inceptive signs,) BE, not as in the authorized version, 'be fulfilled'; this gives an erroneous view of the subject."—*Dissertations*, p. 283.

It would appear that Professor Lee applies *γεννται* to the events preceding *THE END*. He remarks, in his '*Theophania*,' p. 103, on Luke xxi. 22, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled (in them);" that is, as I understand it, that the *accomplishment* and *end* of all things may arrive and come. A very large number of instances occur elsewhere to the same effect; we shall presently notice some of them. From all which it must, I think, be evident, both that a *beginning* and an *end* of all the troubles here mentioned is distinctly pointed out and affirmed; and more generally the days in which all the other things foretold by the prophets should also be accomplished, and come to their destined end." The Greek for the words "that all things which are written may be fulfilled, is, *τοῦ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα*, literally, 'of all things written being fulfilled,' or 'of the fulfilment of all things written.' It is amusing to hear exceptions taken to this most decisive language, because it is worded 'may be;' it is argued that 'may be' expresses a peradventure; it might, or it might not!

Professor Lee seems to me to apply *πληρωθῆναι* to the *end*, and *γεννται* to the preceding events. Nothing, therefore, is gained on *γεννται*, as Mr. Bush, in his '*Anastasis*,' would lead us to suppose. In the text, p. 285, we read as follows:—"We hold it to be utterly impossible, upon fair canons of interpretation, to divorce these predictions of Daniel and Christ (Dan. v. 13, and Matt. xvi. 27, 28,) from a joint reference to one and the same coming, and that too a coming which was to be realized, *in its incipient stages*, at the destruction of Jerusalem." To this Mr. Bush appends a note, containing an extract from 'Cunningham on the Apocalypse,' p. 313: "Now the most proper and original signification of the verb *γίνομαι* is not to be completely fulfilled, but it rather signifies *commencement running into subsequent continuance of action*;" continuance, however, concluded by *πληρωῶ*, which Mr. B. appears not to have seen.

I may be allowed to offer an observation or two upon a construction of Professor Lee's, from which I dissent. I allude to that put upon the word 'scatter' in the following quotation: "When he shall have accomplished to scatter (*disperse abroad*) the power of the Holy People, all these things shall be finished." That is, as I understand it, when *the saints shall have taken the kingdom*; shall have been put in possession of the kingdom under the whole heaven; in other words, when the new or fifth kingdom shall have been established by God himself; when kings and queens shall, in the words of Isaiah, have become the nursing fathers



and nursing mothers of the church, then shall all these things have come to their destined *and full completion* and end."—'Theophania,' p. 110. Is there not here a contradiction to the interpretation of Luke xxi. 22, as above given? Dr. Lee understands the 'holy people' to be predicated of the Christian Church; but let us ask, What is the plain, first-sight exposition which any one would give of the words 'scatter the power?' Most assuredly these words would be understood as implying an overthrow, a ruin, a calamity, a catastrophe, and so forth. The word 'scatter' implies this in most, if not all, the passages where it occurs, as in James' Epistle, addressed 'to the *twelve tribes scattered abroad.*' See Acts viii. 1, 4, and 11, 19, where scattering is connected with persecution. What connexion can there be between the saints' being put in possession of the kingdom, and this signification of the term 'scatter'? But again—Where is the authority for styling any but the Jews the 'Holy People,' in this place of Daniel? The context evidently applies this to the Jews, as in chap. x. 14, "Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall *thy people* in the latter days, for yet the vision is for many days;" that is, the vision referred to Daniel's people, the Jews, 'the holy people,' not even to the ten tribes, as they were no longer a people. It may be argued, that in the opening up of the gospel dispensation, the Jews ceased to be the 'holy people,' the gospel having superseded the law, while they, as a nation, rejected the gospel. This position is destitute of scripture proof. It might as well be said that the temple ceased to be the 'holy place,' and yet we read, "when ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the *holy place.*" This was the 'holy place' in Paul's ministry, as well as in Christ's, as we learn from Heb. ix. 24. "For Christ is not entered into holy places made with hands." The distinction is here, 'The temple was no longer the holy place in the eye of a Christian,' but it was so in that of the world. So with the Jews; they were the holy people, until God *openly* stripped them of that name: just as the ten tribes were a holy people until cut off, though they had long been connected with the worship of Baal, before they were *actually* cut off, to be no more a people. Nothing, one would think, can be clearer than that the scattering mentioned by Daniel, is the utter destruction of the Jewish temple, city, covenant, and priesthood, by him to whom all power was given in heaven and earth, which power the Jew denied altogether.

As to the kings and queens of the prophet, which Dr. Lee brings forward in support of his view, it must be admitted that this language is highly figurative, (see Rev. xviii. 9, &c.) We prove, and Dr. Lee admits, that "the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ;" consequently the prediction of the prophet must have been fulfilled. Earthly, literal kings and queens, have, with few exceptions, been bitter persecutors, instead of nursing fathers and mothers. But more is said on this subject in the text.

#### Note B.

The "Society of Friends" are, in many respects, "a wise and understanding people." They reject the 'Sacraments,' as they are called, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; they do not imbibe the grovelling notions of a resurrection of dust; so neither do they call Sunday the Lord's-day; but simply and *scripturally*, the first day of the week. I suppose this 'Lord's-day' fancy, rests altogether on this passage in the Revelation,—'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Against the traditional view of this passage it is sufficient to observe, that if this were a literal twenty-four hours, then of a certainty John must have had 'the pen of a ready writer,' if in that space of time he indited twenty-two chapters! The words in the Greek for 'the Lord's day,' are *ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, 'on the day belonging to the Lord;' evidently enough pointing to the resurrection day of the Apostolic dispensation, as I shall often in the course of our subject have occasion to show. One proof may be permitted here, from Psalm cxviii. 24, "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." Now that this day was the resurrection day, is clearly demonstrated from infallible testimony. Peter, in Acts iv., when preaching of Jesus whom God raised from the dead, quotes in the 11th verse the 22nd verse of the 118th Psalm,—"This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which has become the head of the corner." The Church of England, in her traditions, calleth the first day of the week *Dies Dominica*, and from this taketh occasion to discourse of the Dominical, or Lord's day letter!

But my purpose in making a note upon the Revelation is of much higher import than a mere exposure of the Judaical notions which are entertained of the first day of the week, under the unscriptural title of the 'Lord's day.'

I wish to anticipate an objection—How is it possible that your doctrine concerning the fall of Jerusalem can be true, seeing that Jerusalem was destroyed about the year 70, while the Book of the Revelation was not written until the year 96?

I deny the accuracy of the date affixed to the Revelation.

As it is of considerable importance to substantiate this denial, I will briefly enter into the subject.

First then.—Let it be understood that the date 96 is of human authority. Neither the Revelation, nor any of the Books of the New Testament, have any dates affixed to them in the original manuscripts. The Bible, and not tradition, is professedly the rule of faith of all Protestants, and therefore I may be excused for questioning the accuracy of the date, prior to any investigation.

II.—Many learned men have laboured to prove, from the only sure method of proof, internal evidence of the Book itself, that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Bishop Newton, in his 'Dissertation on the Prophecies,' has the following, "It is not well known at what time or by whom John was banished to this island (Patmos), but we may suppose it to have happened in the reign of Nero, more probably than in that of Domitian; and the churches of Syria have thus inscribed their version: 'The Revelation made to John the Evangelist, by God, in the island of Patmos, into which he was banished by Nero the *Cæsar*.' The ancient commentators, Andreas and Arethas, affirm that it was understood to be written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Grotius and Sir Isaac Newton place John's banishment to Patmos likewise before the year 70; Dr. Hammond is of the same opinion, as well as Dr. Lightfoot, who dates John's banishment in the year 66, and says, 'As it will be easily admitted to place this book last of all the New Testament, because it stands so in the old bibles, so on the other hand it will be cavilled at, that I have brought in the writing of it so soon as before the fall of Jerusalem, since it hath been of old, and commonly, held that it was penned in the reign of Domitian. But the reasons by which I have been induced thereunto, will appear out of some passages in the Book itself. The opening of the Six Seals, speaks of the ruin and rejection of the Jewish nation which is now near at hand.'" Dr. Lightfoot entertained the same opinion, respecting an early date of John's Epistles.

III.—But this is not all. We are prepared to go farther back than the year 66 for our date of the Book of the Revelation. Dr. Tillock labours to prove from internal evidence, that the Apocalypse must have been written, circulated, and read before any of the Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and most likely before the Gospels. From what I have seen of his proof (for I have not read his work), it appears to me highly satisfactory, and most assuredly it has presumptive evidence in its favour. It is reasonable and proper to conclude that the Revelation was so given to John, prior to any search for proof, just as it is reasonable and proper to conclude that all prophecy ended, and was fulfilled in, the fall of the Jewish Economy, prior to any search for proof of that conclusion.

John 'saw a Book sealed with seven seals.' Now we read of no book sealed but that of Daniel, for Daniel was commanded 'to shut up the words, and seal the book of his visions to the time of the end.' But it is said of the book that John saw, that 'no man in heaven nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither look thereon,' and because of this, John wept much. If John could not read the book, and if that book were the Prophecy of Daniel; if no man was found able to reveal its sealed contents, then it follows, that Paul could not understand the sealed portion of Daniel's prophecy, neither could Peter, nor the rest of the Apostles. But it is evident from the Epistles of Paul, Peter, and James, that they could interpret the hidden mysteries of Daniel. In 2 Thess. ii., Paul explains Dan. vii. 25, and xi. 36, respecting the man of sin, who, saith Paul, "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God and is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God." It is not improbable but this bears upon the Saviour's words, 'When ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not.'

It is admitted on all hands, that the Epistles to the Thessalonians were the first of Paul's Epistles, (and here we see the propriety of the words, "be ye not

soon shaken in mind, as that the day of Christ is at hand"): how then was Paul enabled to read the seven sealed book, and to explain it to the Church of Thessalonica? The answer is simple, because that the 'Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, had prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.'

To quote Dr. Tilloch. Dr. T. shows that Paul, Peter, and John had spoken very clearly of certain particulars contained in the prophet Daniel, and observes, "These particulars were among the things that were *closed up and sealed* in the book of Daniel, and they were to remain so sealed up till *the time of the end*. The question then is simply this: Whence did these writers derive their knowledge? certainly not from Daniel himself, for, if his book could thus be read and explained, it could not be called a *sealed book*, and if this be the *sealed book* spoken of in the Apocalypse, how came John to weep, on the supposition that no one could be found able to open, that is, explain the book? If until this was effected by the Lion of the tribe of Judah, it remained a sealed book to John, how could it be open to Peter and Paul; and not only to them, but to the churches, having been explained by Paul to the believers in Thessalonica both orally and by letter; and by Peter to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia? What! an open book to such multitudes, and yet a sealed book to John! yet this must be the fact, if John did not write the Apocalypse till the year 96 or 97, as some strenuously contend: nay, more strange still, John must have forgotten his former knowledge by the time he wrote his vision; for it is allowed, even by the most strenuous contenders for so late a date, that John's first Epistle was written about the year 80!"

The early date admits of abundant proof. What, it may be asked, would any one understand by such expressions, as 'the time is at hand,' 'the things which must shortly come to pass,' which occur in the compass of the four opening verses of the Revelation? Would we understand two or three thousand years? yet the word 'shortly' is so interpreted at this day. Why not understand it in the same extensive prospect in the following passage: 'Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle?' 'Shortly,' 'quickly,' 'at hand,' were the watch-words 1800 years ago; they are watch-words still. It is all very well to force a Scripture out of its proper application, and to tell us that 'one day is unto the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.' All I want to know is this; if this passage is to be applied to one Scripture, why not to another? If to 'things that must shortly come to pass,' why not to 'knowing that shortly I must put off this tabernacle?' If to 'the time of this prophecy is at hand,' why not to 'the time of my departure is at hand?' The charge of wresting Scripture does not rest with us; but we can substantiate the position with which we set out, viz., "Where an objector can bring one objection against a past second Advent, we can bring fifty, or five hundred, against an Advent yet future."

#### Note C.

This translation of 1 Cor. xv. 26, is given in a very able paper, which appeared in the first number of the Biblical Inquirer. In that paper it is observed, "The resurrection of Christ a past event, with continuous effects, is indifferently expressed by the present passive, *καταργείται*, is disabled, as in 1 Cor. xv. 26, or by the aorist-active, *καταργησάντος*, having disabled, as in 2 Tim. i. 10. Death, the last enemy, (so called, I conceive, because the last that assails human nature,) had been previously disabled by the resurrection of the head; but the victory was incomplete till the resurrection of the members. Death was then 'swallowed up in victory.'"

The expression 'disabled' appears to be hardly sufficiently strong, especially if compared with other passages where the verb *καταργω* is used. This verb is of very frequent occurrence in 1 Corinthians. For instance, we have it in 1 Cor. i. 28, where we read, "Things which are despised hath God chosen, and things which are not, that he may bring to nought things which are;" which meets with a parallel in Romans ii. 6, "That the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." These are forcible usages of the word; and we may here remark that 'the body of sin' and the 'things which are' both refer to the Jewish Church, which Christ calls 'a body:' "Wheresoever the carcase (*πτωμα*) is, there will the eagles be gathered together." This Judaical interpretation further appears from another passage, where the same verb *καταργω* is used, 1 Cor. ii. 6,

"Howbeit, we speak wisdom among the perfect, but not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes (rulers) of this world, which *come to nought*. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, the hidden wisdom, which God predetermined before the ages to our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew; (compare Eph. vi. 12;) for, had they known it, they *would not have crucified the Lord of glory*." This latter clause includes the 'chief priests and rulers' among the 'rulers of the darkness of this age,' if it does no more.

The verb *καταγίω* also occurs in 1 Cor. xiii., "Whether prophecies, they shall fail: whether knowledge, it shall *vanish away*." These are the same words in the original; and again, in verse 10, "Then that which is in part shall be done away:" and once more in verse 11, "But when I became a man I put away childish things."

There is a parenthetical clause in the extract above given, from the Biblical Inquirer, with which I am disposed to differ. I allude to the words, "Death the last enemy, so called because the last which assails human nature." I conceive that death is called the "last enemy" because the last in the Divine category of dispensation enemies. "The wages of sin is death." Here death follows sin, "That he might destroy him that had the power of death, the Devil." Here the devil comes before death. Destroy the devil and death is destroyed. If the devil be dead, death is dead. The Bible makes little account of death in its connexion with human nature. If it did, why not make as much of it in connexion with the beasts of the field?

#### Note D.

I allude to the writings of Mr. Thom, Minister of Bold-street Chapel, Liverpool.

In Mr. T.'s last publication, 'Divine Inversion,' a section is devoted to show that no sect or system can claim 'unconditionality of eternal life.' Among the conditionalists Mr. T. enumerates those whom he styles the Salemites of Devonshire. The charge of conditionalizing the Gospel, which is preferred against them, is amusing; and as Mr. T. is pleased to call my views of Divine truth 'Salemite errors,' I feel anxious to examine the charge.

I.—"They (the Salemites) limit salvation to the Church." So far as I understand their sentiments, they do not acknowledge a church at all since the Apostolic dispensation ceased; therefore this charge is at once refuted. 'The Church' is a favourite theme with Mr. T.; but throughout the Bible a church implies service; and where there is service there must be servants, officers, priests, and deacons; and where these are, they must be of Divine appointment. A church implies, in one word, *conditionality*; and consequently it would appear that, so far from the Salemites being guilty of conditionality, we must remove them from the bar, and place Mr. T. there, to take his trial in their stead.

II.—"They blot out the present reign of the Messiah as spiritual Abraham." This must be a mistake. The reign of the Messiah knows no such possibility as 'a blotting out' to all eternity. I carry the reign of Messiah beyond the period fixed by Mr. Thom's or any other system, and I do so because of the testimony of Scriptures, such as the following:—"His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

In the preface to 'Divine Inversion,' Mr. T. says that Jesus appears first as head of the Church, or elected body, before he appears ultimately as head of all; and he quotes 1 Cor. xv. 22—28. This chapter contradicts his assertion, because it is admitted on all hands that it concerns believers, and believers alone; and if my memory does not deceive me, Mr. T. has said as much in one or other of his works.

There is a 'flesh and spirit' as well as a church story, which runs throughout Mr. T.'s scheme, and it is this flesh and spirit notion upon which he has grounded his universalism in a fancied distinction of spiritual Abraham and spiritual Adam. It is allowed that Jesus did appear first as spiritual *Abram*, or 'Father of the families of the tribes of Israel,' in the Jews being first called to the Gospel feast: it is evident also that he has appeared as spiritual *Abraham*, or 'Father of the nations:' it is equally evident, to an unprejudiced and uncommitted mind, that he has been manifested before the world as spiritual Adam or Abraham, head of all, Lord of all. What more extensive than this? "Have they not heard, Yea, verily, their sound went out unto all lands, and their words unto the ends of the world." But what more comprehensive than this, "before him shall be gathered all nations," which Mr. T. himself allows to be *past*, but not in his 'Divine Inver-

sion,' in a former work, wherein he is constrained to acknowledge a second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, and where he can only support his universalism by the nonsensical doctrine of primary and secondary interpretation and fulfilment.

III.—“The Salemites do not understand Divine Inversion.” Mr. T. gives a curious specimen of their ignorance. He says, “They do not seem to apprehend how the resurrection of the body which we now have may be held, while yet we deny that it is raised a flesh and blood body.” But Mr. T. attempts to explain his riddle. “The swallowing up of the natural in the spiritual, and the assimilation thereby of the natural to the spiritual, through the death and resurrection of Christ, is a doctrine which in its fulness they remain yet to be taught.” And may they ever remain so, for such teaching is not of heaven but of men. Who ever read in the Bible of the assimilation of the natural to the spiritual? This is Mr. T.’s fleshly mind *versus* spiritual mind: this is Mr. T.’s opposition of God’s mind to man’s mind; but the Bible tells another tale, “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, and flesh and blood can *not* inherit the kingdom of God.” And then, that this ‘assimilation’ is through the death and resurrection of the Son of God: this, to me, is a plain betrayal of ignorance common to all Judaizing systems concerning that glorious Scripture, Acts ii. 36. So much for the charges of conditionalizing the Gospel. I must be excused for expressing my dissent from the following charge preferred against the so-called Salemites, “Sad self-inconsistency characterizes them.” There may be something in the following, “Alas! they are, in their respective theories, far from being perfect.” But can Mr. T. prefer any claim to perfection? Let us see.

1.—Mr. T. does not believe that the second advent is past, and yet, in p. 172 of section 11 ‘Divine Inversion,’ he speaks of “Christ’s coming again at the subversion of Jerusalem to render his believing church like himself.” Does he believe in three advents? I conclude so; for he states that this *last* state of things, at Christ’s coming again, was merely preliminary to the highest state of all, that is, *to another state after the last*: ‘so far from being the end, it is merely subservient to that end.’ What proof does Mr. T. advance for what we must call this ‘sad self-inconsistency?’ The xv. Cor. and viii. Romans, which directly contradict him. If the end spoken of in Corinthians be another than that in Matthew xxiv. 14, then the Bible is contradictory, and we are at once cast upon a sea of doubt and uncertainty in the interpretation of Scripture. The Bible is a nose of wax in such interpretation, and may mean anything or nothing.

2.—Mr. T. supports his ‘highest state of all’ by a very favourite text, Rev. xxi. 5, “Behold I make all things new,” and yet, in section 10 of his ‘Divine Inversion,’ he speaks of the Book of Revelation on this wise. “The *whole* of that magnificent and glorious book, indeed, though wrapt up in mysteries to mere fleshly mind, *consists of information respecting the then approaching salvation of the Church*, and of contrasts between the state of reconciliation and that of salvation.” Mr. Thom, in his theory, is far from being perfect: sad self-inconsistency characterizes him.

3.—Mr. T. labours to say something of the great doctrine of Apostolic preaching,—the glory of Christ in his second advent at the fall of Jerusalem. He writes, “No external or earthly church of Christ has existed since the days of the Apostles and the period of Jerusalem’s subversion;” and yet he denied to me that Christ has come a second time: no, he affirms this. He affirms and yet he denies: it is so, and it is not so. This is blowing hot and cold in the same breath.

4.—Mr. T. has no ordinance of the Lord’s Supper in his chapel. It is idle, after the above statement, to ask, by what authority he has discontinued this ordinance? The Apostle saith, “As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord’s death *till he come.*”

It is equally useless to ask Mr. T. why he has Prayer in his public services, and yet no Sacrament: why reject one ordinance and hold to the other? But it is all vanity; ‘sad self-inconsistency;’ a theory far from perfect.

5.—Mr. T. dwells much upon what he calls ‘the earnest of the glorified mind of Christ.’ I know of no earnest but that of the spirit, “In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.” The Scripture earnest is bounded by the limit of a certain day. If there be an earnest

now, where are the witness and the sealing? This also is vanity—a faith which clashes with the plainest declarations of Scripture.

6.—Mr. T's views of sin, Satan, and death, are creaturely. All depend upon the unscriptural dogma of an end of this visible system of things. While condemning all sects, his views differ nothing from the principles and practices of any. All sects hold the doctrine of different degrees of glory in what they call heaven. What is this but Mr. T.'s notion of the church reigning, and the rest being reigned over? But I am wrong. Mr. T. holds the non-immortality of the soul; our sects do not—and they may ask, How does Mr. T. make out his universalism while holding annihilation or purgatory? for I can find no one who can explain this part of his creed to me. Surely this is a 'making all things new' with a witness.

7.—Where is the ministry? This question is, to my mind, far more decisive against Mr. T's views than against Romanism. I maintain that the 'all in all state' was opened up at the fall of Jerusalem, not, as Mr. T. would say, in the sense of a beginning of something which is progressive in its manifestations, but in the sense of manifestation full, complete, perfect, and conclusive, denying all progression and change. I can see nothing but absurdity in the reflection which Mr. T. is constrained to offer on such passages as 1 Thesa. iv. 13—17. "At all events, the circumstances spoken of in that passage then *began to receive their accomplishment*" (page 172 'Divine Inversion.') This arises from a common source of all errors in Divine things, comparing spiritual things with natural.

Where is the ministry? The Apostles, &c. were for the work of the ministry. Is the work of the ministry a finished work? The Apostles, &c., were 'for the perfecting of the saints.' Are the saints perfected? If the work of the ministry is not finished, and the perfection of the saints is not come, is Mr. T. an Apostle, a prophet, or a pastor? No: he denies a ministry, while he writes himself 'minister:' 'it is and it is not' comes in at every turn. If the 'all in all state' is not opened up in the sense of perfect and entire manifestation, so as to exclude all progression and change, then there must be a ministry, and that, too, miraculously commissioned, and Mr. T.'s equivocating denial must go for what it really is—a mere assertion, unsustained by a shadow of proof. The Roman Catholic maintains that there is a ministry, and is so far consistent. Mr. T. rows in the same boat with the Romanist: *his real aim is to establish a ministry.* I submit to Mr. T., what I have submitted to all sects, to fill up their assumed intermediate state, between the Apostolic and the perfect; between Peter's 'end of all things,' (1 Peter iv. 7.) and their own. It is idle to say 'there is, and yet there is not.' This is only calculated to deceive the simple-minded. Mr. T.'s universalism resolves itself, to all appearance, into a 'yea and nay' gospel, a 'supposition' Christianity, as a friend happily styled it. If I am to be a believer in Universalism, I must have a widely different statement from any which Mr. T. propounds. In fact, I must know something clearer of the *soul* than I have ever yet read. I agree with Mr. Bush, that on no subject are we more in the dark than in regard to what is usually termed 'the soul;' though Mr. B. and I may differ as to the point on which we are so much in the dark. I know that the report has gone abroad that I believe in annihilation of the wicked: it is altogether an inference or a presumption: having hitherto never given any opinion on the subject. I can only state, that it is possible there may be punishment in the continued principle of the present existence of the ungodly, in a future state; though I cannot consent for one moment to the gross notions of hell torments, involving, as they do, the unscriptural tenet of a resurrection body. Let it be observed, that the after-existence of the wicked does *not* depend upon an end of the world, a resurrection, &c., *however universalism may so depend.* But indeed this very little concerns me in any way. Nothing is asserted in Scripture more emphatically than this glorious truth, "He that liveth and believeth in me shall *never die.*" As for all others, the testimony is equally clear, "Verily I say unto you, they have their reward." By the way, annihilation is a curious expression.

Having mentioned Professor Bush, I cannot forbear transcribing a passage from his 'Anastasis.'—

"If we were called upon to specify any form of alleged Christian doctrine, for which the *least* amount of evidence could be adduced from the Scriptures, it would be that of the *final universal salvation of the race.* For this we find an entire lack of positive scriptural evidence, and just as little do we find on having recourse to

rational or philosophical considerations.—As *moral character* must necessarily be the basis of *destiny*, we recognise no provision made, either in revelation or reason, for that change, whether at death or after death, by which a bad man can be made a good man, and as such be rendered capable of happiness.”

“James,” said one friend to another, “do you see and hear those drunken, blaspheming wretches at the other side of the cabin; can you believe that if they were to die in yon state, plainly ignorant of all that is holy, and just, and good, they would be brought to the knowledge of God?” “No, not without passing through purgatory.” “I agree with you.” It is well if, when they die, they cease to exist, and ‘God is love,’ even unto them.

I respect Mr. Thom as a man of very superior mental attainments, and have pleasure in conversing with him, or hearing him converse, on any subject save and except his *imaginary* Biblical conclusion.

#### Note E.

It is hardly possible to read a page of the New Testament without being impressed with the unreasonableness of the opposition which our doctrine of the past Second Advent has met with.

“How say the scribes that Elias must first come, and restore all things?” “I say unto you, that Elias is already come, and they have done to him whatsoever they listed.”

Let the question be asked, would it have been allowed that John was Elias, if the word of Christ had not so decided? or is it not just as likely that the mingle mangle law and gospel Christianity, which so much abounds, should be mistaken concerning the true doctrine of the Second Advent, as it was likely that the disciples, with all their advantages of position, should have erred in their estimate of the person and character of Elias?

#### Note F.

The subject matter of this note is inserted in the text, at page 32, for reasons which are given in the preface.

#### Note G.

Let it be observed, that I am here contending for the scriptural meaning of the terms ‘the Devil and Satan,’ and thereby demonstrating the more than absurdity of the general application of these terms, in the preaching of the day. Of how many sermons is ‘the Devil’ the burden, as though the Bible were a revelation of the character of a fiend, and not of the God of love?

This ‘doctrine of devils’ has a most licentious tendency, for it leads pious professors to say, in extenuation of their sins of omission and commission, as Eve, ‘The serpent beguiled me and I did eat.’

This note was affixed to an observation on the Satan of Job. For a clear view of the character of Satan, in the book of Job, I am indebted to my dear friend Mr. Roe, of Exeter, by whose kindness I am enabled to give the following correspondences of the book of Job on this subject.

Introduction (i. 1—5.)

Jehovah and the adversary, (6—22, ii. 1—10.)

Introduction to Colloquy, (11—13.)

Colloquy, (iii.—xxxi. 1—40.)

End of the words of Job, (—40.)

Introduction to Elihu (xxxii. 1—5.)

Elihu (6—22, xxxiii.—xxxvii.)

Jehovah and the interlocutors (xxxvii.—xlii. 1—9.)

Conclusion (10—17.)

I am not sufficiently acquainted with the above system of parallelism as to be able to give a decided opinion upon it. I find the following observation in the first No. of the ‘Biblical Inquirer.’—“The system of Parallelism has been gradually developed in the writings of Bishop Lowth, Bishop Jebb, and the Rev. Thomas Boys; and exhibits the *method* observed in the composition of the sacred writings. This method consists of an orderly recurrence of corresponding topics, pervading every subdivision of the matter, from the greatest to the least: and when these topics are *visibly* distinguished by their position, they are perceived, almost at a glance, to throw so much light on each other, as makes the Bible, in a pre-eminent degree, ITS OWN INTERPRETER.” This is fully borne out by the article to which it is appended. The parallelisms there given of Matthew xxiv. and xxv. thoroughly

satisfied me that those chapters were connected and cotemporaneous. So also with the parallelism, in regard to the person of Satan, in Job. There is a correspondence between the introduction and conclusion; then there is a correspondence in the two places in which Jehovah is personally introduced 'Jehovah and the adversary'—answering to 'Jehovah and the interlocutors,' thus identifying Satan and Job's three friends.

The angels mentioned in 2 Pet. ii. 4, and Jude 6, were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and their company. Their being 'cast into hell,' literally 'tartarized,' and being 'delivered into chains of darkness,' expresses their strange punishment, as recorded in Numbers xvi. 32, 33. And that they are said 'to be reserved to the judgment of the great day,' is, observes a writer in 'The Biblical Inquirer,' an apparent allusion to our Lord's denunciation, "All these things,"—all the things previously mentioned—"shall come upon this generation." (Matt. xxiii. 36.) All the wickedness of former ages was thus summed up in the enormity of theirs; in particular, the rejection of Moses and Aaron was antitypically re-acted, in the far more atrocious rejection of Christ and his Apostles; and Peter and Jude (knowing in part,) might well speak of it as involved in darkness, till fully manifested in the signal judgment about to be inflicted on it. This explanation receives much support from Psalm cxl. 10. "Let burning coals fall upon them; let them be cast into the fire; into deep pits, that they rise not up again." "The word rendered *deep pits*," says Parkhurst, "seems probably to mean *breaches* and disruptions of the earth, as in an earthquake; for the whole verse is an evident allusion to the punishment of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and of the two hundred and fifty men who burnt incense." Horsley is of the same opinion, and entitles the whole Psalm "A BELIEVER'S PRAYER FOR PROTECTION AGAINST THE ATHEISTICAL FACTION," which believer and faction are undoubtedly Christ and the apostate Jews. (See Luke xxiv. 44.)—*Biblical Inquirer*, No. 8, p. 139.

#### Note H.

I refer those who are anxious to investigate this subject, to a work which I have perused with much profit, entitled, "The Last Days," a Dialogue, by W. J. P. Wilkinson, Exeter, second edition.

I must here notice two or three scriptures, which are frequently urged against our view of the fall of Jerusalem.

In 1 Tim. iv. 1, we read, "Now the Spirit speaketh *expressly*, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." It is asked, What is the meaning of this, which was written so late as the year 65? Does it not refer to a period of time not then come? I answer, no, not necessarily, for Paul, in the 1st chapter, had notified that 'this departing from the faith' had already appeared, "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, have made shipwreck concerning the faith, of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander." So also in 2 Tim. iii. 1, "This know, also, that in the last days perilous times shall come." Paul notifies that the characters he describes in the following verses were already manifest, "of this sort *are* they which creep into houses," &c. The same is observable in his Epistle to the Thessalonians, where, speaking of the revelation of the man of sin, prior to the day of Christ, he writes, "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work."

Now, supposing that the three scriptures, 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2 Tim. iii. 1, and 2 Thess. ii. 3, are prophetic, which is not denied; yet the context suffices to prove that the prophecy and its fulfilment were most intimately connected as regards time; the fulfilment following close upon the prophecy.

This is observable elsewhere, with other Apostles. Peter, in his Epistle, writes, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you." I am supposing myself to be one of those to whom Peter addressed this Epistle—one living about the year 66. Query, when Peter wrote to me, and those who had obtained like precious faith with me, and said there should be false teachers among us, should I understand him to be extending these characters over tracts of hundreds and thousands of years? He is so understood, but how absurdly!

Again, in 2 Peter iii. 1, we read, "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance; that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour; knowing this first,



that there shall come in the *last days* scoffers," &c. Mr. Wilkinson writes upon this as follows:—

"Now let us refer to the latest epistle that was written—that of Jude—and attend to his testimony, verses 17, 18, "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that they told you there should be mockers in the LAST TIME, who should walk after their ungodly lusts; THESE BE THEY who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit (verse 4); for there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation," &c. These are what Peter calls scoffers, who should come in the *last days*. Jude declares, when he wrote his Epistle, that they were then crept in. These be they of which the Apostles had foretold them, there should be mockers or scoffers in the last days. If, then, it can be shewn, that in the year 66 these scoffers had crept in, and Peter declared that this should be in the *last days*, we prove that the last days of the scriptures referred wholly to the end of the Jewish nation and people, when Jude declares the words spoken by the Apostles were fulfilled." Again, Mr. W. writes, "I beg your particular attention to the term, *the last time*. It seems like the last time of the last times, as there must be the last day of the last days. And observe, Peter wrote his first epistle in the year 60, which is, according to the common date, six years before Jude wrote; and he refers to the *last time* in the spirit of prophecy, when speaking (chapter i. 5,) of those who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the *last time*. With the prospect of this salvation being so near, or 'ready to be revealed,' he urges believers, at verse 13, thus, 'Wherefore, gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.'—But I must refer to the work itself. I would only offer a remark on the term 'last days.' Professor Bush says, that Christ adapted the style of his discourse to notions then prevalent among the Jews, and which were grounded on the literal record of the Scriptures. So says Mr. B. it is in the conversation in John vi. 39, 40. I do not at all like this principle: it may at times apply, but it is dangerous, and at all events will not apply to the term 'last day.' Mr. B., on John vi. 40, speaks of the number of the ransomed being one day complete, and of the divine economy, which has secured their redemption, being brought to a close: 'then shall the righteous shine forth,' &c., and that this is the day for which the whole creation is waiting," &c. This is surely contradictory to other parts of his work, where he speaks of the *everlasting* nature of the mediatorial kingdom; for it must be granted that the mediatorial office of Christ is a part of the divine economy. In the Revelation we read, "there shall be time no longer." Now if there shall be time no longer, it follows that there is a *last day*, for a day is one measure of time. But it is evident that the Revelation lands us not at the end of the globe in which we live, but in untold ages of its continuance. We ask, When is 'the last day,' for a last day there was to be? We answer the question, simply and satisfactorily, as above; all attempted answers, diverse from this, will most assuredly be decided failures.

While quoting Professor Bush, I may as well append his remarks on 2 Thess. ii. 2.

"The Apostle assures the Thessalonians that the day of Christ was to be preceded by a signal apostacy, and the revelation and destruction of the man of sin. But we see nothing in his language which indicates that he supposed this series of events to be of distant occurrence. The announcement does not in our view stand in the way of our general conclusion, that he and all other Christians did anticipate a speedy coming of Christ, and a consummation embracing the resurrection of the dead, and the rapture of living saints. All that he intended, as we conceive, to intimate in the passage referred to was, that that day was not so immediately instant as they imagined."—*Anastasis*, page 265, note.

#### Note I.

The 24th of Luke xxi. has often been urged as an objection to the fulfilment of prophecy at the destruction of Jerusalem. Professor Lee has the following on the passage: "We are told that Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled, that is, until the period has arrived in which it is determined that *heathenism shall fall in this last dynasty*." *Theophania*, p. 113. Dr Lee extends the fulfilment of prophecy to the destruction

of heathen Rome by the barbarians. This destruction or fall of the beast is the fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles. The passage at first sight is difficult; let it be interpreted as it may, the interpretation cannot be prospective. Dr. Lee's, and an interpretation in the 4th No. of the 'Biblical Inquirer,' are the only ones I have seen that are worth a moment's consideration, and they are both retrospective. In the 'Inquirer,' Luke xxi. 24, is paralleled by Rom. x. 18, and Colos. i. 6, and it is asked, "If this be not a preaching of the gospel *unto all nations*, and a fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles, according to the Scriptures, what is it?" This assumes that the preaching of the Gospel to all nations and the fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles are identical, and from comparison with Rom. xi. 25, this would appear to be correct.

There are several reasons for confining the 'fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles' to the desolation of Jerusalem; or, at all events, the evidence against a fulfilment yet future is conclusive. I shall mention only one.

It is, we conceive, doing violence to 'Jerusalem' herself, to carry the fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles further down than her overthrow by the Romans. When Paul speaks of 'Jerusalem' *the literal*, he writes, "Jerusalem that *now* is." Surely there must be a meaning in that little monosyllable 'now.'—Does it not imply that Jerusalem would one day cease to be? I assume that the great city, in Revelation xviii., is Jerusalem, and I do so because if there is one thing clearer than another in the Bible, it is the locality of this Babylon. It is said of Babylon, "Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and *shall be found no more at all.*" Rev. xviii. 21. When she was found no more at all, John saw "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven to dwell with men;" that city of which Paul in his day preached, "Jerusalem which is above," to which by faith he was come; for, saith he, in the first resurrection, "*We walk by faith, not by sight.*"

It is idle to talk about Jerusalem being in the hands of the Mahometans, and therefore now trodden down of the Gentiles. What if it be said, the Bible recognises no such place as Jerusalem *now*, and no such person as a Jew. Shew us a Jew, and it sufficeth. "He is not," said one of old time, "a Jew which is one outwardly, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly." And here we use with emphatic meaning Paul's emphatic expression, 'how much more' *now*, when the glorious words of the Lord Jesus have long been fulfilled, as they never could be in Paul's day, "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.—God is spirit, and they that worship him, must worship in spirit and in truth." (John iv. 21.) In this worship, as we know, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus."

#### Note K.

With a deep sense of responsibility I remember hearing the following delivered, in the Parish Church of Preston, some time during the summer of 1841:— "It is much to sit in the Apostles' seat, and to hold the office which they held. We, like them, are 'ambassadors for God;' our calling is like theirs; we entreat men, for Christ's sake, to be reconciled unto God. We are stewards of his mysteries; we are overseers and shepherds of his flock. And as successful ambassadors; as faithful stewards; as diligent overseers; as watchful shepherds; if (*aye it*) *the Holy Spirit, working with us, enable us so to prove, we shall need no higher honour, we shall want no greater dignity. And as in no other way can we attain to real dignity, so in no other way can we secure to ourselves the authority to which we are entitled! We could not, in this land of light, maintain the fatal claims which the Romish priests assume, and which nothing except the darkness in which they shroud their people could enable them to preserve!! We pity them, whether deceivers or deceived. God forbid that we should either imitate or envy them!!!*"—Bishop SUMNER'S Charge, 1841, p. 42. This needs no comment. I have not space for further quotation, but the context is equally rich. No unprejudiced reader of my work will need to be told, that the Bishop of Chester is not so much a successor of Paul, in any one of Paul's titles of 'ambassador,' 'steward,' 'overseer,' 'shepherd,' as any private soldier in the British army is a successor of Marlborough. The question of Apostolic succession may be set at rest for ever by the following simple experiment. Take twelve boys (in their infancy), educate them, *but give them only the Old Testament; do not let them once*

see the *New Testament*. When they have arrived at the canonical age, consecrate them; make bishops, or apostles, or ministers, or what you please of the whole twelve; and tell them to write a *New Testament*, in proof of their apostleship. Ask them to explain the *Old Testament Scriptures*. The Apostles did this, and he is no Apostle, neither has he the shadow of a claim to be called in any respect a successor of the Apostles, who cannot do all that they were able to do. Methinks we should hear no more of 'a minister of Christ,' or 'minister of the gospel,' much less should we hear of a 'Bishop,' after the trial of such a *recipe* for making a successor of the Apostles.

Note L.

Mr. Stark, in his tract on the 'Fall of Great Babylon,' observes, "If any one subject in the whole of the divine revelation of God is plain, it is this, that the Great Babylon is the Old Jerusalem."

We have heard much lately of the very small progress (if any,) which the Church of England, a Protestant establishment, has made against Popery in Ireland. But what progress is it likely that such Protestantism can make, which most absurdly inveighs against Rome, as spiritual Sodom, Egypt, and Babylon? The Romanist laughs such an opponent to scorn, and well he may. If a Romanist were asked, Do you believe that your Church is mystical Babylon? he would instantly reply, Do you think I am a fool? The Romanist, however, *dare not* proclaim what is the truth of mystical Babylon. No Dr. Wiseman dare to cast, or would ever dream of casting, off the reproach from his church, by proving that the Babylon of Revelation was Jerusalem. Why? Let the following conversation, which passed between Mr. Stark, and a Roman Catholic priest, be the answer. 'If Babylon be Jerusalem,' asked the priest, 'what is the consequence?' 'There is no ministry.' 'I thought so,' was the rejoinder, and the conversation immediately ended, and they parted. As with the priest, so with the parson; as with the parson, so with the 'minister.' *It will never do FOR ANY SECT—NO, NOT FOR ROME HERSELF, to let the people know that Babylon, the Mother of Harlots, is Old Jerusalem. Why so? O there is in such case no ministry.—Othello's occupation's gone.* I wish the people would ask their teachers this simple question, If Rome be spiritual Sodom, Egypt, and Babylon, how comes it she is not also spiritual Jerusalem? To support the question, I refer the reader to Ezekiel xvi. and xxiii., in a comparison with Rev. xvii. and xviii.; also to (Luke xvi.) the parable of the rich man (the Jewish nation,) in comparison with the same chapters of Revelation. For a full exposition, consult Mr. Stark's tract above mentioned. How absurd is the date 96 of the Revelation, in this view!

Note M.

In support of his opinion, that the Apostles were mistaken in regard to the doctrine of the second advent, Mr. Bush delivers himself as follows:—"The Apostles' writings afford no evidence that the true meaning of the symbolic language in which our Lord delivered his predictions was made known to them." If this proposition be true, it is fatal to the inspiration of the Scriptures. A glance at my work will suffice to show that the Apostles were thoroughly learned upon all points of the Saviour's preaching. Mr. B. himself admits this over and over again; as for instance, in 2 Peter iii., which chapter he pronounces to be a description of the passing away of the Jewish economy. The above statement is passing strange, and no account can be rendered why it should have been made but one, given in the text to which this note is attached, viz., because, if the Apostles were acquainted with the symbolic language of prophecy, Mr. B.'s resurrection doctrine is found wanting. The very same tragical occurrences as are depicted in 2 Peter iii., are related in the prophets, with respect to the destruction of Babylon and Tyre; that is, the same symbolical language is applied to Babylon, Tyre, and Jerusalem. Will any one contend that any Jew (to say nothing of the Apostles inspired by the deep-searching Spirit of God,) was unacquainted with the symbols of Babylon and Tyre's desolation? Examine the Gospels, and it is evident that the Scribes and Pharisees had so far a knowledge of the parables, for how often do we read, 'they perceived that he spake this *against them*.'

Strangely enough, Mr. B. has recourse to infidel authority in support of his view; he quotes the eloquent historian of Rome. Gibbon, in his 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,' urged this expectation of the speedy coming of Christ as an objection to Christianity. "In the primitive church," he writes,

“the influence of truth was very powerfully strengthened by an opinion, which, however it may deserve respect for its usefulness and antiquity, has not been found agreeable to experience. It was universally believed that the end of the world and the kingdom of heaven were at hand. The near approach of this wonderful event had been predicted by the Apostles; the tradition of it was preserved by their earliest disciples; and those who understood in their literal sense the discourses of Christ himself, were obliged to expect the second and glorious coming of the Son of Man, in the clouds, before that generation was totally extinguished which had beheld his humble condition upon earth, and which might still be witnesses of the calamities of the Jews under Vespasian or Hadrian. The revolution of seventeen centuries has instructed us not to press too closely the mysterious language of prophecy and revelation; but as long as for wise purposes this error was permitted to subsist in the church, it was productive of the most salutary effects on the faith and practice of Christians, who lived in the awful expectation of that moment, when the globe itself, and all the various race of mankind, should tremble at the appearance of the divine Judge.” (p. 185, edition 1830.)

This objection has never been answered, *neither is there any existing religious body that can answer it.* Bishop Watson, in his ‘Apology for Christianity,’ in reply to Gibbon, has said, “The Apostles knew but in part; and concerning this particular point (to wit, the coming of Christ to judge the world,) Jesus himself had told them, just as he was about finally to leave them, that it was “not for them to know the times and seasons which the Father had put in his own power.” This is nothing to the point, as we shall presently show. Mr. Bush follows the Bishop of Llandaff, as appears from the following:—“The Saviour expressly said, that it was not designed that the Apostles should know when future events would occur;” and in support of this Mr. B. quotes Acts i. 7, and Mark viii. 32. I answer, all this does not prove the Apostles’ ignorance of ‘the times and seasons,’ but it does assuredly prove the ignorance of the Bishop and Mr. Bush. It was very true that the Apostles did not know ‘the times,’ before the death and ascension of Christ, and *prior* to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost; but it was not true after these events had taken place, for Paul, when writing to the Thessalonians says to them, “But of the *times and seasons* you have no need that I write unto you; for *yourselves* (not ourselves, the Apostles only,) *know perfectly* that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night; for when they shall say, peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape. *But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.*” (1 Thess. v. 1.)

In this view, the illustration which Mr. B. brings forward in support of his position is overthrown. He says, “The Apostles were in fact ignorant and mistaken in regard to, at least, the time of the occurrence of *one* future event, the death of John, xxi. 23.” The disciples were *at that time* certainly mistaken in supposing that John should not die, but they were *not then inspired*, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified, in the glorious death image of his mediatorial reign.

I know not that anything may be added to the above. When Mr. B. goes back to the prophets of the Old Testament for support, and quotes 1 Peter i. 10, 11, he ought to have also quoted verses 12 and 13, where he will read the infinite distance between the knowledge of the Apostles and that of Isaiah, David, John, &c. One great object of my work is to exhibit somewhat of the grandeur of the Apostolic ministry; therefore I need not enter into this question here.

When Mr. B. writes, “There is in the Scriptures *no* statement of the time when the *world* would close,” he assumes that the Apostles held an ‘end of the world,’ whereas they had no conception of such an absurdity. Mr. B. appears also to confound ‘world’ with ‘age.’ Moreover, he must have forgotten scriptures like the following, “*All these things shall come upon this generation,*” or, “*These be the days of vengeance for the fulfilment of all things written.*”

I contend that it *does truly* detract from *Paul’s* (not Isaiah’s,) claims to inspiration, if he have so stated what *was* revealed as to evince that he had in *this respect* mistaken its true purport. If the Apostles were mistaken in regard to their expectation of the speedy coming of Christ, they may be mistaken in other things; *the Bible may be a mistake*, and Gibbon’s objection is in such case fatal.

## Note N.

Oftentimes when, in reading the Bible, some particular beauty of exposition strikes me, I say to myself, "Well, now I will take down Scott, and see what he says; ten to one there will be something supremely ridiculous." However, to my surprise, I read the following in Scott, on 1 Thess. iv. 15: "As the Apostle expressly declares that he spake 'by the word of the Lord,' or by divine inspiration, the consequences of allowing him to be mistaken in what he said should *very seriously be considered*." This overthrows not only Scott's exposition of 1 Thess. iv., but the whole superstructure of his commentary. Again, on the same chapter: "The resurrection of believers is exclusively meant, as every attentive reader must perceive, and therefore all speculations concerning the bodies with which the wicked shall arise (*a subject on which the Scripture observes a profound silence*), must be wholly foreign to the subject." Do not the words in parentheses go very far to overthrow the common resurrection doctrine altogether? If Scripture is silent as to a resurrection of the bodies of the wicked, (for the admission amounts to this,) what right had Mr. Scott, or what right has any man, to assume that their bodies will rise? Again, on 2 Cor. iv. 18, Scott has, "They (the martyrs,) were fully assured that God would raise their *mangled bodies* from the grave!" and in 1 Cor. xv., we read, "The *identity* of the particles of matter, as necessary to the resurrection of the *same body*, is nowhere mentioned in Scripture; and this chapter strongly militates against this opinion!" What sense is there in either of these passages, taken separately or together? God raised Christ's *mangled* body; there was the print of the nails, the wound of the spear, &c. Here is another puzzle for dust resurrectionists. If Christ's resurrection be a pattern, the identity of our bodies must be preserved, in the marks that may be upon them. The whole affair is absurd in the extreme. A Baptist preacher was once describing the resurrection, "and," said he, "it will be like an immense cloud of dust arising out of the earth; a leg or an arm which has been buried in one part of the world, will be seen flying over to join the rest of the body, buried in another." From this we are to suppose, for instance, that the Marquis of Anglesea's leg, which he lost at Waterloo, will come flying across the channel to meet his Lordship's maimed body, which will doubtless be buried somewhere in England. I know not whether I am not deserving of censure for printing this, but it is the *doctrine of the day*. The doctrine of the day holds this, and many more things equally the ridicule of the infidel; for instance, if a person be born with any corporeal deficiency—without a leg—he will be raised at the last day without a leg, *or else the same body cannot be raised*. In 2 Sam. xxi. 20, we read, "And there was yet a battle in Gath, where was a man of great stature, that had on every hand *six* fingers, and on every foot *six* toes, four-and-twenty in number, and he also was born to the giant." Query, Will this giant be raised at the last day with *four-and-twenty* fingers and toes?

There is yet one passage, which, not being expounded in the text of the treatise, I wish to mention here. I allude to 2 Cor. v. 10, "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done* in his body." It will be observed that two words are in Italics; this is the key to a true exposition of the verse. A fellow-collegian of mine, and formerly my schoolmaster, was lately figuring at a 'no-popery' meeting in Blackburn. Having quoted some Romish dogma or other, he is reported to have said as follows:—"The word of God, on the other hand, said every man should give an account of himself, *for the deeds done in the FLESH*." The word of God says no such thing. For a detailed exposition of this verse, I refer the reader to Mr. Wilkinson's 'Last Days,' p. 100. The proper translation reads thus, "That every one may receive the things in the body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad;" meaning, *the things done during the bodily state*, which state was dissolved when prophecies failed, &c.

And here I may observe upon a common objection, "There are surely preachers now; did not Paul give directions to Timothy, 'The things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.' Does not this argue the continuance of the whole, or some, of these offices in the church?"

I answer, 'ALL OR NONE.'—The Apostles were *stewards* of the mysteries of God. Paul writes, "A bishop must be blameless, as the *steward* of God." Stewardship implies trust, according as it is written; "For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called *his own servants*, and delivered unto them *his goods*;" &c. (Matt. xxv. 14,) saying, "OCCUPY TILL I COME."

(Luke xix. 12.) Well—there is a testator: this is the man travelling into a far country: the testator dies: he makes a will: the will comes into operation after he is dead: he has appointed in his will certain trustees or executors; the time of their trust is determined: the parties in whose favour the will is made are "Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise:" these are heirs, as minors, for the state of the church at the resurrection of Christ was new-born, (1 Peter ii. 2,) and so they were begotten again by the resurrection of Christ. They were children: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God;" and again, "if children then heirs." While they were as children, in the sonship state, the Lord had provided guardians, overseers, &c., for the work of the ministry, &c., that is, till the second appearing, when the minority should cease, the children having come to full age, to a perfect man, &c.

Paul's charge to Timothy is thus clearly expounded. If it be a man's testament or will, provision is made therein for the decease of the executors under the will, the same power devolving upon their heirs and assigns; or there is a power given to appoint others as successors, either in the event of death or the parties refusing to act, until the trusts in the will are fulfilled, but not after. So with the New Testament in Christ's blood; "As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death *till he come.*"

The question recurs, Where is the ministry? It is worthy of remark, by way of exhibiting the divine authority of the Apostolic ministry and of Apostolic succession up to the fall of Jerusalem, that all the writings on record of men who lived *immediately* after that period, are full of the most ridiculous nonsense, plainly demonstrating the time of the cessation of all ministry. See the 'Shepherd of Hermas,' &c., &c.

#### Note O.

The common interpretation of the word 'generation,' is that agreed upon by all good authorities. Whitby writes, that the words translated 'this generation,' never bear any other sense, in the New Testament, than 'THE MEN OF THIS AGE.' There is no greater critical authority than Whitby.

Doddridge has the following in a note on Matt. xxiv.

"Though *Brennius* and *Mede* have here the honour to be followed by so great an authority as Dr. Sykes, yet I must beg leave to say, that I cannot think the texts they collect sufficient to prove that by *this generation* we are to understand *the Jewish nation through all ages.*"

What matter, supposing 'this generation' may be rendered 'this nation?' Has not the Jewish nation ceased since the fall of Jerusalem?—See Daniel xii. 7.

I find a remark on this subject in the *Anastasis* of Mr. Bush. "We well know by what criticisms upon the word 'generation' it is attempted to rebut the force of the natural construction, and make it harmonise with an accomplishment that should first ensue hundreds and thousands of years after the life-time of the disciples. But after all, it is impossible to explain away the native and genuine import of the phrase. It is only by the most downright violence that we can elicit from the words anything but the declaration that the event predicted should occur in the term of the natural lives of the then existing generation of men." p. 199. As this is the last time I shall have occasion to mention Mr. B.'s work, I would beg again to suggest its perusal, as a *startling objection* to popular notions of the resurrection. The preface and introduction alone are worth the price of the volume.

For a full discussion of the word 'generation,' consult the Appendix to the 'Last Days.'

#### Note P.

Much stress is often laid on Acts i. 11, by those who are accustomed to interpret a divine revelation as that which they can see with their eyes, hear with their ears, and handle with their hands. The subjoined exposition is by Mr. Roe, and is quite satisfactory.

"The chief argument for a future literal coming is founded on the assumed principle that, as the fulfilment of prophecy was literal in the case of the first coming, it must be equally so in the second. The two cases, however, are essentially different. The first related to his *personal manifestation*, the second to his *unseen agency*. The first, therefore, even though expressed in figurative terms, required a literal fulfilment; but the second, even though expressed in literal

terms, a spiritual fulfilment. This view affords an easy explanation of the object's last-cited text. The disciples had seen a cloud receive our Lord out of their sight, and were informed that he should 'so come in like manner,' that is, the likeness of literal to figurative, or of type to antitype, which, if we transfer ourselves to the time when this language was used, we shall perceive the disciples would be at no loss to understand it. They had been familiarized with it in the following passage of Isaiah, "Behold, Jehovah rideth on a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt: and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence." (ix. 1.) And our Lord's use of the same image, when speaking of his judicial coming, would lead them to assign the same meaning to it under this similar association. It is further remarkable, that Luke, as if to identify the meaning of the word 'cloud,' on both these occasions, uses it in the singular; whereas Matthew and Mark use it in the plural. Compare Luke xxi. 27, and Acts i. 11. The cloud in Isaiah is shown, by the context, to prefigure anarchy and invasion; and the cloud or clouds, in the other passages before us, the Roman armies. See also Jer. iv. 13; Dan. vii. 13; Rev. i. 7; and Professor Lee's Dissertations, p. 239—243."—*Biblical Inquirer*, No. 1.

I transcribe another note, bearing upon this subject.

"The words in Matt. xxvi. 64, translated *hereafter ye shall see*, and implying any future time, are, in the original  $\alpha\pi' \alpha\gamma\tau. \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota$ , henceforth ye shall see; as in Matt. xxiii. 39; xxvi. 29; Rev. xiv. 13. How were they to see him 'henceforth?' In the signs occurring at the crucifixion, resurrection, pentecost, &c., &c. In the corresponding text, Luke xxii. 69, the words, also translated *hereafter*, are, in the original,  $\alpha\pi\omicron \tau\omicron\upsilon \nu\upsilon\upsilon$ , literally, *from now*."

JUN 1 1999

*Acme*  
Bookbinding Co., Inc.  
300 Summer Street  
Boston, Mass. 02210





3 2044 052 82

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

TOWNLEY, Robert

AUTHOR

The second advent of the

TITLE

Lord Jesus Christ

Call Number

BT

885

.T6

the 1990s, the number of people in the UK who are aged 65 and over has increased from 10.5 million to 13.5 million, and the number of people aged 75 and over has increased from 4.5 million to 6.5 million (Office for National Statistics 2000).

There is a growing awareness of the need to address the needs of older people, and the need to ensure that the health care system is able to meet the needs of older people. The Department of Health (2000) has set out a strategy for the health care system to meet the needs of older people, and the Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people.

The Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people. The research agenda is based on the following principles: (1) to address the needs of older people; (2) to address the needs of the health care system; (3) to address the needs of the community; and (4) to address the needs of the nation.

The Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people. The research agenda is based on the following principles: (1) to address the needs of older people; (2) to address the needs of the health care system; (3) to address the needs of the community; and (4) to address the needs of the nation.

The Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people. The research agenda is based on the following principles: (1) to address the needs of older people; (2) to address the needs of the health care system; (3) to address the needs of the community; and (4) to address the needs of the nation.

The Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people. The research agenda is based on the following principles: (1) to address the needs of older people; (2) to address the needs of the health care system; (3) to address the needs of the community; and (4) to address the needs of the nation.

The Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people. The research agenda is based on the following principles: (1) to address the needs of older people; (2) to address the needs of the health care system; (3) to address the needs of the community; and (4) to address the needs of the nation.

The Health Service Research Unit (2000) has set out a research agenda for the health care system to meet the needs of older people. The research agenda is based on the following principles: (1) to address the needs of older people; (2) to address the needs of the health care system; (3) to address the needs of the community; and (4) to address the needs of the nation.