

THE KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD ARE BECOME THE

187
SECOND ADVENT LIBRARY.

NO. XVII.

APRIL 23, 1842.

LETTERS

ON THE

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST,

AND THE

CHARACTER OF HIS MILLENNIAL
KINGDOM:

TOGETHER WITH

A REPLY TO THE OBJECTIONS AND ARGUMENTS
OF REV. D. D. WHEDON.

BY REV. G. F. COX.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
14 Devonshire Street.

5½ Sheets. Postage—under 100 miles, 8¼ cts.; over 100, 13¾ cts.

AND THE SEVENTH ANGEL SOUNDED; AND THERE WERE GREAT VOICES IN HEAVEN, SAYING;

KINGDOMS OF OUR LORD, AND OF HIS CHRIST; AND HE SHALL REIGN FOREVER AND EVER.

DEPOT OF SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS,

14 DEVONSHIRE ST., OFFICE OF THE "SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

All communications relative to the *Signs of the Times*, and Publications on the Second Advent, should be addressed to JOSHUA V. HIMES, 14 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

Important Works

ON THE PROPHECIES OF THE SECOND ADVENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOR, JESUS CHRIST.

Miller on the Second Coming of Christ.—In one volume. This work contains nineteen Lectures; to which is added a Supplement, containing a Chronological Chart of the prophetic periods, with an explanation. Price 50 cents.

Miller's Life and Views—In one volume. This work contains a Sketch of Mr. Miller's Life, his Chronology, the Chart and Exposition, eleven new lectures, reviews, letters, &c. Price 50 cents.

Bible Student's Manual.—This work is compiled from Mr. Miller's works, designed for a pocket note-book and manual. It contains the Chart, Rules of Interpretation, &c., with blank paper, for notes. Price 25 cents.

An Address to the Public, and especially the Clergy, on the Near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth. By J. Litch. Price 25 cents.

No. I., Second Advent Report of General Conference, held in Boston, Oct. 14th, 15th, 1840. This is a very able and important document: it contains two discourses from Mr. Litch, on the Second Advent—Chronology of Prophecy. One from Rev. Henry Jones, on the Restoration of Israel. Two from Mr. Miller, on the Chronology of the Prophetic Periods—Judgment. One Discourse, in three parts, by H. D. Ward, on the Millennium. 174 pages. Price, 37 cents in boards, 25 cents in pamphlet.

No. II., Second Advent Report of General Conference, held in Lowell, June 15th, 16th, 17th, 1841. This is a very able and important document: it contains the Proceedings of the Conference, Circular Address, Dissertation on Christ's Second Coming, Signs of Christ's Second Coming quickly, by Rev. Henry Jones. The Kingdom of God on Earth at hand, the Fall of the Ottoman Empire, and Dissertation on the Millennium, by Rev. Josiah Litch. Price \$20 per hundred, and 25 cents single.

LETTERS

ON THE

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST,

AND THE

CHARACTER OF HIS MILLENNIAL KINGDOM :

TOGETHER WITH

A REPLY TO THE OBJECTIONS AND ARGU-
MENTS OF REV. D. D. WHEDON.

BY REV. G. F. COX.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
14 Devonshire Street.

1842.

P R E F A C E .

THE present, in whatever light we view it, is an age of investigation and inquiry; and many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increased. There are few subjects concerning which this is not true; but of none more true than the one of which the following letters treat. No publication, probably, which has appeared during the present age, has been the means of doing more than these letters, in the same length of time, to awaken public attention to the subject of the fulfilment of prophecy, and the speedy coming of the Lord Jesus Christ; *first*, from the known ability and influence of the author; *secondly*, by drawing out an opponent to his views, of distinguished ability—thus calling the public attention to the subject, in a manner no single individual could have done. *Finally*, the circulation of the letters has been beyond anything else which has appeared on the subject. The arguments here presented, on the character of the millennium, the two resurrections, and the everlasting duration of the kingdom of God on the new earth, are clear and conclusive, and cannot fail to satisfy the sincere and unprejudiced inquirer after truth. The remarks on the time, in the history of the Medo-Persian kings, for the commencement of the 2300 days or years of Daniel's vision, as also the NOTE at the end of letter VII., are worthy of attention, but especially the former.

The value of these letters, as an exhibition of the Second Advent doctrine and defence of its main positions, has induced the publisher to give them to the public in a more permanent form than in a newspaper, not only for the benefit of those who have never seen them in the papers, but also for those who, having given them a partial examination there, wish to review more carefully and consecutively the whole ground. With these remarks the letters are submitted to the candid perusal and consideration of the Christian public. And I cannot believe that they can be read by the humble Christian without profit; especially the controversial portion of them, which breathes a spirit of kindness worthy of the imitation of all Christians who engage in a public discussion. The letters were evidently written in view of the solemn truth that the end of all things is at hand; and that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. May the Lord render them a blessing to thousands, by preparing them for that day.

JOSIAH LITCH.

Boston, April, 1842.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
No. I.—Character of the Millennium—Opinions of the Christian Fathers,	5
No. II.—Argument from the Bible,	14
No. III.—The Kingdom of God and First Resurrection,	26
No. IV.—Return of the Jews,	36
No. V.—The New Heavens and Earth the Christian's Heaven,	43
No. VI.—Difficulties in dating Prophetic Times,	48
No. VII.—Time of the Millennium,	56
No. VIII.—Signs of the Second Advent near,	68
No. IX.—Reply to D. D. Whedon—Objections to his view,	76
No. X.—The Millennium—The unanswerable Argu- ment,	88
No. XI.—The Millennial Kingdom of Christ—D. D. Whedon,	90
No. XII.—The two Resurrections—D. D. Whedon,	103
No. XIII.—Incidental Objections examined and an- swered,	116

CHARACTER OF THE MILLENNIUM.

[No. I.]

MR. EDITOR,—Shall I be allowed to express a few thoughts that have occurred to me on the subject of the millennium? I do this the more readily, because, as yet, you have said but little in your columns upon the subject. And yet you are aware that the question is canvassed with great interest in both this and the old world.

A blissful period has been before the eye of the church for two thousand years. Nay, more—it was looked for by the Jews in most of their interpretations of the prophets; and it has been looked for more or less steadily by the church ever since that period. It fired the martyr as he went to the stake, and sustained the more private Christian, in the hour of heavy persecution, with the hope of “a better resurrection,” and which would give an ample return for all their sufferings. But to the point at issue.

I think that the majority of Christians will take one or other of the following positions,

if they take any at all on the subject; namely, that the millennium will be either,

1. Nothing more than the universal diffusion of the gospel, accompanied with great prosperity in earthly things; and the conversion of most of the Jews that may at that time be alive, and, perhaps, with their return to Palestine: or,

2. That it shall be ushered in by the personal appearance of the Son of God; the resurrection of the *just*; the "sitting" or commencement of the judgment in some form, and the renovation of the earth by fire, or the new heavens and the new earth; and the establishment of Christ's everlasting kingdom on earth, which becomes the *final* abode of the blessed.

I know other views have obtained: but I judge all who canvass the subject, will embrace, from necessity, one or other of the above views. There will be but little half-way matter about it. To the one or the other, all, as I think, *must* yield.

I adopt the last of these views; and, with your indulgence, I will give you some reasons that have conducted me to this conclusion.

1. And, first, I remark, that sentiments similar to the last-named obtained in the church very generally during the first three centuries of the Christian era. Indeed, from the second epistle to the Thessalonians, it is demonstrable that some expected the revela-

tion of the Lord Jesus Christ with the associate circumstances—this millennium—in their day; but in the *time* of the event they were mistaken, and were, in the second epistle of Paul to the church named, corrected by the apostle. The doctrine, however, of the personal appearance of Christ, with the setting up of his kingdom ON THE EARTH, after its renovation, spread throughout the church during this period, and very generally obtained credence. And Gibbon without question is correct in his statement, and records merely a matter of Roman history, when he says, that the idea of Christ's personal appearance, and reign, and speedy coming, was prevalent throughout the Roman empire among Christians during the first centuries. And Bishop Watson doubtless attempted too much when he essayed to wrest this argument from him. What if this view did contribute to the spreading of Christianity, and hasten the decline of the Roman Empire? May not God speak of "things that are not as though they were? One day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." If the Spirit of God saw such an event ahead a thousand years, or two thousand years, he might speak of it as "at hand," and trespass not upon the use of language common to the prophets. Do what we will, we must come to this conclusion, if we allow consistency to all or either of the books

of the New Testament. It is the very language of St. John. All he saw was "shortly to come to pass," "at hand," "quickly;" and yet his events reach, as all admit, to the resurrection of the dead.

But if this sentiment did not obtain throughout the Roman empire, why did the Emperor Domitian (A. D. 80—96) become alarmed, and send for some of the relatives of our Lord, in the line of David, and inquire of them what kind of a kingdom they expected, and when it would be? And why were his fears somewhat abated when he was told by them that it was not a "terrestrial kingdom, but celestial, and that its time was the *end of the world?*"—not regarding, as says the narrator, "the kingdom which was to come," if he might be allowed to have that which is now here.

Now, it is at least probable, that the great *outlines* of this doctrine that thus spread among Christians, were the result of apostolic preaching and writing, and of course *true*. Thus we argue in all points when we lean upon the fathers. We cannot argue that it is true in *detail*—for it were an easy task to mix error with truth—but its grandest features were probably from Christ and the apostles. But if its broader features were from them, as they must be to have obtained so early, they furnish a conclusion fatal to the idea of any other millennium than

that which connects with it the personal advent of the Son of God.

But, to make this reason valid, I remark, in the second place, that this was the view taken of it by the apostolic fathers. They connected with the millennium the personal appearance of Christ; and, therefore, their views were fatal to the ground first named.

I begin with Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, and a martyr—remarking that Bishop Watson's suggestion of him can have no force, because the views of Papias are sustained by the whole council of Nice.* Papias, of the first century, and one who attended on the ministry of St. John the "Elder," taught, "that Jesus Christ was to appear on earth, and there to reign with his saints for the space of a thousand years in great glory." Papias says of himself, in his book called the Explanation of the words of the Lord, as St. Jerome gives us an account of it, (De Script. Eccles.) "that he did not follow various opinions, but had *the apostles* for his *authors*; and that he considered what Andrew, what Peter said, what Philip, what Thomas, and other disciples of the Lord; as also what Aristian, and John the Senior, *disciples of the Lord*, what they *spake*; and that he did not profit so much by reading books as by the *living voice of these persons*."

* Nor can those of Eusebius; for he did not intend to rebuke the doctrine received by the Nicene fathers.

The testimony of Irenæus is very clear. He was bishop of Lyons, in France, and was one of the best Christian writers of the second century. Irenæus was a disciple of the venerable Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John; both of whom were doubtless influenced, the one by the writings, the other by the personal testimony of St. John. Irenæus testifies, in reference to the "times of Christ's kingdom," that "the just, *rising from the dead shall reign*; and nature, *renewed and set at liberty*, shall yield abundance of all things, being blessed with the dew of heaven, and great *fertility of the earth*, according as has been related by those ecclesiastics who *saw St. John*, the disciple of Christ, and heard from him *what our Lord taught* concerning those times." And Irenæus argues the point from the promise which Isaac made to Jacob, which promise he thought was not fulfilled in the patriarch's lifetime; and is therefore yet to come to him in this world, new made.

Justin Martyr, who was beheaded at Rome, A. D. 165, and who is reputed to have been sound in the faith, and well prepared to write, says, in his Dialogue with Tryphon the Jew, "that a certain man among us Christians, by name John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation made to him, did prophesy that the faithful believers in Christ should *live a thousand years in the new Jerusalem*, and *after that*

should be the general resurrection and judgment." And he quotes, to prove the same doctrine, the 65th chapter of Isaiah; Ezekiel is also quoted as consenting to it, and Peter in Acts iii. 21. And he gives this as the faith of *all the Orthodox Christians of his day*.

I will only add to the above the testimony of the Nicene Council, which had its session at Nice, in Bithynia, A. D. 325, and consisted of over three hundred bishops—combining all the wisdom of Africa, Europe, and Asia, in the Christian church. "In their ecclesiastical forms or constitutions, in the chapter about the providence of God, and about the world, they thus speak:—The world was made meaner, or less perfect, providentially; for God foresaw that man would sin. Wherefore we expect *new heavens and a new earth*, according to the Holy Scriptures, *at the appearance and kingdom of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ*. And *then*, as Daniel says, (chap. vii. 18,) the saints of the Most High *shall take the kingdom*, and the *earth* shall be pure, holy, the *land of the living*, not of the dead. Which David, foreseeing by the eye of faith, cries out, (Psalm xxvii. 13,) *I believe to see the good things of the Lord in the land of the living*. Our Savior says, happy are the meek, for they shall inherit the *earth*. And the prophet Isaiah says, (chapter xxvi. 6,) "The feet of the meek and lowly shall tread upon it."

If the great outlines of the above views, therefore, were derived from the apostles, as these witnesses testify, then there is no millennium, unless it be connected with a new heaven and a new earth, or with the personal appearance of Christ and the resurrection of the just; and the identification of *either of these events* renders the testimony fatal to the theory of a merely earthly millennium, and confirms the views adopted by the writer of this article. Papias witnesses to the whole doctrine—all its principal features; Irenæus to the “rising of the just,” “reigning of the saints,” and “renewing of the earth;” Justin Martyr to the new Jerusalem, the thousand years, and *after that* the general judgment. The three hundred bishops at the council of Nice witness to the “appearance of Christ,” his “kingdom being set up on earth,” according to Daniel—to the new heavens and earth, and that the earth shall be the *inheritance* of the saints, and also to the meaning of Isaiah lxxv. So that, if the fathers may decide the question, we remark again, we can have no merely earthly millennium. And here let us ask, if the church for the last century has not been falling into the error of the ancient Jews: they expected an earthly prince—we an earthly millennium; whereas prophets and apostles were looking for a “city out of sight, whose builder and maker is God”—that is, a “heavenly kingdom.”

The doctrine that there was no millennium, but "at the resurrection of the just," and in connection with the "new heavens and earth," and at Christ's coming, has been *in the church*, irrespective of sect, from the above dates to the present; and it has been advocated by some of the brightest ornaments—by some of the profoundest minds, by men as deeply learned as any that have adorned her history. And now we ask the reader, if it be not an argument of some weight in favor of a doctrine, if it have dwelt in the church from the days of the apostles, through the lapse of eighteen hundred years, amid all the storms of that period that have rent her bosom; and that it has to sustain it, the apostolic fathers—so great a witness as the council of Nice, embracing three hundred clergymen of the highest order, and among whom was concentrated all the wisdom of the church in Asia, Europe, and Africa—and to which we might add, since that day, the testimony of a host of others? Let the reader judge. The next argument will be from the Bible.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Me.

[No. II.]

ARGUMENT FROM THE BIBLE.

MR. EDITOR,—Before proceeding to the argument from the Bible, it may be well to spend a moment in suggesting some practical tendencies of the doctrine I advocate. This is done to obtain a less prejudiced hearing.

If Christ's personal appearing and the new heavens and earth are circumstances attending the *true millennium*, doubtless the event is not a remote one, but may be expected, in the language of St. Clement, "every hour," and is now, emphatically, "at hand," "even at our doors."

One of the first impressions such an event should make upon the heart is, to lessen our attachment to this world; our worldly-mindedness should cease, and we should "seek for the kingdom of God and his righteousness," with the conviction that all things of a worldly nature necessary would be added to us.

Another tendency is, and should be, to give vigor to every *benevolent enterprise*. As we should "hasten to the coming of the day of God," so we should hasten to every work pertaining to it; "pulling the sinner as a brand from the burning," and doing by every sinner, every friend and foe, as the angel did to Lot in his escape from Sodom. We should drive the car of missions as if

we had but a short time to complete our work in; we should work as in the time of harvest; work as for life; "whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might;" for we may not have passed the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come. "Let every man" at once "break off his sins by righteousness, and his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor."

Another thought. The bright features of that "world to come," "whereof we speak," may cheer us, delight us, win us to duty, and fix our affections upon it, instead of this world. And who, I ask, would not desire to see it, and see it now? And may we not test our character, even in ascertaining whether we prefer the *present world* to such a state—such a heaven? Alas, for us, how many prefer misery here to a state thus glorious! But to the argument from the Bible.

If the millennial state is anywhere spoken of, it is to be found in Daniel ii. 34, 35, and 44, 45. He says, "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image *upon his feet*, that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. *Then* was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces *together*, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the *wind carried them away*, that *no place was found for them*; and the stone that smote the image became a *great mountain, and filled the whole earth.*"

This is the dream; the interpretation is—“*And in the days of these kings,*” signified, as I understand it, by the “ten toes,” or “feet,” “shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people,”—they shall have no power over it,—“*but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.*” “And I saw, and behold, one like the Son of man *came with the clouds of heaven,* and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him *dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages* should serve him; his *dominion,*” triumph, or rule, “is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed;” (Dan. vii. 13, 14.) Isaiah intimates, on the same subject, (chap. xxxiii.) that there we shall “see the King in his beauty,” and that “Zion, the city of our solemnities,” and “Jerusalem” (the church) shall become “a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be *taken down*; not one of the stakes thereof shall *ever be removed*, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. But *there* the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of *broad rivers and streams*; wherein shall go no galley with oars,” no warlike implement whatever, “neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is”

there "our Judge, the Lord is our Law-giver," like unto Moses, "the Lord is our King; he will save us." "And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick; the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity."

Now, Mr. Editor, it strikes me, if we can argue at all from these Scriptures, and they appear very plain, we may determine from them, with *certainty*, that the kingdom which God will set up "in the days of these kings," or in the latter days, shall be of such a character as, 1. *To exclude all other kingdoms*, all other "lawgivers," so that all others shall be as the "chaff of the summer threshing-floors"—"no place shall be found for them." If this be true, the kingdom of the devil *cannot be there*. Neither can his works be there; for to the existence of his works, his presence in the sense intended is essential. The devil can rule in no nation; for "*all people, and nations, and tongues,*" serve Christ. He can rule in no heart, for *no place* is found for adverse kingdoms. *They* are destroyed. There can be then, as I judge, no *unrenewed heart*; for this has been essentially the devil's empire in this world.

2. These Scriptures testify, also, that this kingdom shall be both *universal* and *perpetual*. It shall stand *forever*, and shall not be left to other people; all opposing power is withdrawn, or destroyed. It is universal,

for it “fills the whole earth.” “And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, *under the whole heaven*, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom, and *all dominions shall serve and obey him*.” So permanent, indeed, is this reign of the saints, that “the tabernacle shall not be taken down” for a journey to any other country; nay, “*not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed*.” There can be no backsliding, therefore—“not a cord shall be broken, not a stake ever be removed;” nor short or long apostasy after a thousand years; but all as immutable as immortality.

3. Another characteristic is, the millennial state excludes *war* and *death*. They “shall learn war no more.” The church shall war no more, as she did in the wilderness, or in Canaan. For “there shall be no Canaanite in the land.” And of the church it shall be said, “her warfare is accomplished.” And there shall pass through her no more the unclean forever. Nor shall individuals war any more. And from hence may we not judge that every “lust” shall cease, from which war springs? (James iv. 1.) And the inhabitants shall not say, “I am sick,”—from wounds, or aught else; for they “shall not *hurt* nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of God, as the

waters cover the sea." And "death," our great destroyer, "shall be swallowed up in victory." Isaiah says, expressly, (Isa. xxv. 6—8,) "*In this mountain;*" the one of which Daniel subsequently speaks as filling the whole earth; and the one called by another prophet, "the mountain of the house of the Lord," to be established upon the tops of the mountains; "in this mountain He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away all tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off *all* THE EARTH; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

4. Another feature of the millennium is, there is to be "one Shepherd," "one fold," and the watchmen are to see "eye to eye." "One King shall be king to them all. And David, my servant, shall be king over them, and they shall have one Shepherd." "And Judah, and the children of Israel his companions; Joseph, and Ephraim, and *all* the house of Israel his companions, shall be *ONE*;" as so many "sticks joined into one stick;" (Ezekiel xxxvii.) And the *several parts of the stick* referred to by Ezekiel, and the "bones" in the valley, "or plain" of vision, appear to be but one and the same thing, under different emblems, and are, therefore, said to be "*the whole house of Israel*;" that is to say, *all* believers; the good of all nations, people, and tongues; all the true Israel: for he is not a Jew who is one out-

wardly—neither are they all Israel who are of Israel: but the prophet plainly intimates that no distinction is then to be made between Joseph, Ephraim, and Judah, but all are to be one.

Now Christ represents that “*He* is the true shepherd.” All that came before him were not shepherds. He also represents to us that when he spake he had *two folds*; and that the time would come when there would be but “*one fold, and one shepherd*;” (John x.)—the very language of the prophet Ezekiel. I know not how to apply this language as interpreted by commentators generally; for there are as much two folds *now* as then, unless every Jew since then perish eternally. Nor even then can it be fully understood. I therefore judge the passage to refer primarily to the gathering of the Jewish and Gentile believers of every age, “in the fulness of time,” into one fold, or the gathering of the whole house of Israel—not a part it—into the new heavens and earth. And, therefore, it indicates rather the “gathering” from the “grave” and from the “living” all that are in Christ: or, to use the language of St. Paul, I think God has here “made known to us the mystery of his will, which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might *gather together in ONE all things in Christ, BOTH* which are *in heaven*, and which are *on earth*, even in him;” (Eph. i.)

And the "Holy Spirit of promise," he continues, "is the earnest," or pledge, "of our inheritance, *until the redemption* of the [this] purchased possession."

5. Another feature in the millennial state is, that the will of God is to be done "*on earth* as it is in heaven." This will probably be conceded on all hands, from the prayer put into the mouth of every disciple of Jesus, "Let thy kingdom *come*; thy will be done *on earth* as it is in heaven." Such a state would be a blissful one indeed; but it cannot take place while man, in his moral nature, is organized as he now is. From our present structure, children are born with an *unholy nature*, so that their tendency is wholly evil. And however holy a parent may be, he can no more transmit his *acquired* moral feelings than he can his education. Take a scion from an apple tree and engraft it upon a thorn, and the scion will bear apples; but if you sow the seed from the apple thus raised, the product will be a *thorn*, possessed of all the elements of the old, uncultivated, unsubdued thorn. And while children have unholy natures from their birth, it is *impossible* that the will of God should be done on earth *as it is in heaven*. But a greater difficulty would arise from the present structure of man in his own case. Such is his present imbecility, that he, from *necessity*, commits error; and however holy he has become, from these errors, and con-

sequent regret and shame, he has never been freed. We need a heavenly state, to do the will of God as it is in heaven. We need a new heavens and earth. *Such* a one may God grant, in answer to the prayer of the church, shall soon come!

6. The kingdom of God, when spoken of in the sense of the millennium, was always expected *suddenly*, in the twinkling of an eye, and as yet *future*. So the disciples expected: so the ancient fathers anticipated. After the resurrection of Christ, and after the disciples had felt the kingdom of grace in their hearts, they said unto him, "Wilt thou *at this time* restore the kingdom to Israel?" And this, from the answer, was evidently his future kingdom of which they spake. "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is *nigh at hand*." In the last passage, the term "kingdom" cannot mean his spiritual kingdom, for that *had come*; but this was not to come until the signs predicted had taken place, which have not all come to pass yet. Nor could it mean the establishment of the Christian church on the day of Pentecost, for the same reason. And no stretch of charity, I think, can place it upon the head of the destruction of Jerusalem; that heap of unaccountables, where commentators have cast everything, the top-stone itself, when they saw no other place for what they regarded as rubbish, or which

was to them unknown. "The kingdom that was to come" was different from the occurrences abovenamed. It was the same kingdom for which the thief looked when upon the cross. It was the kingdom for which the patriarchs and apostles looked; theirs was a city *out of sight*—a "heavenly one, whose builder and maker is God."

And to add no other characteristics—several of which come to our hand—I would ask the reader if he can persuade himself that the above description of the millennium, (and most of the passages quoted can apply to no other event primarily,) will ever be realized with the present organized state of man or the world? It seems to me demonstrable, that if the millennium have connected with it the above attributes, it *cannot* take place in *time*, properly so called. We must look to a new heaven and new earth, wherein from necessity dwelleth righteousness, and the immediate presence of the great Shepherd himself to be the light and joy thereof. Such an event alone can justify the sacred writers in the language they use.

Let us review these passages a moment. "One shepherd," "one fold," "eye to eye." Can this take place while man has his present *head*? *Can* we think alike? Were we to have apostolic times and miracles, could we think alike? Did not Paul and Barnabas contend? Was not their contention so

sharp that *they parted asunder*? Is such a state "eye to eye," even under the fulness of the Holy Ghost? Did not the apostolic Christians have divisions—one of Paul, another of Cephas, another of Christ? Was not *Christ* divided among them? Was this one shepherd, any more than in the days of Judah, or Joseph, or Ephraim, or Israel? Was Peter sanctified? Was Paul? Did it make them see eye to eye? Look at other characteristics.

"From whence come *wars* among you? Come they not from hence, even your *lusts*, that war against the soul?" Can we be free from these lusts *universally*, while man is ushering into life every moment with a heart un sanctified, depraved? Man is at war with God by nature; he is "at enmity with him." And how can it be said, in such a state, that Christ's kingdom is *universal*? Is not the kingdom of darkness inseparably connected with all unrenewed hearts? Then, verily, a new estate must pass upon man before God's will can be done by him *universally*, as it is done in heaven; a radical change must pass upon him first; such a one as stamps his being with *immortality*. Can we be in such a state as not to *backslide in time*? Would not such a state imply an end of probation? Not a stake can be removed, not a cord broken, in that day. Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the *first resurrection*;

on such the *second death* hath no power. Hence his state is a changeless one. He that is holy shall be holy still; and he that is unholy is unholy still. There is to be *no war*, I repeat again. But *warfare* is essential to a probationary state. And to belittle the passages excluding war, to mean outside of the church, is not to allow it its full force. The *church* is to war no more, and the *world* is to know it no more forever. Again; there is to be no death, no sickness, no crying, no sorrow. This, of necessity, also excludes *pain*. But pain is essential to man, as he now is. Can we be free from sorrow where the child or parent dies? Whatever may be the state of the soul in holiness, will it not weep over the grave of infancy or gray hairs? But if death be here, then the kingdom is not Christ's; "for death is to be swallowed up in victory." No, verily; if death is yet to spread its mantle over us, and shroud us in its icy folds, what have we more than we have had since Enoch walked with God three hundred years?

G. F. COX.

Portland, Nov., 1841.

[No. III.]

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND FIRST RESURRECTION.

IN the preceding articles, it has been shown that the millennium looked for by the early fathers of the church, and by all the orthodox Christians in the days of Justin Martyr, and all the clergy so late as the Council of Nice, was such a millennium as embraced in it the personal appearing and reign of Christ, the new heavens and new earth, and a permanent and universal reign of the saints *with* Christ upon the earth. It has also been shown from the Bible that those passages usually relied on to prove a millennium of *any character*, point evidently to a period and a state in which,—

1. All other kingdoms, and of necessity their works, will be destroyed, so that no other kingdom or adverse power can be left upon the earth.

2. It has been shown that this kingdom of Christ will be *perpetual*, everlasting, “forever, even forever and ever.”

3. That this kingdom excludes “warfare” to the church and individuals, and “war” from the world.

4. That death is destroyed in that kingdom, or is swallowed up in victory.

5. That there will be ONE FOLD and ONE SHEPHERD, in a sense that has never yet ex-

isted, and in a sense that cannot exist with the present organized state of man.

6. God's will is to be done in that kingdom AS IT IS IN HEAVEN—in EARTH AS IN HEAVEN.

I now add to this view two characteristics more, viz., that the millennium state includes *a* resurrection from the dead, and *a* coming of Christ. And if this resurrection and coming of Christ can be proved to be connected with the millennium—and also that it is a literal resurrection and a literal coming of Christ—it settles the question. On this point I remark, St. John saith expressly, “they *lived* and *reigned* with Christ a thousand years:” and adds, that “this is the *first* resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first resurrection. On such the second death hath no power.” Paul saith, “The dead in Christ shall rise *first*.” These expressions imply inevitably a reigning *with* Christ, never *yet* enjoyed by a saint *after death*. Some change evidently passes upon them, here called “rising from the dead”—“living with Christ,” &c. Nor has any man yet enjoyed such a reigning with Christ on earth. By referring to the 6th chapter of Revelation, we get a clue to the truth in the case. It is there said, *prior* to the reign just spoken of, that John saw these “souls under the altar,” and they cried with a *loud voice*, saying, “How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on

the earth? And it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, *until* their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be *killed* as they were, should be fulfilled." But in the instance of the millennium, "*all* that were beheaded," and had not worshipped the beast, "LIVED and reigned with Christ," as they did not while *dead* and crying with a loud voice. But they lived, and in this reign they all meet, "fellow-servants and martyrs;" which demonstrably it appears they did not do by simply dying and going to Christ, nor till they *lived* again—that is, were raised from the grave. And this resurrection is directly made, by John, the millennium or thousand years. It is further said, "*The rest of the dead lived not* till the thousand years were finished." These saints, therefore, must have been of *the dead*; and there were yet others of the *dead* that did not live. It follows, I think, that this must have been a *literal resurrection of the dead*. And inasmuch as no such event can take place till the end of the world, the millennium must be deferred to the same period. But that the apostle John cannot mean a moral resurrection is certain—1. Because the second death hath no power over those raised. This can be said of no one in a probationary state. 2. They who rise are "of the dead," and therefore rise from the dead. But a *saint cannot* rise from a moral death;

for he *is* holy—he *is* risen already. Sinners may rise from a moral death, but a saint cannot. He is already quickened. 3. Their *souls* lived and reigned with Christ. Now all that a soul can have, which is already in Paradise with Christ, is its body; this, and this alone, completes its happiness. And it does not help the case to say, they are to reign in another world—for their bodies must come from this—and it is to the resurrection of the just that we are looking. If, then, these souls were desiring the completion of their happiness, and crying out, How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge us?—and if nothing can be added to the completion of a soul's happiness but a resurrection of the body in glory—and if, when they attain to this resurrection, they are blessed and happy, and the second death hath no power over them—it is demonstrable the blessing they enjoyed was the first resurrection, and a *literal one*. The text further states, in this resurrection, that the saints are WITH Christ. This cannot be said of any saint on earth. The saint on earth is *in* Christ, but not with him. Nor can he be with Christ, unless he either goes to Christ, or Christ comes to him. And as the saints already dead are *not with him* in the sense of the text, it must refer to another event, when Christ will be with them; and as there is but one other when this can take place, it plainly follows it is a literal resur-

rection, when Christ and his people will be forever united; when it may truly be said, "Happy and holy is he that hath a part in the first resurrection."

The millennium is also to be connected with a coming of Christ. This we have proved was expected by the early fathers. And to the same point the prophets bear witness. Thus Daniel, in the seventh chapter, referring to the kingdom which the God of heaven was to set up "in the days of these kings," says, "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like unto the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven—and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that *all people*, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." And this "kingdom shall be given to the saints of the Most High, *under the whole heaven.*" I think it will be conceded also, generally, that the event noticed in Matt. xxiv. 30, is identical with that of Daniel. The words of Matthew are nearly a quotation from Daniel; and the circumstances are so very similar that we cannot, without violating just rules of interpretation, separate them. Matthew says, "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." Daniel says he saw one like unto the Son of man, coming with the clouds

of heaven; and a kingdom was given to him; possessed of which there must have been both power and great glory. St. John represents Christ as with his people in the millennium; indeed, they are apparently joined with him in the government. St. Paul, in quoting a text from Isaiah, evidently associates the coming of Christ with the millennium also. *Then*, he says, *shall be brought to pass* the saying, Death is swallowed up in victory. *When?* "When this mortal shall have put on immortality, and this corruption, incorruption," which certainly must be at Christ's coming to raise the just; as he says in another place, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise *first*. And that Isaiah refers to the millennium, and can refer to nothing else, any one may perceive who will read his 25th chapter entire. And the apostle has shown, by the quotation above, that the event is also connected with both the resurrection and Christ's coming with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God.

But as the reader may still doubt, the question may be proposed still, are you sure that Daniel, Matthew and St. Paul all harmonize in the same event? I answer, although I allow that other events *may* be regarded as the coming of Christ, in a very subordinate

sense, in a few places in the New Testament, yet there are but two events that in a primary and leading sense can be so called—his incarnation, and his second coming to judge the world. And the isolated passages are so few and dubious, that no doctrine can be built upon them. In a matter of criticism, we must refer to one or the other of the obvious events. And particularly should we do this as the two primary events are so guarded and surrounded as not to be mistaken. Every passage, therefore, embracing the coming of Christ, should be referred to one of these leading events, unless the circumstances evidently require another reference. Now the event spoken of in the texts quoted, could not mean his first coming, because the saints did not then possess the kingdom under the whole heaven; and the passages in the New Testament were not then uttered. They could not refer to the day of Pentecost, for the same reasons. Paul, John and Peter also spoke of his coming, long after the Pentecost. They could not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem; for death was not then swallowed up in victory—nor did the saints put on incorruption—nor did Christ then come in the clouds of heaven—nor did the saints then possess the kingdom under the whole heaven—nor did he come with power and great glory, and with *all* the holy angels with him. But if there are but two events that

can be called the coming of Christ in a primary sense, and it cannot be the first, *it must be the last*—when he comes at the resurrection of the just. This last event exactly *answers the description, and no other event does*. I ask, then, can a serious man be at a loss for the truth upon this subject? And the above interpretation appears the more certain, because the Holy Ghost, in the mouth of St. Paul, witnesses that “His SECOND COMING shall be without sin unto salvation, to them that look for him.” Now his *second* coming, it is said, is without a sin-offering. So the text reads. He comes a second time, not to atone—not to expiate guilt; there is then no more a season of grace or mercy. That door is closed. The Master hath risen from the mercy-seat, and shut to the door! Again, when he comes a second time, he comes to salvation—perfect as I understand it—to all that look for him—all his children, living or dead. The same event is referred to by John, (xiv.)—“I will come *again*,” or a second time, “and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.” And that the disciples understood this coming to be his second advent, is evident from the fact, that when Christ said to one of them, “If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?” they understood by it, if that disciple did tarry till he came, he should never *die*. “Then went this saying abroad, that

that disciple should not die. Yet Christ said not, he shall not die, but *if I will*, that he tarry till I come." And I scarcely know of a place in the gospels where his coming is mentioned, but what his second coming is referred to. When he referred to the sacrament—"Do this till I come"—he could have referred to no other.

But not to mention more at the present time, take another view of the subject. His *second* coming—he shall come a *second time*. Now if Christ came *first* to be incarnated—if he came again at the Pentecost—and yet again at the destruction of Jerusalem—and yet once more at the victory of Constantine—then his second coming is not without a sin-offering, but *with* one. And when he comes without a sin-offering to judge the world, it will be his third coming, fourth coming, or fifth coming, as our fancy may lead us. But this cannot be. The Holy Ghost testifies his *last* is his second coming. So ought we to do. But in this way we identify the language we have quoted as pointing out in connection both his second coming and the millennium as one and the same event—"at his appearing and his kingdom."

Although I think I have demonstrated beyond a doubt, that we can have no millennium but in connection with the second coming of Christ, a literal resurrection, and a new heavens and new earth,—yet I will

refer to one more fact in the case. That such a state of the church as has been hoped for, and prophesied of, cannot come in this world as now organized, is certain, because Christ has said, "Let the tares grow TILL the harvest; and the harvest is the end of the world. The tares are the children of the wicked one; and he that sowed them is the devil." But Christ says, Let these grow with the *good seed*, "together" with them—till the end of the world. But if the children of the wicked one are to grow with the righteous, what kind of a millennium can we have, more than we now have, till the heavens be no more? John says, in the millennium the "*rest of the dead lived not*"—the wicked *lived not*—"till the thousand years were finished." But Christ says, "Let them both grow together till the end of the world." Now, then, it is certain, if the millennium *excludes* the wicked, as John testifies; if blessed and *holy is he* that hath a part in the first resurrection; and if the wicked are to grow till the end of the world with the righteous—we cannot have a millennium in this world, till it is burned up, and that great event comes when Christ will gather out of his kingdom *all things* that offend, and *them* which do iniquity. Can demonstration be clearer?

The whole Papal power, too, with its harlot abominations, is to remain till the same event occurs, whom the Lord shall

destroy with the brightness of his coming. The words of the prophet are, "I beheld, and the same horn *made war* with the saints, and prevailed against them, UNTIL the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the *time came that the saints possessed the kingdom*. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, was given to the people of the saints of the Most High whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and *all dominions shall serve and obey him*." Amen—even so, come Lord Jesus.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Dec., 1841.

[No. IV.]

RETURN OF THE JEWS.

As what is usually termed the "return of the Jews to the land of Palestine," or ancient Canaan, as a nation, is yet confidently expected by many—and as the promise of their return, under some circumstances, might be urged as an objection to the views of the millennium adopted by me, I will bestow the present article to the consideration of that subject. The ground I

assume is, *That no return of the Jews, as a nation, to the land of Palestine is promised in the Scriptures, other than what has already taken place.*

1. The first argument offered in proof of the ground assumed, is the opinion of Taylor, Rennell, and *Calmet*, that "the main body of the Jews were never deported from their own country; they that were carried away being only a small portion of them; and that when the Jews returned from Babylon, after the fall of the Chaldean or Assyrian empire, those of the *ten tribes* who were pleased to, returned with the tribes of Judah and Benjamin; so that the ten tribes, as a distinct people, do not now exist." Among the reasons offered for this opinion is the fact, that nearly a hundred years after the captivity of the ten tribes by Shalmaneser, Josiah, king of Judah, not only purged Judah and Jerusalem from idolatry, but went in person to the cities of Manasseh—west of Jordan—Ephraim, Simeon, and even to Naphtali, "throughout all Israel," and did the same great work; which he could not have done, had not these tribes been there, at least a part of them. And it may be seen, also, that when Zerubbabel returned, there are mentioned as going with him other tribes than those of Benjamin and Judah. Also, under the Maccabees, and in the time of our Saviour, Palestine was peo-

pled by the *Israelites* of all the tribes indifferently.

2. It should be recollected that *all* the prophets who have been supposed to predict the return of the Jews, lived and uttered their prophecies *prior* to the return of the Jews from Babylon; so that all the predictions referred to *may have* been fulfilled already, as far as they can be in an earthly sense. The return from Babylon took place B. C. 457; but Isaiah prophesied B. C. 760 to 706; Jeremiah from B. C. 629 to 588; Ezekiel, B. C. 595 to 574; Daniel, B. C. 606 to 534; Hosea, 785; Joel, 785; Amos, 787; Obadiah, 587; Jonah, 862; Micah, 720; Nahum, 720; Habakkuk, 626; Zephaniah, 630; Haggai, 520; Zechariah, 520; Malachi, 400; so that whatever Ezekiel may have said of the return of the Jews, or what any other prophet may have said—all may have been fulfilled when the Jews went from Babylon and other places to their own country; for, it will be recollected, when Cyrus issued his decree, his kingdom was immense, and embraced Assyria. He testifies that “God had given him all the kingdoms of the earth.” And the dominions of Artaxerxes Longimanus, who issued the decree of liberty for the Jews, B. C. 457, were not less than the dominions of Cyrus. This is stated to show that the Jews, universally, had liberty to return, if they

wished, wherever they may have been scattered. And they did actually return—vast numbers of them at least—built their temple again, and enjoyed more or less prosperity till Christ came, who was its glory and end.

3. Does not the return of the Jews to Palestine, to build up again their temple, conflict with express declarations of the gospel, and otherwise appear absolutely *absurd*? Think of it. Prophets raised up, and prophecies uttered over two thousand years beforehand, that the nation of the Jews shall return to Palestine, and build up Jerusalem so that it shall equal in magnificence Boston, or New York, or even London!—with a wonderful temple, in its structure, gold and other appendages—for what? Why, to worship God in—to worship the true God—the meek and lowly Jesus. How does such a theory look beside the plain Quaker—Methodist—Moravian? How does it look to any Christian? Yet such an idea is entertained—entertained in face of the express sayings of our blessed Lord; “The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father. And the hour *now is* when the *true* worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him.” And would not such a theory as we are contemplating—would not such a movement in the provi-

dence of God as the return of the Jews to their former land, accomplish the very thing which Christ came to destroy? He came to make both Jews and Gentiles ONE—to break down the middle wall of partition, and to make of the twain *one new man*. What conflicts with the plain testimony of the gospel cannot be true.

4. The fourth argument I offer is, that the Jews have no more title to Palestine than have the Gentiles; because the original promise to Abraham was a *general one*, and given *before circumcision*; “In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed.” It was given before circumcision, that he might be father of the Gentiles; and circumcision was added that he might be father of the Jews also. But the promise was given to both Jew and Gentile, through FAITH; and they only which be of FAITH are blessed with faithful Abraham. And this covenant of faith in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, could not disannul. 2. The promise was given to Abraham *in person*, and to *his seed*, which was *Christ*: unto thee and “to thy seed, will I give the land,” which seed, the apostle says, was Christ: “not to seeds as of many, but to thy seed, which is Christ.” But it will be recollected that neither Abraham nor Christ ever owned a foot of land in Canaan. Christ had not where to lay his head; and “to Abraham he gave none inheritance in it,

no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." But Abraham and others "died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth!" And "these things plainly declare that they sought another country"—one out of sight—whose builder and maker is God. For had they been mindful of that country from which they came out, they might have returned. But these things show plainly that what was promised to Abraham and to Christ, was a "heavenly kingdom," shadowed out by Canaan. For Abraham and Christ both became heirs of the world. Had even Joshua given the Israelites the *promised* land or rest, God would not afterward have spoken of another rest. But there remaineth yet a REST or Sabbath to the people of God. Now, whosoever "have been baptized into Christ, and have put on Christ, are children of God by faith." And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed*, and *heirs* ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE. I cannot illustrate the subject better than in the language of another, who has said the Bible speaks of "three habitable worlds." The first was given to Adam; the second to Noah, for he became heir of the world through faith; the third, through a figure,

was promised to Abraham. The first was before the flood; the second after the flood; the third is the new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, and to which all are heirs, joint-heirs, who have faith in Christ.

I conclude, then, if the land of Palestine was promised to Abraham and to Christ, neither of whom ever possessed it, they must either come back again to inherit it as it now is, or they are to possess it in its new and purified form under the new heavens and earth; either of which implies a resurrection, and at once confutes our hope of the carnal Jews' return, and establishes the truth that with the millennium there is connected the resurrection of the dead, and the presence of Abraham and Christ.

Let me conclude, then, by asking the reader if he does not join me in saying, if it be probable that the ten tribes were not, as a general thing, deported from their own country as captive; if they were permitted to return after the fall of the Assyrian empire, by Cyrus and succeeding princes; if the prophets who have predicted their return, prophesied before their return from Babylon; and if at the time they were restored from all the tribes, indifferently, and built their temple, and flourished in Jerusalem; if Christ came to break down the middle wall of partition—to break up the division between the Jews and Gentiles as

distinct nations; and if the original promise was never given to any but to Abraham and Christ, and to those who *believe* with Abraham; is it not probable that no restoration is intended in the Scriptures, other than what has already taken place, or may be claimed equally by the Jew and Gentile? Thus I judge, and thus I think the prophets testify.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Me., Dec., 1841.

[No. V.]

THE NEW HEAVENS AND EARTH THE CHRISTIAN'S HEAVEN.

OF the specific character of the millennium, further than we have advanced already, it will be difficult for us to speak with certainty. We have but few beacon lights to guide us. One thing, however, we think we have fixed without a reasonable doubt; namely, that the millennium spoken of in the Bible, cannot take place in the present organized state of the world, or of its inhabitants. Man must be new-made, and so must be the world he inhabits. Of this the Scriptures speak abundantly in all those places which are relied upon as pointing out a millennium. "Behold I create," says Isaiah, "new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not come into mind."

And this new heavens and new earth, he informs us in the succeeding chapter, shall REMAIN. And that Isaiah was speaking of the millennium, I think none will doubt. The event he speaks of cannot be transferred to any other region than the present earth new made; nor can the scene be withdrawn to a period this side its renovation. The language of the prophet will not bear it.

There is another fact settled. The new heavens and new earth are to be the *final* abode of the saints. This was the opinion of Mr. Wesley. This was the opinion of ancient fathers; and this the Scriptures confirm. Peter expressly declares, not only that there is to be a new heavens and new earth, but he holds out this as the HOPE of the church, which he could not do unless it were to be her children's, or their abode. "*We look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*" And Peter wrote his second epistle, that the disciples should not forget *this very promise*, though that promise seemed to be delayed. John also fully and gloriously points out the new heavens and earth as the final habitation of all the redeemed. And *where* this abode is to be, we gain additional light from the testimony of the four living creatures *who are before the throne*, and the four and twenty elders. Their united testimony declares it will be ON THE EARTH—and that it shall be inhabited by the *saints*, or by those

“washed in the blood of Christ, and made priests and kings unto God.” This I think unexceptionable testimony. Their exact language is, “And when he had taken the book, the four living creatures, and four and twenty elders *fell down* before the Lamb, having, *every one of them*, harps, and golden vials full of odors, *which are the prayers of the saints*. And *they* sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain and hast *redeemed* us to God by thy blood, out of *every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation*; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and WE shall REIGN ON EARTH.” Who these living creatures are we may easily learn from the fact that, 1. They worship God; therefore they must be *creatures*. 2. They were redeemed by the blood of Christ. They could not therefore be angels, for he taketh not hold on the nature of angels. They must therefore be the representatives of human creatures. 3. They will reign on earth. They without doubt represent, with the four and twenty elders, the Jewish and Christian church, and the redeemed from all nations. So they testify. “Thou hast redeemed us from every kindred, tongue and people.” And they are to reign on earth. No one would expect them to reign on earth as it now is; nor could they till they obtain their bodies, which would imply, at least, the resurrection of the

just. The "departed souls" also, which John "saw," if they differ from the above, (and he may intend to signify the martyrs by them,) are to be on earth also; for they are to live and reign with Christ. But in what sense can a departed soul live, unless it be to come back to life? It already lives with Christ in every sense in which it can without its resurrection body. To live, therefore, and to reign with Christ, implies its resurrection. And to reign with Christ, implies that Christ first reigns; and this he is to do in its full sense on the earth, the uttermost parts of which are his inheritance.

If the above two propositions are true, we have ground enough for our present purpose. There is to be a new heaven and a new earth. This cannot take place in time, properly so called. There is but one *new* heaven and earth spoken of, *after time*. That one is the abode of the saints. And *this* must be the one spoken of by the prophets, and by John, because the one they speak of *cannot take place* in time, and they speak of but one after time. This new heavens and new earth is also identified with the millennium, because the millennium of the prophets includes a new heavens and a new earth.

Taking our departure, therefore, here, we are safe, although our light were glimmering in the extreme. The new heavens and new earth is the Christian's heaven. Whatever that heaven contains, this contains.

Sure we are, *this* will contain the “redeemed of all nations.” This itself were enough, seemingly, to consummate bliss. But we superadd to it the presence of the Lamb. And it shall be said, too, “Behold the tabernacle of God is *with men*,” and he shall walk with them— *dwell with them*. And they shall hunger no more—thirst no more; for the Lamb shall feed them, and lead them to living fountains. And they shall never die. Perhaps angels will be there; for *these* also will God bring with him. But God will be its light, and glory, and joy. Hallelujah, indeed, it shall be said, when the Lord God in this sense reigneth. Something of its blessedness may be shadowed out in the following stirring lines of one of our hymns:—

“O what a mighty change
 Shall Jesus’s suff’rers know!
 While o’er the happy plains they range,
 Incapable of wo!
 No ill-requited love
 Shall there our spirits wound:
 No base ingratitude above;
 No sin in heaven is found!

There all our griefs are spent!
 There all our sorrows end:
 We cannot there the fall lament
 Of a departed friend!
 A brother dead to God,
 By sin, alas! undone!
 No father there, in passion loud,
 Cries, ‘O my son, my son!’

No slightest touch of pain,
 Nor sorrow’s least alloy,

Can violate our rest, or stain
 Our purity of joy!
 In that eternal day
 No clouds or tempests rise:
 There gushing tears are wiped away
 Forever from our eyes."

I will only add, that Mr. Wesley has an excellent sermon upon the new heavens and earth, with which I can heartily unite, and to which I refer the reader; simply remarking, it will be a place of RIGHTEOUSNESS. All things that offend will be taken from it, or rather not allowed to enter. The wicked shall not be there; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place—but it shall not be. "Without," in utter darkness, are the "unclean."

The next question will be the *time*.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Jan., 1842.

[No. VI.]

DIFFICULTIES IN DATING PROPHETIC TIMES.

MR. EDITOR:—I write in great haste. I have but little time to devote to the press. For the last four weeks I have scarcely had two hours that I could call my own. I have been out, too, in about every storm during that period. This must be my apology for not furnishing this article earlier. To-day I

have a few hours' leisure, and I devote them to the deeply-interesting subject of Christ's personal advent, or the true millennium. I promised in my last to discuss in the present article the TIME of that event. Let me say,

1. That I proceed upon the supposition that I am safe *if* I speak in apostolic language. I am safe, as is every minister of God, to speak as the oracles of God; hence I may say, "The end of *all things* is at hand"—"The coming of the Lord draweth nigh"—"The day of the Lord is at hand"—"He cometh quickly"—"shortly." In all this I must be safe, for I speak the language of the Holy Ghost. And with this *example* before me, I should demolish *every theory* that placed that event at a *distance*, especially the one that declares his coming to be a thousand years hence; as I take it for granted that the time of Christ's coming, if known at all, could *not be known* till just before his appearance: "Then *know ye* it is *nigh, even at your doors.*" But prior to the time of the end, conjecture must supply the place of knowledge.

2. I proceed on the supposition that all uninspired interpretations of the prophecies, *that are not in direct terms*, are, in a degree, *uncertain*, until fulfilled, and that this rule holds good particularly in the application of prophecy to the *time* of any specific event. That Christ was to be of the "seed of David," and to be "born in Bethlehem," were

prophecies in direct terms, and could not be mistaken. That in his time the lion and the lamb were to lie down together, was of darker import and could not be so easily determined.

3. I believe, nevertheless, that the time is pointed out specifically. This was the opinion of Mr. Wesley; and this was the opinion of Mr. Watson, who fixes the resurrection *at the end of the days* spoken of by Daniel. Mr. Wesley supposed not only that the time of the millennium was specified, but that the period of the day of judgment was revealed to St. John.* The fact, too, that *time is referred to*—and *the days* when time shall be *no longer*, numbered by both Daniel and John, and that all commentators have *thus* understood the subject, and many of them sought to find out the time, is proof enough that it is *there*; although many have shown by their efforts that it was but darkly shadowed out to them.

4. This leads me to remark, in the fourth place, that prophecy is so constructed, in most instances, as to have a *general bearing upon ALL periods, till* its fulfilment, when it is clearly seen *where* the prophet's eyes were fixed, and *to which it referred*. That the seed of the woman was to bruise the serpent's head, but it was to bruise his heel, was a prophecy to bear upon every period of the

* His note on Matt. xxiv.

time till fulfilled. That Christ was to come "*in the last days*" was a broad field also, and was thus given that the eye of the church might look upon *every* period of those days till he came, from first to last. This is the case with nearly all the prophecies relating to Christ's second coming. They were so constructed that the eye of the church has been constantly upon the look-out, in every age, from the days of the Apostles downward.

5. But I doubt not there are prophecies referring to Christ's second coming, so constructed that we may *know* that the end is *nigh*, even at our doors, although there may be circumstances attending them which would forbid us from fixing with *certainty* upon the *exact period*. This I judge to have been the case in the prophecies predicting the *time* of Christ's *first coming*; and this I judge to be a law that pertains to the prophecies concerning his second coming. They knew certainly that the time of his first coming *was near*; and the whole world stood on tip-toe expectation of the event—but none could tell *for certainty the exact time* till it came to pass. The difficulty arises from the nature or design of prophecy, which I apprehend to be, 1. To excite expectation of an event long before it takes place—inspire the church with hope—the wicked with dread; and, 2. *When the prophecy is fulfilled, to confirm the word of God.* There

may be other objects intended, but these appear to be the principal had in view, at least in his first coming. Several periods might have been fixed upon, and the probabilities rendered strong that at any one of them he would come, or be cut off; and it might have been said at *one* or the other, or within the distant points named, he *must* come—but the exact period could not, as I judge, be fixed upon with certainty; yet probabilities less or more strong might have clustered around any one of them. To illustrate. The famous prophecy in Daniel; predicting that the Messiah would appear, accomplish his work, and be cut off in *seventy weeks*, which was well known at that time to mean sacred weeks, or weeks of years, or four hundred and ninety years—was to take its commencement “from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem.” Now it was so ordered in the providence of God that *four* commandments went forth to *accomplish* this object; and all the commandments seemed necessary. The first was dated B. C. 536, and was issued by Cyrus, a Persian king. The second by Darius, B. C. 519. The third and fourth by Artaxerxes Longimanus—the first by Ezra, B. C. 457, and the second by Nehemiah, B. C. 445. There were a little less than a hundred years between the distant points. The first, I doubt not, excited hope in the church that in 490 years Christ would be on the earth. It

excited hope in Daniel, especially as this commandment went forth only two years after the prophecy was given; and when the first period was passed, the church fixed her eye upon the second as being probable; the third had clustering around it evidence yet stronger, and proved in the end to be the commandment intended by the Holy Ghost; for in just 490 years, to a week, perhaps a day, the Messiah hung upon the cross for the redemption of the world. And, on a careful investigation of *that* commandment, it may *now be seen* the prophecy harmonizes exactly, and as it does with no others; yet, as I judge, no one could have told of a certainty, till the prophecy was fulfilled, at which point to commence reckoning. Circumstances very like the above surrounded the prophecies relating to his second coming. Much is made to depend upon the time of the establishment of Popery, or the papal power, which is supposed to be the "setting up of the abomination that maketh desolate," spoken of by Daniel; 1335 years from which time Daniel was to have his lot, according to Mr. Watson, among the RESURRECTION saints. But I find it extremely difficult to determine *when*, in the *prophetic sense*, that abomination was set up. In looking over the history of the church,* I find, as early as A. D. 344, a *provincial synod* at Sardica acknowledged the

* See American Encyclopedia.

bishop of Rome as PRIMATE, and as the last tribunal of appeal from the other bishops. A *decree* from the *Emperor* Valentinian III. acknowledged the same thing in A. D. 445. In A. D. 534, Justinian, the Greek emperor, passed an edict constituting the bishop of Rome head of all the churches. Another event occurred in 439, from which its rise might be dated. In 606 a similar circumstance occurred; and the last period has been the one from which commentators have usually dated its rise. But another edict came forth in 755. I think there are more probabilities for one of these periods than for another; and I trust God will give me and the reader power to have our eyes upon the *whole field*, every part of it, till the Savior may come; but to fix with *certainty* upon which point to reckon is perhaps impossible for common Christians; nay, perhaps for any one, unless especially endowed by the Holy Spirit. This God may give to some one, or more; it is probable he may—perhaps has; but from mere reasoning, doubt, I think, must remain. Similar difficulties surround several of the prophecies of the Old Testament—the “seventy years captivity”—the sojourn of the Israelites of 400 or 430 years. And from these I deduce the general law—not *universal*—that we may determine, within a *given circle*, an event *must* come; but the *exact period* can only be known when it is fulfilled. We may *know it is nigh us*, even at

our doors, but the exact period lies hidden from us.

From all that has been said in the above, I conclude the true ground for the church to occupy upon the all-absorbing point is, *that the event is at hand, even at our doors*; but from the law above stated, it will be difficult, and probably impossible, to fix upon the exact period *when it will arrive*. I think we have already, considering the state of chronology—the fallibility of man—more than entered *the circle* where probabilities of the event strengthen. The shadows of eternity are about us—the church from her chaotic state has struck soundings, and soon the waters will have assuaged, and she will go forth into a new world. Looking upon the whole field, I judge the world has not assurance of an hour's safety. Although the church need “not be in darkness, that that day should overtake her unawares,” yet as a snare, and as the breaking of a thunderbolt from heaven, will it come upon all the world. What a motive to the church of God to labor for the salvation of souls! What a motive to a minister of Jesus! What a motive to the perishing sinner! Up, sinner, in the name of the Lord, for he will assuredly destroy this place. The Lord have mercy upon thee, and give to us each a shelter in that terrible day!

In my next I hope to give some evidence that the event is nigh at hand.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Me., Jan., 1842.

[No. VII.]

I PROPOSE, in the present article, to throw out some indications that the millennium, with all its heavenly glory, *is at hand*, even at our doors.

1. I think it indicated, and rendered at least probable, by an ancient tradition of the church in conjunction with the chronology of the Bible; or that the last may be made to harmonize with such an idea. The tradition is, that at the close of six thousand years from the creation of the world, the great or endless sabbath of God's people would commence. The tradition is so common, I need not refer to authority. It was built upon the fact, that God was six days in creating the world, but RESTED on the sabbath, and upon the supposition that his work in creation was an epitome of his work in providence, or the moral world; and that a day stood for a thousand years. And it is a little remarkable that St. Paul, when speaking of the future rest of the people of God, in his epistle to the Hebrews, uses the term *sabbath*: "there *remaineth*, therefore, a SABBATH to the people of God."

Chronology,* I know, has been deemed uncertain—and it is conceded that difficulties exist of no ordinary character—but take what is *known*, and which we have inspira-

* See Note at the end of the chapter.

tion for, and astronomical calculations, and then the event is shadowed out as *nigh*—nigh enough to startle both the church and the world, as though on its last verge. In that view of the case, I am writing not only upon the sixth day of the week, in the world's history, but I write near its evening; when its sun, enlarging as it declines, is just above its last horizon.

The following chronology has, without doubt, its difficulties, but I have less objection to it than to any other.

From the creation.	Yrs.	Mos.	Ds.	A. M.
From the creation to the time Noah left the ark,	1656	1	27	1656
From the flood to the call of Abram, at Terah's death,	427			2083
From the call of Abram to the exodus,	430			2513
Journeying in the wilderness, Joshua, and interregnum,	83			2596
Judges and servitude to various nations,	450			3046
Samuel, Saul, and David,	100		6	3147
From the beginning of Solomon's reign to the captivity of Jehoiakim,	411		3	3558
From Jehoiakim's captivity, third year of his reign, to Belshazzar's death,	70		10	3628

From the death of Belshazzar to the seventh year's reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus,	71	7	3700
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	3699	6	7

Now, by the undoubted canon of Ptolemy, and the famous era of Nabonassar, which commenced B. C. 747, the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus is fixed in the Julian period 4256.* And the present year, 1842, is in the Julian period 6555. The next year, of course, will be the Julian period 6556, which will make just 2300 years to have passed since Artaxerxes. Add these two sums together, that we have given, namely, 3700 to Artaxerxes, and 2300 since, and we have 6000 years since the creation. If this be true, we are, indeed, upon the eve of the great sabbath. But, says an objector, are you sure that chronology is right? But what if it is not right? Can you tell which way the error lies? And if not, you gain nothing, whereas my point is gained. If there is anything in the type of creation, the great sabbath is near—even at our doors—if not as near as this calculation would make it appear; and if wrong, it is as likely to expire this week, or this year, as it is a century to come.

* See Furguson's Astronomy, and Ency. Amer.

But that 6000 years have nearly expired since the creation, is rendered the more probable, because Josephus and others make more than that time to have elapsed already. Josephus makes the present age to be over six thousand, as does Pezron. And, from the whole, I judge that the glorious and terrible day is just upon us.

2. That the millennium is near, I think is indicated by the *concurrence* of some commentators and distinguished students of the Bible, as fixing upon the present time for the fulfilment of prophecy and the mystery of God. The great Bengelius—famous for his comprehensive views of the New Testament—and John Wesley, who adopted his views as to the *time* of the fulfilment of prophecy, both supposed that the millennium would take place, and the mystery of God be finished, about 1836. And whatever may be supposed the character of the millennium, it should be recollected that the calculations for the time of its commencement rest upon the same basis in the instances named at the commencement of these articles. The period fixed upon by the great Bengelius and Wesley, to be sure, has passed—but the fact that they fixed upon *about* that period, shows, conclusively, on what point of time their eyes rested for a great movement in Providence; and also shows that the prophecies of Daniel and John both present to the eye of good sense—sound understanding, and

deep piety—such an appearance as to justify their calculations. The prophecies appear the same *now*, both to learning and piety. And we ought not to be surprised that others are found in the same path; and if *they* commit an error, we should no more blame *them* than we should Bengelius, or Wesley. Let them all think and write; truth will, sooner or later, come.

The celebrated *Joseph Wolf*, a converted Jew, and a man of distinguished learning in the Hebrew Scriptures, has fixed the event of Christ's second coming, and the millennium, in 1847—eleven years later than Mr. Wesley. Should we blame him for this? He hath done what he could. He may be right—he may be wrong. But the fact that these men of distinguished ability, of deep learning and piety, after twenty or even fifty years research, as was the case with the venerable Wesley, had fixed upon a period so near each other, is, surely, worthy a thought before they be hastily condemned. And who would not share with them, if disappointed, rather than be with those *who ridicule them for their credulity!* Who, at the present day, that laughs at Wesley, or Bengelius, or Wolf even, could instruct them in the prophecies? Another man has recently sprung up—*William Miller*—whom to name is almost to incur the displeasure of whole communities—who fixes the time, not when Wesley did, in 1836—not where Wolf

has, in 1847—not where hundreds of others have, in 1866—but in 1843; and for this the world are ready almost to devour him in anger, because the time fixed upon for the fulfilment of the prophecies in his theory, happens to be in his own age. I hesitate not to avow to the world, I should rather share with him too in a disappointment, if his deductions are the honest convictions of his mind, as I doubt not they are, than to join the hue-and-cry against him. But what if, says the reader, 1843 should pass, and the event not arrive? I answer, look for another period; and so on, till it does come. “This do,” said Jesus, “till I come.” The sentinel had better fire a *false alarm*, than, without that alarm, have the camp surprised and its inmates all destroyed, without notice. Nay, he had better fire ten false alarms than to suffer the enemy to approach, unexpected, to the encampment; nor could he discharge his duty as an honest soldier, without giving alarm—in *due season too*—if he had any apprehensions that he was in danger, and that an enemy was creeping upon him like a midnight thief. Let him shout from the mountain-top, and make the earth ring again, and awaken all the valleys below: he will have done his duty, and will receive his reward; while the shepherd that gave no alarm, if there is *anything* to excite apprehension, will be judged a neglecter, if the event come or not: he cannot so well acquit

himself. I ask him not to sound the alarm unless he sees, or thinks he sees, cause: but let him keep a watchful eye, for at such an hour as he thinks not, the Son of man comes. Above all, let him not join in the cry of the vain and unprofitable servant, "My Lord delayeth his coming," and so that day come upon him unprepared. Let no man be persecuted for his faith in the Bible. Errors have usually arisen from following *impressions* instead of the Bible, or without the conjoint testimony of the Bible, or from the neglect of the Bible, or shutting it up from the world. Let them read and understand, if they can, and what they see let them declare.

Mr. Miller's theory is not without some foundation for its truth: And I give it the preference to any theory—so far as the *time* of the millennium is concerned—I have seen or heard. The foundation of it is laid, as I understand, in the eighth chapter of Daniel. Several visions had been presented to Daniel, all ending in the same results—shadowing out the government of the world *till the time should come* when the saints should possess the kingdom under the whole heaven. In the eighth chapter, as he understands it, the *length* of those governments, after a certain event in the one which the prophet then saw, is given in prophetic language, then well understood, of twenty-three hundred days or years. The event had not come

when Daniel saw the vision, and would not for years after; but was so marked, as he supposes, as not to be mistaken. The first thing presented to the eye of the prophet, was a ram having *two horns*. The horns were high, and one higher than the other, and the highest came up last. While looking, he beheld also a he-goat having one horn, and whereas that horn was plucked up, four sprung up in its stead; and in the latter time of these four horns, a little one sprung up which practised and prospered, and did marvellous things. While he was yet looking, he heard a conversation passing between two august beings, the one asking the other, how long the vision—the daily—and the transgression of desolation, to give both the *sanctuary* and *the host* to be trodden under foot? The answer was, “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; *then* shall the SANCTUARY BE CLEANSED.” The personage declared further to Daniel, that he would make him know *what* should be in the *last end* of the indignation; for *at the time* appointed the END should be. The angel further declared to him, that the ram which he saw was the kings of Media and Persia; and the he-goat the kingdom of Greece, and the great horn the *first* king. But the vision was *shut up*, as we afterward learn, till near its close, *when* it should be *known*; for it was to be for *many days*, and these kingdoms were to be for *many days*.

The fact that these kingdoms were to rise and fall, and other events take place, named in the vision, show that the days *could* not be literal. I know of but one other interpretation to be given to them, and that is one well known among the prophets, namely, a day for a year. "I appoint," saith the Lord, in one instance, "*a day for a year.*"

Without going through with the vision further, the question comes up, where *does it commence?* For if this point be gained, all is *apparently* safe. I answer, where would you begin to measure a man—at the head, and measure downward—or, at the feet, and measure upward? You would not surely begin at the breast, and measure downward, nor at the knee, and measure upward; but at the top of the head, or at the feet. But as the head only is now given, and only that needed, we must begin at the head. But, where is the *head?* Why, what the prophet *first saw*—a ram, having two horns, and they were high; the one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. Here are circumstances quite clear. The testimony, too, of the angel, is that the ram was Media and Persia. We must therefore begin to reckon from that empire. But in what age of it? When the horns are *high*, and when the last is the highest. When a Persian king has the ascendancy; and when both kingdoms are in their glory. But when was this? This, too, is quite

clear. The Medo-Persian empire commenced its fall in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus.* It cannot therefore be placed later than his day. It could not commence before for two reasons:—1. The empire did not reach its height till his day; and, 2. To place it before his day, it would have expired already without *any event* to answer the import of the prophet. Nor can we begin to reckon when Artaxerxes *ascended* the throne, for both these reasons. He recovered Egypt, which his predecessor had lost, and celebrated his victories in his third year for a hundred and eighty days. But if we commence in his reign, it would be reasonable to suppose there would be some public *act*, so plain as to be at once apparent. Such an event occurred in his reign. He published in the seventh year of his reign, a decree—which is now known to be a subject of prophecy—granting liberty to all the Jews in his realm, and making provision for restoring and rebuilding Jerusalem and its temple. Twenty-three hundred years from that decree, will, without doubt, end in 1843. Before the days of Artaxerxes, and since that time, chronology, as to the number of years that have gone by, can scarcely admit of a doubt. True, there is a possibility; but I do not see it to exist in the time. If error exists, it must be found in something else than the chronology *since that time*.

Before that time much of it is dark. And what corroborates this view is the fact, that, at a subsequent *interview* with the same angel, he fixes upon this very period for the commencement of the seventy weeks—one of the most important prophecies ever delivered to man. And the angel expressly revealed to him, that he came to give him understanding in the vision; and he gave him no understanding of it, unless in the time.

This, we have said, is the basis of Mr. Miller's theory. He brings to his aid the fact, that he can harmonize chronology so as to meet exactly his views. Another circumstance in his favor is, he makes, without violence, all the predictions in Revelation harmonize also. And again; God threatened, in the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, in four instances, that he would punish *his* children, on conditions, *seven* times, which in a prophetic sense would make 2,520 years. Commencing at the general captivity of Israel under Esarhaddon, this number too runs out at the same period. Many other things are brought to bear which I need not here name; only adding that he thinks the present state of the world shadows it out in a most imminent sense. But of this, if it please God, hereafter. G. F. COX.

Portland, Jan., 1842.

NOTE.—I have said difficulties exist in Chronology; and that it is a little uncertain from which period prophe-

cies may take their rise. It has been supposed by some that the decree issued in Nehemiah, instead of that of Ezra, was the one from which the seventy weeks were to take their date. This is possible, and the following chronology is suggested in its favor: but the reader will judge for himself. It will be recollected that the weight of commentators—the extent of the decree, is in favor of the first; and at present I incline to that opinion. Meantime, let us remember, that no prophecy can be shaken by any change of this character, as on either plan the seventy weeks expire with the death of Christ, so that it does not affect the great question at issue.

	Yrs.	Mos.	Days.
1. From the creation to the time Noah left the ark,	1656	1	27
2. From the flood to the call of Abram at Terah's death,	427		
3. From Abram's call to the exodus,	430		
4. Journeying in the wilderness, Joshua and the interregnum,	83		
5. Judges and servitude to various nations, including Samuel and excluding Samson, who judged Israel 20 years in the time of the Philistines,	450		
6. Saul and David,	80	6	
7. From beginning of Solomon's reign to Jehoiakim's captivity, in the third year of his reign,	411	3	
8. From Jehoiakim's captivity to the death of Belshazzar, and the end of the 70 years' captivity,	70		10
9. From the death of Belshazzar to the 20th year of Artaxerxes, allowing 20 years for Xerxes, according to Prideaux, instead of 13 according to Rollin.	90	7	
10. Artaxerxes farther reigned—Rollin,	28		
11. Xerxes, and Sogdianus, “		7	15
12. Darius Nothus, “	20		
13. Artaxerxes Mnemon, “	42		
14. Ochus, “	24		
15. Arses, “	3		
16. Alexander the Great, “	12	8	

	Yrs.	Mos.	Days.
17. From the death of Alexander to the division of his kingdom,	Rollin,	22	
18. Ptolemy Soter, king of Egypt, according to Ptolemy the Astronomer,		20	
19. Ptolemy Philadelphus,	Rollin,	39	
20. Ptolemy Euergetes,	"	25	
21. Ptolemy Philopater,	"	18	
22. Ptolemy Epiphanes,	"	26	
23. Ptolemy Philometer,	"	35	
24. Ptolemy Physcon,	"	28	
25. Ptolemy Lathyrus,	"	10	
26. Alexander I., brother of Lathyrus,	"	26	
27. Alexander II.,	"	16	
28. Ptolemy Aulutes and Bernice his daughter,	"	14	
29. Cleopatra and her brother,	"	21	
30. The Romans become masters of Egypt, B. C. 30,	"	30	
Total from creation to A. D. 1,	4156	9	22

From the above the reader will perceive that on this system, there were 4157 years, within a few weeks, from the creation, to A. D. 1; and 457 from the 20th year of Artaxerxes to A. D. 1.

[No. VIII.]

SIGNS OF THE SECOND ADVENT NEAR.

THAT the millennium is near, is indicated by circumstances connected with the *present state of the world*.

“I come as a thief.”

“But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the *days that were before the flood* they were eating and drinking, marrying and

giving in marriage, *until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away* : so also shall the coming of the Son of man be."

"THEN shall the kingdom of heaven be like unto ten virgins—five of them were wise, and five were foolish. The foolish took their lamps, and took *no oil with them*, but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept."*

"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."

In the above Scriptures we see shadowed out what the state of the world is to be at Christ's coming. A state in which the above characteristics combine is now developing itself, and has been for some time; so that the state of the world favors the idea of Christ's immediate coming.

I think the world is now, in its moral aspect, more like that immediately preceding the flood than any age since the deluge. There have been ages of war; there have been periods of peace; there have been

* The ancient lamp was made of a small staff, with a tuft of wicking attached to one end of it. This tuft was first dipped in oil, and then lighted. But it was necessary, if one wished it to burn any length of time, that oil in a vessel should be carried with it, so that it could be poured on occasionally to the tuft, and the lamp renewed. In this way it need not expire.

spots of luxury also; but I judge there has been no age in which all the characteristics above conjoin as they now do. The world is in luxury amid perplexity: the church is asleep, or slumbering, on the question of her Lord's coming: for she could not be in virtue and yet be true to her Lord—and she is up trimming her lamps with oil by her side. One half of the church is nearly graceless; not all alive, not all dead. The pulpit is crying peace and everlasting life, as consistent with, and sure to, the most abominable vices that ever degraded man. This never occurred before in the world's history. And here I ought to remark that whatever signs occur to admonish the world, they are to be of such a character as to permit the ungodly to say, "All things continue as they were when the fathers fell asleep." They will be such as to permit the church to be asleep upon some subject; and such as to permit others to say, "My Lord delayeth his coming"—and they will smite their fellow-servants—and themselves join with those who eat, and drink, and are drunken. He comes as a *thief*. The thief gives *no warning*. He comes unexpectedly. I say no warning—none that will be heeded.

The first likeness given us in the above Scriptures is to be found in the *Noahatic world*. Thus shall it be when Christ comes. I expect the fact of the world's overthrow was not *particularly* impressed upon it by

the Spirit of God. It was left to be warned by the preaching of Noe. So it may be—doubtless will be—with us. But to be more particular. At the time of the flood the Noahatic world had been in existence about sixteen or seventeen hundred years. From the length of human life, men had so multiplied as to be as numerous, perhaps more so, as at the present time. They were perhaps as wicked as now. From the length of human life, too, the arts and sciences flourished in a high degree. This is apparent from the giant plans, in their cities, struck out just after the flood, in Egypt, and in other places; also from the state of the arts and sciences in these places. They had *arts*, not yet restored to the world. The present remains upon the Nile give evidences, as a late writer remarks, that the arts, &c., came down the Nile to Egypt. If this be true, they must have existed in the family of Noah. And it is reasonable to suppose that a man like Newton, living nine hundred years in youth, would have discovered more than the world could in many centuries. But what if it were so? says an objector. I answer, this remark is made to meet the question, will God destroy the present world just as it is ripe for explosion from the very maturity?" This was the exact state of the Noahatic world; and thus shall it be at the coming of the Son of man. But I need not dwell on probabilities. The state of the

world is given without conjecture in the above Scriptures. "They ate, drank, and knew not until the flood came." Now what is apparently here reproved? Not marriage, for this was instituted in Paradise; not eating, for by this life is preserved: but they devoted themselves to the world, to *the exclusion of God*. This is the exact state of *the present age*. Man is now for the world—for the world without God. What is France but a house of ill-fame? What is England? What all Europe? What is America—her principal cities? What is the whole world? What shall I eat, what shall I drink, and wherewithal shall I be clothed? is perhaps an inquiry, to a degree unprecedented. There is to be added to this view of the Noahatic world, that although Noah preached to the people that the world would be destroyed "in a hundred and twenty years," yet they *knew it not* till the flood came. They would not heed it. Thus it is now in an eminent degree.

But the time is shadowed out most certainly by the present state of the church. *Then* is the kingdom of heaven to be like "ten virgins." The church, at the period specified, is not to be *all corrupt*, or nearly so, as in some ages; nor all pure, or nearly so, as in the days of the apostles; but half wise, with oil; and half foolish, without oil. In the present state of the nominal church you *have this picture*. There is another fea-

ture among some of the Lord's servants. They are to say in the heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming." When has the church said, as of recent date, my Lord delayeth a thousand or three hundred thousand years? And now *strife* is abroad among her children, if the thought be promulgated that "the end of all things is at hand." Nay, a man could hardly obtain some pulpits, if, like Mr. Wesley, he were to fix a period when it will take place, unless he threw it so far in the future as to remove it from the present generation.

When they shall say "peace and safety," *then* it comes. This is another fact in the signs of the times. I believe the history of the world affords no instance, till within the present century, where man was believed to be above a brute, in which it has been taught publicly from the pulpit, by professed messengers of God, that a man might commit *any crime*, and yet be as certain of heaven and happiness, as to live virtuously. Yet this is now done. Peace, peace, is preached throughout the land. All Egypt believed in future punishment, as their tombs now give evidence. All Persia did, as her writings prove. All Greece did, as Homer testifies. All Rome did, as we learn from Virgil. That the Jews did, Josephus testifies. The Indians, east and west, believed the same. But now we are taught that all punishment in the world to come, is a fable; as though a

different God governed then from what controls man's destiny now.

“Where is the promise of his coming?” The cry on both continents is, “Where is the promise of his coming?” And everywhere it is met with, “All things continue as they were when the fathers fell asleep.”

And doth not nature herself indicate that mortal pangs are now in waiting for her? There are, doubtless, to be some signs of old age and a dying state. The sun is to shadow out sickness, and so the moon and stars. But if these indications are to be figurative, and apply to the church, they are all fulfilled. If they are to be literal, it will be the very last signal and coetaneous with Christ's appearance, and can occur *in one moment*, the whole of them. If we take a medium ground, the signs have already occurred—but in just such a way as might be expected, on the same general principles of God's providence as were manifested in the days of the fathers. But these signs are no less an admonition for that. Had Christ foretold an eclipse of a remarkable character that was to usher in the day; and had that eclipse been on natural principles, it would have been no less a sign. But has anything remarkable occurred recently in any way? I answer, yes. *Fifteen hundred stars* have recently faded from the vault of heaven. Some of them were observed in a state of conflagration. Just so it was when the fathers fell asleep,

only not so striking. But was ever such a grand phenomenon exhibited as in the shower of stars in 1833? That event I had the pleasure of witnessing. They fell on the same principles as when the fathers fell asleep. They only differed in number and glory. But their number who could tell? Turn the eye where you would, and *at the same moment* you would perceive *millions* of meteors falling all around you. This was its appearance to the eye. Do not our northern lights also, and their grand drapery, as sometimes exhibited, appear like "pillars of fire" and blood? And is it not remarkable that, although we may account for them on the same principles as were in operation when the fathers fell, no record of them appears till quite recently? The sun, too, has been darkened in his going forth, within the memory of the present generation. But I might proceed almost indefinitely, if I would, in recording the fearful sights and portents that have been witnessed in the present generation. War, famine, earthquake, fearful sights—men's hearts failing them—have all been before us. War of principle, too, as though the great battle of God Almighty was either now fighting, or soon was to be fought: the church cut up into sects, warring about mere points in theology, and leaving the weightier matters of the law, as when Christ first came, is everywhere apparent. Men too are publicly scoffing at religion, and pro-

posing, not the laws of God, but of corrupt man, to govern society. These are fearful portents. But let us not deceive ourselves by expecting too much. Whatever comes will come, like the preparations of the thief, scarcely observable, excepting by the most watchful eye. Hence the divine precept, "What I say unto you I say unto all" the church; "watch." Whatever comes, will come so as not to surprise the world, till the hour of destiny arrives. Men will be sporting, as usual, on that very night and day. The bride, on that evening, will be led forth with the glow of happiness before her, and the reaper's eye will be upon his fields with joy—but as quick as the lightning darts from east to west, so will the coming of the Son of man be.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Feb., 1842.

[No. IX.]

REPLY TO D. D. WHEDON—OBJECTIONS TO HIS
VIEW.

BEFORE proceeding to review the scriptural quotations of your esteemed correspondent, Rev. D. D. WHEDON, who has conducted the "opposite view" with a spirit truly admirable, and an ability which all

will confess compasses the entire ground and strength of the argument on that side of the question, I wish to present a few leading objections to his theory. He adopts the ground of a *terrene* or *time* millennium, a thousand years of unknown prosperity to the church and world *before* Christ's coming: a millennium in which Satan shall "be bound, cast into the bottomless pit, shut up, and sealed;" and one that shall justify the sacred writers in the language and images in which they set forth this state. Such texts as follow must apply to this *terrene* millennium, if any such state is referred to in the Bible; viz., "But as truly as I live, *all the earth* shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, *as the waters cover the sea.*" What a depth of glory! What a depth of knowledge! What a state of joy, and freedom from evil! None to *hurt*, much less destroy, in *all* my holy mountain, saith the Lord. And this glory and knowledge are to be *on earth*. My objections lie not against *such a state*, or such a millennium: but I think that such a state will not be enjoyed till Christ comes a second time; and not until the earth is new-made. Brother Whedon, on the contrary, thinks this state *terrene*, and limited to time. My objections to his view of the question follow.

1. Such a state as brother Whedon supposes, during the *period of probation*, must inevitably *change the conditions of salvation*. This, it will be conceded, the attributes of God and the Bible forbid; the latter in express terms. "My ways are equal," saith the Lord. God is not partial: "In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." God is the SAME throughout all ages, "yesterday, to-day, and forevermore." It was as easy for Abraham to believe as any one else—as easy for Sodom to be saved as for Jerusalem—no more so, no less so. If God gave much to a nation, or to an individual, he required more; if he gave little, he required less. This law holds good throughout all of God's dispensations—throughout the universe. God's ways are *forever* equal. But the state proposed is confessedly *probationary*; and yet free from "evil"—free from the devil, and free from danger of *every sort*. "Blessed and *holy* is he that hath a part in the first resurrection—on such the second death *hath no power*." "Nothing shall hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain."

The millennium presented in the Bible, it should be recollected, is one of REST. But such a state is essentially totally irreconcilable with the circumstances *under which all have believed* and been saved, from the beginning of the present dispensation; nay, from the beginning of the world. The devil

was even in paradise. But in the millennium, that spirit is enclosed in "the bottomless pit"—"shut up and sealed." And if we contend that God will put on a balance-wheel on *either side*, by requiring of any one in the millennium state, more, or in proportion to what he enjoys; or, if he puts upon any one *trials* of any character, equal to the privileges he enjoys, you destroy entirely the picture drawn by the Holy Ghost, as shadowing out the millennium state.

The millennium state of necessity excludes the devil—the Bible expressly declares it. If it also exclude "lust," there is no ground for trial; and if *lust* remain, even "without being set on fire of hell," it destroys the idea of a millennium as shadowed out in the Bible. But in any case, it must be a better state than the present, if of any value as a state; but if we make it worth *more* than the present state, then we cannot reconcile it with the equality of the divine government. If God pour upon the world noon-tide glory—if the state be still probationary, he must require of us ten talents: so that one probationary state is scarcely to be preferred to another. Hence it is said, it shall be better for Sodom in the judgment, than for Jerusalem. Great heights are always *hazardous* in proportion to the altitude ascended.

2. I object to the theory of a *terrene*, or

temporal millennium, because it *destroys the true and essential characteristics of a holy life in a probationary state*. One characteristic, as expressed in the length and breadth of the Bible, is the *trial of faith, patience, hope, fear, love, meekness, and every other grace* that ever adorned a redeemed soul. And without this *trial—deep trial, too—there can be no virtue*. All the redeemed will, and must say ultimately, “they have come up out of *great tribulation*, and have had their robes washed in the blood of the Lamb.” Great tribulation: implying hazard—mental anguish—one that *tastes* of temptation—“*suffers with Christ*”—and is in all points *tempted like as he was*; and yet the Christian must overcome. They must *suffer* with him, if they would reign with him. The trial, too, must be equal in some form to that which has tested or proved the faith of Christians in general. It is not more to suffer martyrdom, probably, than to suffer as did John Nelson, or John Haime: they died *daily*—a thousand deaths. But a millennium containing *such trials*, the Bible not only nowhere mentions, but everywhere presents a picture as different as are the joys of heaven to the sorrows of earth.

3. I object to a *terrene* millennium, because it renders useless the great light of the church of God—the BIBLE. What need can we have of the Bible in the millennium? Take a single portion of it—the prayer put

into the mouth of every disciple of Christ—"Deliver us from evil;" or, as Mr. Wesley has it, "the wicked one"—the devil. But the devil is bound, shut up in the bottomless pit, and will have been for a thousand years. "Let thy kingdom come." But it *has come*, even in a probationary state. *That* prayer no millennium saint can need. Take the sermon of Christ on the mount: "Blessed are they that mourn." No. This cannot be. None mourn in that day. To the church in that state, it is said, "The days of thy mourning are ended"—tears are wiped away from their eyes—"and thy warfare is accomplished." "Blessed are the peacemakers." What! when there is no war—when the devil, the author of war, is no more with us—when lusts, too, have disappeared! It cannot be.

Suppose one to have arisen in the congregation, in the terrene millennium state, while Satan is shut up, to read Christ's sermon. How, think ye, would it appear in its application to the assembled multitude? Let us begin by prayer: "Deliver us from the wicked one," the devil! What! when sealed up in the bottomless pit? Let us read: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they *shall be* comforted." Nay, say the assembled multitude, this was to our *fathers*, not to us. What, too, shall we need of the following passages:—"Strive to enter in at the straight gate; for many, I say unto you,

shall seek to enter in, but *shall not be able.*" "Love your enemies!" But enemies they have none; they have no opportunity to exercise *this grace*; that high excellence is not for them. Nor can they be meek, in the true sense of that term. They cannot *suffer reproach*, nor be bruised; they cannot love those that hate them; for "none can hate or destroy in all my holy mountain."

Take one more exhortation of Christ. "Enter ye in at the straight gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and *many there be that go in thereat*;" although there is no destruction which they can feel, because over them the second death hath no power; nor are destruction and wasting known now in the land. Indeed, we shall want nothing of Christ's sermon on the mount; nothing of those alarming exhortations everywhere interspersed in the gospels—none which require watchfulness and prayer, lest the adversary, the devil, who goeth about to destroy, should overcome them: for now that arch fiend is shut up in his prison. Nay, dear brother, we shall need no apostolic epistle—no book of the New Testament—nor shall we need any from the Old Testament; for that is equally inapplicable: so that the book of God, for one thousand years, at least—perhaps three hundred and sixty thousand—will become a *dead letter*. The great light

of God's church on earth has accomplished its purpose, we shall say in that day. The devil is shut up—all is holy—and no note of discord is left to mar the universal and triumphant song, "Now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God :—and the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and HE SHALL REIGN FOREVER AND EVER."

4. But these last words offer another objection, which must be fatal to the idea of a *terrene* millennium; and that is, that, *when* the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, the saints are not only to *possess* the kingdom *forever* even *forever* and *ever*—not a thousand years—not three hundred and sixty thousand years—but *forever* and *ever*!—expressions that point out nothing less than the eternal duration of the state; but CHRIST is also to reign *forever* and *ever*. Forever and ever! *Christ* is to REIGN during that time. But if a *terrene* millennium be intended, it cannot be longer than a thousand years—a singular forever, indeed! And it should not be forgotten, that, when Christ comes, he is to find the world in the same state that it was in the days of Noah—given to worldliness—given to schemes of pleasure, without God. He is to find the world in the state that it was in the days of Sodom, when that place was destroyed by fire. He is to find the church also *half dead*—half of its members, without

oil with their lamps, and so dead as not to be saved. He is to find scoffers also in the world, ridiculing the idea of his coming. Now if this be the state of the world when Christ comes; and a terrene millennium be allowed—this state of wickedness in the world must be preceded by the reign of Christ and the saints for a thousand years *only*, instead of *forever* and *ever*, as the Bible declares that reign to be. And it ought to be remembered that the world and the church fall into this state of apostacy—a fall, on the part of the church, so great that half of her members are dead; and, on the part of the world, so great that it is filled with scoffers, Sodomites, men loving pleasure more than God; in a word, a world ripe for destruction—I say that it should be remembered that all this is brought to pass without the agency of the devil, who has been shut up, and sealed in prison. But, I ask, can Christ reign in such a state of the world any more than he reigned in Sodom, or before the flood, or than he now does? If not, it follows demonstrably, that he reigns but a thousand years. But such a reign contradicts the Bible. For, in a most exalted sense, the universal song is struck, *HE shall reign forever and ever!*

The reader will allow me to press this objection. It is not ideal. It is full of weight. And it is fatal to a *terrene* millennium. For no criticism can make the words *forever and*

ever mean less than ETERNAL. Recollect, gentle reader, also, that this is not an isolated circumstance, nor passage. When the saints take the kingdom, as is represented by Daniel, they hold it forever—even forever and ever. Can words be more express? Can language be more certain? And as to the extent of the kingdom, it is *under the whole heaven*; they have the *greatness of it*:—it is perpetual also, without interruption; and eternal, having *no end*.

5. And this brings me to another objection, viz., The KINGDOM of CHRIST is not given to him till after the destruction of the papal power; and then the kingdom “STANDS FOREVER;” (See Daniel vii. 13, 14, 21, 22;) after which it is not to be given to another people. Nor is it given to Christ, as it appears to me, till the stone has smitten and consumed all other kingdoms. (See Daniel ii. 35, 44, 45.) Then a kingdom was *given him* that all languages and nations should serve and obey him. Now, then, if the kingdom is not given till the destruction of the papal powers, and all other kingdoms adverse to his, then the kingdom spoken of in Daniel and Revelation *cannot be* what divines have usually called his mediatorial kingdom, which is confessedly yielded up when all enemies are under his feet. The mediatorial kingdom commenced properly with the slaying of the Lamb, at the foundation of the world; and Christ was inaugurated publicly as a “Priest

upon his throne” of mercy, at the banks of Jordan, when he was *baptized*. Kings, brother Whedon will recollect, were not *baptized*; priests were. And when the kingdom is begun—the kingdom of the mountain, that fills the whole earth—it *never ends*. It stands forever. So that it is reduced to an absolute certainty, that no apostacy can take place after its establishment; and inasmuch as the Savior is to find the world in the state it was when destroyed by the flood—when Sodom was overthrown—when the church is fallen—when scoffers abound in the world; it is reduced to all the certainty that can be given to the argument, that no earthly millennium can ever be realized, as no such state can take place *after* his reign commences.

There is another thought I will throw in under this head; and with it, for the present, close my general objections. And that is this: a general promise given to the faithful is, that they shall *sit down* with Christ upon his throne, even as he has overcome, and is set down with his *Father* upon *his* throne. Now Christ is to have *two thrones*. He is a Priest upon his Father’s throne; but King, in a true sense, upon his own throne; and on that throne the saint is to sit. He reigns properly enough upon both. Upon the first he remains till his enemies be made his *foot-stool*; upon his own he reigns forever, even forever and ever. When that event takes place, God shall be all and in all; that is,

the entire Godhead shall then be exhibited in Christ. He shall then appear in the GLORY of the FATHER. While a Priest, mercy was predominant; but in that world all the Godhead will appear in Christ; every attribute, justice, power, love, and mercy. What else does the psalmist, and the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews, mean in those remarkable words, [*kisaca Elohim olam vaad,*] "Thy throne, O God, to the Son he saith, is over *both worlds*. Thy throne is *forever*, and to eternity." Certainly there must be a sense in which CHRIST will *reign* forever; and in which, as the angel announced at his birth, to "HIS kingdom there shall be NO END." And as his mediatorial kingdom *terminates* with the subjugation of his enemies, there must be another throne and kingdom, on which he and his saints shall sit, and in which they shall rejoice forever and ever; and this is the one promised in all the above Scriptures. This view, I believe, harmonizes the Scriptures upon this subject: but that view which limits his reign and kingdom to *time* cannot, while the Bible declares that Christ has a throne—a kingdom—and a people, to serve and obey him *forever* and EVER.

G. F. COX.

Portland, Feb. 22, 1842.

[No. X.]

THE MILLENNIUM—THE UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT.

As, in my general objections to an earthly millennium, one of my arguments was stated less clearly than it might have been, you will allow me to repeat it, slightly varied in its form.

I think the two following passages of Scripture render it as certain as the "lip of truth" itself can make it, that there can be no earthly millennium—none upon the "old unchanged earth." They follow:

"But the *saints* of the Most High shall *take* the kingdom, and *possess the kingdom* forever, even FOREVER and EVER." (Dan. vii. 18.)

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, the kingdoms of *this world* are *become* the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign FOREVER and EVER." (Rev. xi. 15.)

The argument rests upon the two facts, that these passages point out the hope of the church usually termed the millennium; and the fact, that the terms employed can be applied to nothing but *eternity—immortality*—in the most absolute sense. They never can be *applied* to a world that is doomed to

be dissolved. This world of necessity is limited in its duration, because sooner or later it must be *burned up*, with all that is *therein*. Christ, therefore, *cannot* reign in it *forever and ever*, no more than a king can reign, in a kingdom which was to last but *an hour, a million of years*. Nor could the saints *possess* this world forever, even *forever and ever*, any more than they could possess a temple *eternally*, which *to-morrow* was to be consumed in the flames. The eternity of the *reign*, therefore, of Christ, and the *possession* of the saints, of necessity excludes mutation, or change, and both are stamped with immortality, or there is an end to all just biblical interpretation. The words can only be applied to the "new heavens and new earth," which are to remain. As certainly, therefore, as the present world is doomed to decay, and God has spoken the passages quoted; so certainly they must be applied to an ETERNAL STATE—"the world to come." Where, then, it may be asked, is the "thousand years" of St. John? I answer, *not in time*; but his thousand years is the commencement of eternity. It is the porch—without an inside door, so to speak, to that ineffable place—but firmly attached to the house eternal in the heavens. The thousand years merely mark the distance between two resurrections. The saints reign in a peculiar sense, perhaps judge, with Christ a thousand years. "Know ye not

that ye shall judge angels?" Yet that thousand years have in them the essential elements of immortality. Beyond this, I know nothing; nor need I know till the day dawn and the day-star arise. G. F. COX.

Portland, March 28th, 1842.

[No. XI.]

THE MILLENNIAL KINGDOM OF CHRIST—REV.

D. D. WHEDON.

"But I must confess I find nothing in the sacred writings distinctly enough marked to support the opinion of the *millennium* or *thousand years'* reign, (before Christ's coming, and the general judgment,) nor can I conceive any important end that can be answered by this procedure."—*Adam Clarke.*

I WRITE not for victory; I think my sole object is truth. Did I write for victory, I should pursue a very different course with my esteemed brother than I now intend to. I should notice some things that might give me an advantage; but I intend only to notice what may be required to set the truth on which we may differ in a clear light. I do not intend, however, by this remark, a reflection upon brother Whedon. He is entitled to my thanks for the urbanity with which he has hitherto conducted the matter; and the two articles particularly on the Messiah's kingdom, are highly creditable to

any man; and if he fail in the argument, it will not be on account of the *advocate*, but of the *cause* he has espoused. His article on some of the fathers I cannot speak so highly of, if he have read them—a fact which I ought not to doubt; and yet I cannot conceive how he should represent them in the light he has, unless he has read without much examination the remarks on the fathers, of Dr. Middleton, who most grossly, as Bishop Newton justly observes, *mis-represented* them. It is as palpable as the sun in the heavens, that the fathers *did not* believe in a *terrene* millennium. And if Br. Whedon will hazard his reputation as a scholar upon the question that *they did*—those quoted by me of course—I will join issue with him on this question alone. Br. Whedon must know that the *three hundred witnesses* at the council of Nice, in A. D. 325, all bishops of the church, from all parts of the world, testified that the millennium was *not terrene*; or, in other words, that it was to be a *new heaven and earth*. Did they contradict the fathers? Did not Barnabas and Lactantius witness the same? Barnabas expressly declares that the “sun, and moon, and stars,” shall be destroyed *first*; and then the thousand years.* These

* I think it best to add *the words* or exact language of some of the fathers. *Barnabas*, who, it will be recollected, was the fellow-laborer of St. Paul, who doubtless learned much from him, says, “In six thousand years” (refer-

all unite with Justin Martyr in placing the millennium in conjunction with the *New Jerusalem*, the New Jerusalem of St. John, or a new earth, at Christ's coming, and in conjunction with the *first* resurrection. With these remarks I dismiss the article, regretting that I was obliged to differ from Br. Whedon, in a matter of plain, palpable history. If Br. Whedon wishes a terrene millennium, surely he must find it somewhere else besides in the fathers. Will he re-read Bishop Newton's remarks upon this subject in his *Dissertation on Prophecies*, p. 588, and onward?

Before proceeding further I wish to ascer-

ring to the six days of creation) "the Lord God will bring *all things to an end.*" "For with him one day is a thousand years." "He rested on the seventh," he continues, and says this means, "that *when* his Son shall come, and abolish the *season of the wicked one*, and judge the ungodly, and shall change the sun, and moon, and stars, *then* he shall gloriously rest in that seventh day." "Behold, therefore," he continues, "he will *then truly* sanctify it with *blessed rest, when we*, having received the righteous promise, when *iniquity shall be no more*, all things being RENEWED by the Lord, shall be able to sanctify it, being ourselves *first* made holy." And he adds, "The eighth day will be the beginning of the other world."

Irenæus says, "The just, *rising from the dead, shall reign, and nature,*" the material world, RENEWED and set at *liberty*," referring as I suppose, to the passage in Romans, which speaks of the creation groaning for liberty, "shall yield abundance of all things."

Justin Martyr says, that "*All the saints* should be raised in the flesh, (a) and reign with Christ in Jerusalem."

(a) "Raised in the flesh," appears to be a phrase peculiar to early writers, and means, as I judge, the resurrection of the just. The

tain the true point of difference between Br. Whedon and myself, so as not to beat the air.

We agree, as I understand Br. Whedon,

1. In the fact of a millennium.
2. That in the millennium, Christ is king, (*de facto*,) that is, he is king in fact, and by possession of the throne and kingdom.
3. We agree that Christ was not king (*de facto*) at his first coming, but was inaugurated king, (*de jure*,) or, as he will allow me to state it, he was publicly thus acknowledged at the banks of the Jordan: remarking on my own part, that his baptism was

What Jerusalem? Not the old one, surely. For he adds, "That a certain man among us Christians, by name John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation made to him, *did prophesy that the faithful believers in Christ,*" (of all ages, I suppose it must mean,) "should *live a thousand years in the NEW JERUSALEM*, and after that, should be the general resurrection and judgment." Now, he must have meant the New Jerusalem of St. John, "the holy city," which John evidently makes the final abode of the saints.

The council of Nice state, "Wh. efore, *we expect new heavens and a new earth*, according to the holy Scriptures, at the *appearing and kingdom* of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. And THEN, as Daniel says, (chap. vii. 18,) the saints of the Most High shall take the *kingdom*, and the earth shall be pure, holy, the land of the *living*, not of the dead."

Is Br. Whedon prepared, in view of the above, to say that the *fathers* believe in a terrene millennium? I think if he is, he will enjoy his opinion *alone*.

phrase is found in the creed of the apostles, as late as A. D. 600. The creed then read, "I believe in God, the Father," &c.—"and the resurrection of the flesh." See Mr. Justice Baily's edition of Common Prayer. G. F. C.

rather an evidence of his priestly than his kingly office; yet I have no objection to conceding the other fact, because God there testifies, not, however, in the language quoted by Br. Whedon—"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." By king, *de jure*, I understand a legitimate heir to the throne royal, but not in full possession of the throne.

I remark, also, that the whole probationary state is under Christ in this sense of king, *de jure*, and also as priest; for Christ united the two offices of king and priest together, in a given sense, but not in every sense. He is *now* properly a "Prince and Savior." And as mediation, or mediatorial kingdom is necessarily limited to the *king de jure* state; as mediatorship *cannot* apply to monarchy in fact—or the *de facto* state; so when the *de jure* state ceases, the mediatorial kingdom is surrendered, and he becomes king *de facto*, and not till then.

4. We agree that Christ is *not now* king *de facto*, but that he will be in the millennium state; that is, that then he will be truly, essentially, and properly king.

5. Br. Whedon admits, also, that Christ will assume this kingdom while papacy is yet living; and that *then* he will destroy papacy, and take his kingdom *de facto*. We are agreed here also. He cites Daniel to prove this.

6. He admits that when Christ takes the

kingdom de facto, the *kingdom* will be *universal* and *eternal*. Here we agree also.

7. He admits that while Christ is king *de jure*—heir to the throne—his kingdom is in its *germinating* state, in its infancy; or, as I would explain it, while it was yet in the “kingdom of the stone form,” and not of the “mountain which filled the whole earth.” It is thus explained, I believe, by bishop Newton. And with this admission, I explain all the passages of Scripture that are quoted by brother Whedon, as referring to what he calls Christ’s “minute kingdom.” At first it is the smallest of seeds, but finally *overshadows the world*. The “leaven” refers more properly to the “kingdom within us,” yet it applies to his general kingdom, in the fact that the entire *earth* and *world* are *renovated* and made his. It explains, too, on this same principle, such parables as the “tares of the field”—the “net,” which gathered of every kind; where, however, it should be noticed, that in its germinating character, the kingdom was *crowded* in the one case with *tares* representing its state *TILL* the end of the world; and in the other, the net encompassed of every kind of fishes *till* the end of the world; when the tares were gathered in “bundles”—a large quantity, indeed—“and burned,” and the fish “cast away.” The kingdom remained in this state *till* the end of the *world*; then it went into its

mountain form, and "filled the whole earth."

8. Brother Whedon admits that St. Paul "associates" the coming of Christ and the resurrection with the millennium, by quoting Isaiah; but thinks they both placed the millennium *before* the resurrection. But it should be recollected that if Paul and Isaiah *associate* the second coming of Christ *with* the millennium, the whole argument is given up, because with the theory of brother Whedon an apostacy comes on, rendering the world as corrupt as Sodom itself, after the millennium, and *before* Christ's second coming; so that the two events, of the millennium and Christ's second coming, are as much *disjoined* as though they were apart ten thousand years. If, therefore, St. Paul and Isaiah *associate* the two events, no apostacy could come between them; no millennium, therefore, can take place before the first resurrection and the second coming of Christ.

9. Brother Whedon agrees with me in the *time* when Christ becomes king *de facto*—when he takes his throne and kingdom—and a kingdom is given to him "under the whole heaven;" namely, "*while the little horn is still talking great things,*" while papacy is yet in a living state, or standing.

10. Now, then, there can be between us, but *one point* of difference, of any magnitude—and that is, how long is Christ to

reign king *de facto*? How long is he to possess the THRONE as KING universal—in law—in truth? On this single point I submit the following thoughts.

1. A king *de jure* of necessity has a *termination*, either by death, when heirship ceases, or by possession of the throne. In either case he is no longer king *de jure*; but in the last case king *de facto*.

2. If one is king *de jure*, or by heirship, it implies, of necessity, if life be spared—and the kingdom be not wrested from him unlawfully—that he becomes king *de facto*, or, in a true sense, monarch.

3. Now, then, can it be reconciled with the Scriptures that Christ will be king *de facto* “just a thousand years?” Is it probable that the king *de facto* in his estate would be of less length of time than his kingdom *de jure*, or heirship rule? As king *de jure* he reigns six thousand years—and after a public acknowledgement of the fact, nearly two thousand; but after he takes the throne—becomes king—and all nations are given into his hands, and his kingdom becomes universal, he reigns but a thousand years! Can this be possible? I think it not possible in the nature of things. When he becomes monarch shall he not reign forever? Who shall deprive him of rule? Shall angels? Shall men? Shall the wicked one? Nay, truly—he is Conqueror. But according to the theory of brother Whedon,

his kingdom *de facto* cannot go beyond a thousand years, because at the end of the thousand years, while he is king *de facto*, while ruling upon his throne, he is not only publicly made to *resign*, but prior to the judgment the world is to *rebel*, and become as corrupt as in the days of Noah; and the church *so dead* that one half of its members *cannot be saved*. But can Christ rule *de facto* while *half* of the church is in rebellion, and the world in the state that it was before the flood? Christ of course cannot rule in such a state; his rule would therefore expire *before* the resurrection and judgment—as truly as he does not now reign king of this world.

4. But the theory of brother Whedon is in direct hostility to the Bible. Daniel says—and brother Whedon admits this text to apply to his state as king *de facto*—(chap. vii. 14,) “And there was *given him*,” to the Son, “dominion, and glory, and a *kingdom*, that all people, nations, and languages should *serve him*: his *dominion* is an everlasting dominion, which *shall not pass away*, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” What is here affirmed by the Holy Ghost?

(1.) His *dominion*, sovereign power, or supreme authority, is “everlasting;” and, lest we should mistake the meaning, it is added, “it *shall not pass away*.” No, NEVER!

(2.) It is affirmed that a KINGDOM WAS THEN *given* to the *Son of man*, and all nations were then brought under his sway; and the saints possessed it *forever*, even *forever and ever*.

(3.) The *dominion*, therefore, then given, is not only *everlasting*, but the kingdom then given is *everlasting*, or forever and ever. Does this look like a thousand years? How can any man reconcile this view of Christ's kingdom *de facto*, the one admitted by brother Whedon, with simply a thousand years' reign; and that then it is to be upturned by the rebellion of both the world and the church, to the state it was in before the flood? *It cannot* be. If we can affirm the truth of anything, we can affirm that the description here given, by inspiration, of Christ's kingdom, and the *RULE he then* receives, can never be properly applied to anything less than a rule and government *WITHOUT END*, and without *interruption*.

Take another passage from the Bible. "To the Son he saith, Thy *throne*, O God, is *forever and ever*." Can there be, then, termination to the throne of CHRIST? No, verily; it lasts forever. Does not this scripture harmonize with Daniel, who says, his dominion, or supreme power and *government*, shall be everlasting?

Does it harmonize with the annunciation of his character before his birth? "And the Lord God *shall give* (in the future) unto

him (Christ) the throne of his father David; and HE SHALL REIGN FOREVER; and to his kingdom there shall be NO END." Does it not harmonize with the passages where both cases are referred to, king *de jure*, and king *de facto*? "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the *throne of David*, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment, and with justice, henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Can expressions like the above be reconciled in *any form*, allowing language any force at all, or any definite meaning at all, with the RESIGNATION of his kingdom, or rule, or throne, or people, at *any point of time whatever*? Indeed they cannot.

5. Let it be recollected, also, that in the new *Jerusalem*, in the *new heavens and earth*, the THRONE of God and the LAMB is seen; and the river of water of life proceeds from beneath that throne; after the judgment has passed, with all that preceded it; heaven and earth itself had fled away; and all the inmates of the *new Jerusalem*, of the new heavens and earth, are to serve *him*. Can brother Whedon maintain, in view of all these facts, that Christ's kingdom, in its *de facto* state, is EVER to be resigned? No; much less can he maintain that it will be done *in a thousand years*, or at the resurrection, or judgment. Christ never surrenders anything but what is essential to the

probationary state, his mediatorial kingdom, or mercy seat; this, and this only, is given up at the judgment day.

6. All Christ's children, all the children of God, reign WITH CHRIST, in both his states, both as king *de jure*, and as king *de facto*. "If children, then *heirs*, and joint-heirs with Christ." They are also to sit with him "upon HIS THRONE," in its *de facto* state. But the Bible expressly declares this reign of the saints to be FOREVER AND EVER. Now if they "sit *with him*," "upon *his throne*," "FOREVER AND EVER," it makes both his reign and throne as perpetual as language can make them; for both are identified as co-eternal. They suffered together, and will be glorified *together*.

In conclusion, let us compare these two reigns of Christ—two kingdoms, if you choose—or the germinating state, with the inauguration of Christ at Jordan—and the reception of his kingdom and people at the last, or *de facto* state.

In the first there was little display. The great king, heir apparent to the throne, had his birth in a manger—appeared in human form. John was his herald. His prime ministers were twelve fishermen. His royal entrance to Jerusalem the most humble in the world. His subjects despised, and with himself crucified. They groaned, being burdened, six thousand years. But how is it at the last? His heralds are God's mighty

angels, and the trump of God. His ministering spirits ten thousand times ten thousand. He speaks, and the dominions of death tremble, and give up their dead. His redeemed come forth to immortality and life; all that are written in the book, to an everlasting salvation, and all enemies are placed beneath his feet; all rule and all authority are put down; and he appears no longer as heir, but God, and monarch of the world; and his kingdom as perpetual as eternity, passing on without interruption.

If human authority will avail anything with brother Whedon, I will add, that Mr. Wesley says, Christ, *as Son*, in his human nature, must reign FOREVER, after the resurrection; and cites Luke i. 33, to prove it. Benson expressly bears witness to the same. Dr. A. Clarke says, He must be EVERLASTING KING. And our beautiful poet says,

“There GOD THE SON forever reigns,
And scatters night away.”

G. F. COX.

Portland, March 2, 1842.

[No. XII.]

THE TWO RESURRECTIONS—D. D. WHEDON.

ARE THERE TWO RESURRECTIONS?

I think there are *two* resurrections. And this has been so palpable that most writers on, and believers in the New Testament, have come to this conclusion. Many, however, have supposed that one resurrection would be a *moral* one—and the other literal, or the raising of the body from the grave. Bishop Newton thinks we should be careful in making the first resurrection moral, lest we should be driven to the inference that the *last* is also. It appears to me that we should be careful, *indeed*, lest the hope of the righteous be entirely cut off, and God's word be rendered null and void.

Before proceeding directly to the question, I wish to make a remark or two on the meaning of one or two words in the Bible, in their connection with this subject, viz., "*day*" — "*last day*" — "*hour*," &c.

1. I begin with hour. What is the meaning of hour, in John iv. 23? "The *hour* cometh, and now is, when true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him." "The *hour* cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusa-

lem, worship the Father." In the above two instances it is admitted, on all hands, that it *cannot* be limited even to a thousand years, but spreads itself over the whole gospel dispensation. "And Jesus answered them, saying, The *hour* is come that the Son of man should be glorified." In this instance, also, it is used for *period* instead of the twelfth part of a day. 1 John ii. 18: "Little children, it is the last [$\omega\rho\alpha$] hour"—(the same word that is used in the above instances, and by the same writer, too)—or "time: and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now there are many Antichrists; whereby we may know it is the last [$\omega\rho\alpha$] hour or time." I think, in the above instances, all must admit that the inspired writer means, by "hour," the period included from the time he wrote to *the end of all things*. *John*, therefore, in some instances, uses the term for a long and undefined period. Plato and other Greek writers use it in the same manner. If this be true, it will take something more than *verbal* criticism to prove that it includes anything less than a long period, when applied to the resurrection or judgment. Brother Whedon's argument, therefore, based upon the term "hour," can have no weight when applied to the resurrection of the just and unjust. The scriptural meaning of the phrase, in the above instances, is *time*, or period: the "time" cometh and

now is—the period cometh and now is. But *John*, especially, uses it in this sense.

2. What is the meaning of *day*—last day? Brother Whedon says “it means a common, *terrestrial day*,” even when applied to the day of judgment! Does he really *believe* this, or was it an oversight? Mr. Wesley thought that, when applied to the judgment, it meant at *least* a thousand years—perhaps more. I incline to the same opinion. And brother Whedon will allow me to embrace Mr. Wesley’s view of the judgment without charging me, I trust, with heresy. Although my views are not settled in reference to some circumstances connected with the judgment, yet, at present, so far as the length of that day is concerned, I adopt the views of Mr. Wesley, remarking that “judgment will *begin* with the house of God,” and will spread over the space of a thousand years or more. But what does the *Bible* say upon this subject? “I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is *day*; the night cometh when no man can work.” “O that thou hadst known in this *thy day*.” He hath appointed “another *day*.” “Saying in David, *To-day*.” “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see *my day*, and was glad.” “*Day* of salvation.” In the above instances the term *day* evidently means an undefined length of time—the *time* for saving souls—the time when one may be saved—the Gospel dispensation—and the *day* of Christ. And these are abundant to show

that *verbal criticism*, limiting it, in doubtful cases, to "a common earthly day," would be a procedure that critical acumen would scarcely sanction. To use a term familiar with brother Whedon—"It would be absurd." In one instance, (1 Cor. iv. 3,) Paul uses *day* [ἡμερας] for judgment; and this idea, I believe, is frequently included in the term, "day of the Lord." I only need to add to this that Peter, and some of the early fathers, understood by "the day of the Lord"—the "last day"—a thousand years. Peter, in speaking of this day of the Lord, says, "One day with the Lord is as a thousand years;" and Barnabas, Paul's associate, says, "One day with the Lord is a thousand years." And he supposed "the day of the Lord" to be the seventh millenary or thousand years. Bishop Newton quotes Rabbi Ketina, in the Talmud, with others, as saying that "the world shall endure six thousand years; and *one thousand years it shall be laid waste—in which all the enemies of God shall be destroyed—and in which 'the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day'*"—or in that thousand years.* No criticism, therefore, on the word "day," "days," or "last day," or "last days," can prove that the *word* is to be limited to "a common earthly day" of twenty-four hours, when applied to the day of judg-

* By *waste* is meant, uncultivated, or growing spontaneously.

ment; and is it not amazing that brother Whedon should have based his argument upon such an assertion?

But I now proceed to the question—Are there *two* resurrections? I answer, Undoubtedly there are; and I take them to be *literal*. I begin with John v. The Savior is conversing upon his Godhead. “The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what *things soever* he doeth, *these also doeth the Son* likewise.” The union is so intimate that one cannot work without the other. “For as the Father *raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.*” Our blessed Lord then remarks, with direct reference to the position here laid down, that the Father raises the dead—*so also* does the Son—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, the *hour is coming—and now is—when the dead shall hear the voice of the SON OF GOD; and they that hear SHALL LIVE:*” and then adds, after another explanatory clause, “Marvel not at this”—that the hour is coming when a *part* of the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and *live*—“for the hour,” or time, “is coming, in the which ALL that are in the graves shall *hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, at [εἰς] the resurrection of life: and they that have done evil, at the resurrection of damnation.*” So plainly do these texts of Scripture point out *two resurrections*, that I know not how it

could be done more perfectly in so few words; and particularly when it is remembered that many of the Jews did not believe in the resurrection of the wicked, but *only* in the resurrection of the just.* For my right hand I would not affix a meaning to this text which the Son of God did not intend. But, after the most careful and prayerful attention to this subject, I believe no true criticism can make it mean anything less than two resurrections. Why did not Christ say, "shall come forth at the *resurrection*—they that have done good, to life—they that have done evil, to damnation?" But instead of this, he names specifically two resurrections—the *resurrection of life*—the *resurrection of damnation*. There could be no *resurrection of life* if half of the multitude that came forth were to be damned; and there could be no resurrection of damnation if half, or more, of the multitude that came forth were to be saved; it would then have been a mixed resurrection. In such a case it would have been called *the resurrection*—not resurrection OF LIFE, and *only life*, as the words plainly imply; nor would it have been called the resurrection of damnation, for the same reason. This view of the passage is confirmed by what the Savior says in the verses preceding; the sentiment of which is, that the Son, not only while on earth, quickened or

* See Adam Clarke on John, chap. vi.

raised up whom he would, and had power to do so as well as had the Father, but, also, in further confirmation of his power, the hour was *coming* when the dead *generally* should hear his voice—and as many as hear, in a specific sense, shall *live*. This sentiment—as many as hear shall live—was in conformity to Jewish faith; and, therefore, lest a wrong impression should be made, he states, in a verse subsequently, that *all* should come forth that were in the graves; but he states, also, that it will be at two distinct resurrections, one of the just, and another of the unjust. And that Christ, in the first text named, refers to the dead literally, is the opinion of both Wesley and Clarke.

I have used the word *at* instead of the word *unto*—a liberty perfectly justified by the original. But *unto* is equally in point: for how could they come forth *unto* a resurrection that did not exist? We are to come forth *unto the resurrection of life*. But if there is not a resurrection of life, how can we come forth *unto* it? And Christ states here who shall come forth *unto* it—“*they that have done good.*” Nor could one come forth *unto* the resurrection of *damnation*, if there were no such resurrection. But our Savior states explicitly here, also, who shall come forth *unto* it—“*they that have done evil.*” The only text, therefore, of any weight, on the side of Br. Whedon, which he has quoted, proves demonstratively that

two resurrections *must* take place. I ought to add here, that I believe commentators have generally acknowledged that the *wicked* will not come forth with the just. The *order* that will be followed, as they suppose, is, 1. The righteous dead will be raised. 2. The righteous living will be changed. 3. Then the wicked. This is admitting, so far as the *order* is concerned, all that is claimed. It is admitting, too, the point in dispute. For if the wicked come forth *after* the righteous are raised, and the righteous living changed, there must be *another* resurrection for them.* But I am confirmed in this view of the subject by other passages: "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all he hath given me" (all that come to him—that believe on him) "I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son," by the eye of faith, "and *believeth on him*, may have everlasting life: and I will raise *him* up at the last day." "No man *can* come to me except the Father which sent me *draw him*, and I will *raise him* up at the last day." "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso *eateth my flesh*, and drinketh my

* See Benson on 1 Cor. xv.

blood, hath eternal life; and I will *raise him up* at the last day." So "he that eateth me, even he shall LIVE by me." (John vi. 39, 54.) These, certainly, are remarkable words—if they convey no other meaning than that *all men* shall be raised at the last day. What did Paul mean when he said, "If, by *any means*, I might attain to the resurrection of the dead?" Was he afraid that he should not be raised? What! when *all* are raised? and at the same time, too? Can any sense be attached to his words if this were their meaning? He counts all things lost—presses toward the mark like a race-runner—"if by *any means* he might attain to the resurrection of the dead." The truth is, I think, the twelve tribes hoped to come to a "glorious resurrection"—a resurrection spoken of by Job, when *He* should stand on the earth—and when the wicked should be chased out of the world—and one that should be shared in by the righteous ONLY. And it is to this resurrection, called by the Savior, in another place, "the resurrection of the just," that constant reference is had in all the above passages. Hence that resurrection is made to depend on "*coming to Christ*"—on "*believing on him*"—on "*eating his flesh*"—"drinking his blood." If reference had been had to the resurrection of the wicked—"of the unjust"—it could not have been made to *depend on everlasting life within him*: yet such *alone* are referred

to by our blessed Lord. Taken in connection, therefore, with the passage from Philippians, "If by *any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead"—in connection with the passage, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just"—in connection with the passage, "There shall be a resurrection *both* of the *just* and of the *unjust*," it is difficult to believe that our Lord had any other reference than to the "resurrection of the just;" and it seems quite certain that our Lord, in these passages, points out that glorious resurrection *only*, which shall be enjoyed a thousand years "before the rest of the dead shall live." I think, also, from one passage, that 1 Cor. xv. refers *only* to the resurrection of the just; and that passage is as follows: "As *we* have borne the *image* of the *earthly*, *we* shall also bear the *image* of the *heavenly*"—Mr. Wesley says, of "holiness." And on ver. 22 he says, "The righteous *only* are referred to." And all must concede that the wicked are *not* referred to *directly* in any part of the chapter whatever. Put beside 1 Cor. xv., the texts, "Even so *them* also *which* sleep in *Jesus*, will God bring with him"—and may we not add, *only* them—and also, "Thou shalt come with all thy saints with thee"—"and the *dead in Christ* shall rise *first*, then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up"—and, as in another place, "changed;" how else can we

conclude, than that the righteous rise first, and that there are *two resurrections*? In one other place he promises to “quicken” our mortal bodies by his Spirit, which *dwelleth in you*, or, as the margin reads, *because of his Spirit, &c.*—apparently making the resurrection to depend on the *fact* that the Spirit of Christ is *within us*. Now if we superadd to the whole of this the remarkable language in Rev. xx., apparently no doubt can remain, and with me none does remain, that two literal resurrections are clearly *revealed* in the word of God: “And I saw *thrones*”—(the same that Daniel saw)—“and *they* sat upon them, and judgment was given to them:”—(so says Daniel)—“and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, *and for the word of God*”—(covering all the Old Testament saints)—“and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they *LIVED* and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the *first RESURRECTION*.” They who have a part in it are *blessed* and *holy*; and on such *the second death hath no power*. Can this last sentence mean anything less than they *cannot be damned*? And if they *cannot* be damned, they cannot be in a probationary state. The angels themselves were originally exposed to this. But if the

second death hath no power over such; if they are blessed and holy—all of them—“on *such*,” saith the Holy Ghost; how, I ask, can there be an *apostacy*—such a one as will grow up into Gog and Magog, covering the breadth of the earth—“in number as the sand of the sea?”—such a one as will bring the world into the state that it was when it was destroyed by a flood?—such a state as it was in when Sodom was destroyed?—such a state as is described, (Matt. xxv. 1—12,) when half of the church is *so dead* as not to be saved? But all this, according to the theory of Br. Whedon, springs out of a millennium, all the inheritors of which are *blessed* and *holy*—springing from persons “who lived again”—persons over whom the second death *had no power*. Who, I ask, are to live at the *last end* of the millennium? Will they become as filthy as in the days of Lot? of Noah? Then doth not the second death have power over them? How then can John’s words be true, “on such the second death hath NO POWER?”

How exactly answering to the conclusion to which I have come do those words of our Lord appear: (Luke xx. 35, 36 :) “But they who are counted *worthy* to obtain that world, AND *the resurrection from the dead*, neither marry nor are given in marriage. For neither can they die any more: for they are equal to angels; *and are children of God*, BEING *the children of the resurrection*.”

Surely the Savior must have had reference here only to the resurrection of the just—"the children of God—*being* children," on that account, "of the resurrection." But if brother Whedon's theory is true, all—the *wicked* as well as the just—are children of the resurrection. This idea the text plainly forbids. And Daniel does but shadow out the same great distinction of *two* resurrections, although in the manner quoted by brother Whedon, it might otherwise appear. He says, "*At that time thy* people shall *be* DELIVERED—*every one* that shall be found *written in the book*"—book of life. Here is the first resurrection. Then pursuing the course that our blessed Lord did subsequently in John, he says, "And many of them"—all, as I understand it, but without reference to time—"that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake;" but to preserve the distinction before alluded to, and with direct reference to the great deliverance, to wit, the redemption of the body, which he had just referred to, of *all* God's people written in the book, he adds, "some to everlasting life"—at the deliverance spoken of; "*some* to shame and everlasting contempt"—at the resurrection of damnation. What other deliverance can the prophet refer to than the *general deliverance*, when he specifies, "EVERY ONE that shall *be found written in the book*?" What book but the "book of life" can be intended?

I only need to add here, that St. Clement, the disciple of Peter, afterward bishop of Rome, talks in the same language. He says, "Shall any one think it to be any very great and strange thing for the Lord of all to raise up THOSE that *religiously serve* him in the assurance of a good faith, when, even by a bird"—referring to the fabled Phoenix—"he shows his greatness to fulfil THE PROMISE?" He adds, "We must come to judgment in the flesh"—"in the flesh receive the reward." The reward was the "kingdom of God," which he elsewhere taught the church to expect "every hour." In Paul and Thecla also, Paul is represented as saying, "There could be *no future* resurrection unless we continue in chastity, and do not defile the flesh." But if one will not believe the prophets, sure I am he will not believe antiquity—not even the fathers.

G. F. COX.

Portland, March 8, 1842.

[No. XIII.]

THE following letter contains a reply to some of the incidental objections of Professor Whedon, and is a most valuable and important portion of the discussion. There are several points introduced in it, either one of which is

sufficient to do away forever the doctrine of a temporal and spiritual reign of Christ for a thousand years before his personal coming. The argument, for instance, drawn from Matt. xxiv. 14, "This gospel of the kingdom," &c., can never be met and confuted. Reader, look at these points and weigh them carefully.

J. L.

INCIDENTAL OBJECTIONS EXAMINED AND ANSWERED.

I PROPOSE in this article to answer some of the incidental objections interspersed through brother Whedon's articles, that have not yet been attended to in answering the more leading objections. And even here I may omit some that he may regard as important. If so, and he will suggest them, I will give my views upon them, or yield to them.

1. While he allows the view I have adopted "may have no evil tendency upon myself, he fears its disastrous effects upon thousands" of others. The disastrous influence brother Whedon does not suppose will arise from the *fact* that the advent of Christ is *near*, or that we preach that it is near: but from an "excited *belief* that this event, with the dissolution of the earth, is near, when *in truth* they will soon find that it is all a delusion." Brother Whedon here *assumes* the *point* in question. His reasoning, therefore, can have, or should have, no influence on the question. The same objec-

tion existed to the preaching of Noah, and must of necessity exist in all coming time, till the event arrives. If we yield to him, therefore, we can never preach that Christ's coming is near. If we may ever speak of Christ's coming, we may *now*. If we may ever preach that it is *nigh*, that "he cometh quickly," we may *now*. And there is no motive in the Bible more frequently applied to arouse man and the church, by the Holy Ghost, than is this same second coming of Christ—and that, too, on account of its *nearness*; and so much the more "should we do it"—all the church—"as we see the day approaching."

But, perhaps, his objection lies entirely against fixing the exact time;—then he should release those *who do not fix it*. But it should be recollected, that scarcely a commentator of any note has lived who has not said something of the *time* when "the end of all things would come." His objection, therefore, lies against *all* biblical interpretation that has preceded us on this subject. Dr. Clarke, himself, fixes, as a propable event, the dissolution of the mundane system in a hundred and seventy-five years from A. D. 1825. This objection can have no force, therefore, when applied to the *time*, unless it is to the *specific time* named; and if he will enter the list here, he will find a task more difficult than he ever yet undertook of a Biblical character.

Well has Mr. Fletcher remarked, "Is it possible that God, who foretold to a year, and very clearly, the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage, their return from the Babylonian captivity, the building of the second temple, and the death of the Messiah, should have been silent, or not have spoken *as clearly*, concerning his coming to destroy the *destroyer*, and set up his everlasting kingdom?" And has not almost every biblical student said the same. In either case, therefore, brother Whedon should allow us to lift up the voice like a trumpet, if need be, and say, in the language of the Bible, "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh!"—and to cry to all the prophets in Israel, "Seal NOT the sayings of the prophecy of THIS BOOK; FOR THE TIME IS AT HAND."

2. But brother Whedon supposes "we shall destroy the hope of the world's conversion." So did the Son of God, when he taught, that the *state of the world* at his coming should be "as it was in the days of Noah." Of course the *world* cannot be converted when Christ comes: it must be *as it was before the flood*. If the world is converted for a thousand years, it rolls back again to the days of Noah and Lot—to the days when Gog and Magog shall come upon the breadth of the earth, "whose number is *as the sand of the sea*;" so that all that the world can hope for, on brother Whedon's

theory, is a "single bright spot;" one, too, where "*death reigns*"—where there is toil, "procreation," "wolves and tigers," and what else I will not say. But even from this state it will backslide; and will not the last state become worse than the first? And would it not be good for *that world*, or thousand years, "if it had never been born?" But, aside from this, it should be recollected, that, without an earthly millennium, in which all the world is converted, we have *all the motives of the apostolic age*. Need we any more? Nay, ought we to have any more? Would it not of itself be a proof, that, if we had, we were in error? The grand motive of the first three centuries of the Christian era, which was employed by both the apostles and their successors, was the *second coming of Christ*.

3. Brother Cox nowhere "says the early fathers were unanimous" in anything. Justin Martyr makes a remark, that they were on the subject of the millennium; and that they placed it after the resurrection, and after the world was *renewed*. I stated that sentiments, similar to those adopted by me, spread through the church during the first centuries, and have been within her pale ever since that time. This is true. I quoted some of the fathers who adopted this view. This brother Whedon should not contradict; and will not, if he allows what is truth. And when he says of the early fa-

thers, (they being mistaken as to the time of Christ's coming,) that their system was therefore proved false, he does not reason well. That error only proved that they were mistaken in the *time*, not in the thing itself.

4. Brother Whedon says again: "To the article of brother Cox, in which, by giving an overdrawn picture of the millennium, he attempts to demonstrate that it cannot take place until a new earth is created, I shall, at present, give this brief, but I trust conclusive reply. Brother Cox, like most other advocates of his view, makes the 20th chapter of Revelation a strong hold for his millennial reign, and brings some acute, and, as he thinks, demonstrative arguments to prove the necessity of a literal interpretation of that passage. If now brother Cox has demonstrated the necessity of the literal interpretation, then, most certainly, he has demonstrated that the millennium will take place on this old and unchanged earth. For, let the reader specially mark, it is not until after the binding of Satan in that chapter—after the thousand years' reign—after the final judgment, and consignment of the wicked to the lake of fire—that we have the announcement—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea!'"

To the above I have many replies, but offer but two:—

1st. No commentator, to my knowledge, supposes the book of Revelation can be interpreted in a consecutive or chronological order. No just interpretation can be given on such a plan. Mr. Wesley speaks beautifully upon this subject. He says of the book of Revelation—“Its whole structure breathes the art of God, comprising, in the most finished compendium, things to come; many, various, old, new, long, short; near, intermediate, remote; and these interwoven together, opposite, composite: relative to each other, at a *small* or a *great* distance from each other: sometimes *disappearing*, broken off, suspended, and afterward most *unexpectedly* and most seasonably appearing again.” This is the truth in the case; and this is true of all prophecy. No man can interpret prophecy consecutively.*

2d. But if brother Whedon’s objection is of any value, it proves too much. “For the kingdoms of this world are become the

* I cannot represent my thoughts upon prophetic Scripture better than by quoting a text from Isa. xxviii. 9, 13, 14. He says, “Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? them that are *weaned* from the milk, and drawn from the breasts. But the word of the Lord was unto them, precept upon precept, precept upon precept: line upon line, line upon line; *here a little*, and *there a little*; that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken. Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule the people which is in Jerusalem.” G. F. C.

kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ," in such a sense that Christ "reigns FOREVER and EVER," (instead of a thousand years,) in the *eleventh chapter*—long before the new heaven and earth appear—long before the "souls reign on earth a thousand years," or the first resurrection. Nay, brother Whedon, "the mystery of God was finished," (chap. x.) "and the time came that the dead should be judged," (chapter xi.) "when *reward* should be given to the *prophets*, and to the *saints*, and to them that *fear* the name of God,"—and the time, too, "when God should destroy," not raise, "them which destroy the earth." But the serious reader will remember ALL THESE EVENTS named are to occur under the *seventh angel*. And when he *begins to sound*, "the mystery of God is finished." O! what a moment for the reader and writer! Who can stand when he appeareth! Precious reader! seek a shelter in the blessed Redeemer. Now he is on the mercy-seat; but when *once* he hath *arisen* to shut to the door, there is no more a moment to be saved! Now lift up your cry to God, that your heart may be broken, your sins pardoned—your spirit washed, and your soul finally saved.

5. I unite with brother Whedon in saying, the parable of the tares (Matt. xiii.) "teaches that both the righteous and WICKED will be left *undestroyed* till the end of *this world*; and then immediately the one will be *burnt*,

and the other translated to the *firmament* of heaven." But, I ask again, is not this admission fatal to his theory? If he allows *sinner*s to exist in his millennium, "bundles of them," to such an extent as to induce the servants of Christ to say, "Sir, shall we gather them out?"—sinners, too, when they have no devil to tempt them—when the Gospel is universally diffused—when the earth is full of health and life—full of virtue and holiness; why, they must be the veriest villains that ever lived—cut-throats or pirates not excepted. Will brother Whedon allow these a place in the Bible millennium? Sad picture for the promise of the church! and sadder still for the word of God, which says, "None shall hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain"—"None shall make afraid." But these would, in such a place, almost make an angel to tremble. Must there not be murders, thefts, liars, backbiters, adulterers, drunkards, if these characters are allowed a place in the millennium? What security has society *then*, more than now? But I turn from a picture so dark. God deals on general principles; and if one may *SIN*, so may *all*. Is this the millennium of the church, where "not a stake is to be moved, not a cord be broken?" It cannot be.

6. But, brother Whedon inquires, "Whence come Gog and Magog, if the heavenly state is to commence with the millennium, and if

they appear subsequent to the new heavens and earth?" On brother Whedon's theory, they come out of a "millennium" that had been promised to the church four thousand years; the inhabitants of which were "all holy"—"blessed"—placed beyond "the power of the second death;" and yet this number of sinners exist, and the great work of rebellion is accomplished as it were in a moment of time. "Nations" there are "in the four quarters of the earth," "coming up upon its breadth"—"the number of whom is as the *sand of the sea*." Do these look like the relics of better days—like the fruits of a millennium? But brother Whedon asks for a better theory. No; I am saved that trouble. He acknowledges that I am under no obligations to give one. He will find, however, the whole theory darkly shadowed out by the prophet Isaiah, in chap. xxiv. 25, 26, 27. And if consecutive or chronological order is anything, brother Whedon will find that the "earth is utterly broken down"—"the earth is clean *dissolved*"—"reels to and fro like a drunkard"—is "removed like a cottage"—"shall fall and not rise again," before the millennium and the resurrection are named. When the dissolution of the earth takes place, "the high ones shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered, in the pit, and shall be shut up in prison, and *after many days shall they be visited*. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun

ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."

7. There is one remark more I wish to make. It is on the best article I have seen from brother Whedon. It is worthy of the man. I harmonize with the most of it. But he assumes *two* unsafe and dangerous positions. One is, that the world is *not now* in the "last days;" whereas the apostles affirm that it is, repeatedly, even in the "last hour." 2. He establishes most conclusively the meaning of 2 Peter, (chap. iii.) as giving a description of the literal destruction of the present world, and the creation of the new heavens and new earth, and makes it harmonize with the new heavens and new earth spoken of in Rev. xxi. Here we are agreed with the grasp of charity itself. But now comes a point at issue. He acknowledges also that the new heavens and new earth are spoken of but three times in the Bible, in a specific sense; twice in the New, and once in the Old Testament. The instances in the New Testament are in Peter and Revelation. The one in the Old Testament is in Isaiah, and is as follows:—"For behold I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." And of this, in the following chapter, it is said, "It shall remain." In reference to this passage—for there is no other to which reference can be made: so brother Whedon testifies—of this

passage the HOLY GHOST says, "Nevertheless, ACCORDING to his PROMISE, we look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Now, one of two things is inevitably true; either the new heavens and new earth, spoken of by Peter, was *never promised*--or it is promised in Isaiah. But the Holy Ghost says *it is promised*; and as it can be promised nowhere but in Isaiah, therefore the new heavens and new earth, spoken of by Isaiah, must be identical with that spoken of by Peter. It must be the same. And as Peter speaks of the final abode of the saints, so does Isaiah. If Isaiah speaks of the true millennium, then the millennium is not till after the destruction of the present world; so saith the Holy Ghost by Peter. If Peter speaks of the final abode of the blessed, then the final abode of the blessed is the *true* millennium. No man can escape from this conclusion. If we then admit Peter to refer to the physical dissolution of the earth, and the creation of a new one, then Isaiah refers to the same: for God cannot promise bread, and give to us a stone. The promise and the gift must be identical. As certain therefore as the immutable God has promised a new heaven and earth—and the Holy Ghost says, according to that promise, we may look for it—we can expect *no other*. But, says brother Whedon, the scenes are dissimilar. I cannot help that. God has promised; and that promise, accord-

ing to the Holy Spirit, is literally a new heaven and earth. But, says the objector, "The new heaven and earth of Isaiah hath *animals* in it—'the lamb'—'the wolf;' and these good brethren make of heaven a *vile* menagery." Hold! brother Whedon. Libel no man, nor number of men. "The picture of the lamb and wolf," the *Holy Ghost* hath drawn, and presented to us as an emblem of the peace of heaven. It is brother *Whedon* that makes it a *vile* menagery. The good Mr. Wesley, who supposed these animals *would be raised* up to enjoy the heavenly state, made it not a *vile* menagery, but a *glorious* one.

But "does brother Cox believe that the lamb and the lion will inhabit the 'saints' final abode?" I have no faith about it. I doubt it much. Mr. Wesley believed it; but I will not ridicule him on that account, nor any other man. But, really, there is no more difficulty here than there is in the "trees" of Revelation, which "bare twelve manner of fruit"—equal to those of Papius—and "yielding their fruit every month." There is no more difficulty in Isaiah lxxv. than there is in the expression, "God is a rock," or in the river of the water of life proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb. Why then this flourish? One may as well object to the new city entire, because of its pearls and gold. I take it, therefore, to be incontrovertibly established that Isaiah and Peter

refer to the same heaven—the same earth : and as that of Peter *cannot* take place until the destruction of the present mundane system, as brother Whedon grants, neither can the other. Brother Whedon's remark, therefore, that "there is no *future* literal new creation mentioned in the Old Testament," according to his own showing, is flatly against God's word. For, if not mentioned there, how could it be *promised*? But the Holy Ghost saith by Peter, that it *was promised*: and according to it, not otherwise, we are to look for it. We repeat it—as the passage in Isaiah *must* be either the millennium, or heavenly state, or both; for in the last case it may be identical; and as the Holy Ghost *has made it identical* with the heavenly state in Peter, there can be no more controversy on the subject.

But to sweep away all hope of an earthly millennium, at a single stroke, and with a single passage or word from the immutable Jehovah, I give the following as a closing remark: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and *then shall the end come.*" (Matt. xxiv. 14.) From this passage it is demonstrable that there can be *no* general diffusion of the Gospel among all nations *a thousand years*. For the Lord Jesus testifies that *as soon* as it shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations, **THEN** shall the end come. Now, as the Gos-

pel cannot be generally diffused until it is everywhere preached, so, as soon as it is everywhere preached for a witness to all nations, *then* cometh the end. This looks to me like the ancient *elenchos*, or demonstration—that which cannot be otherwise than we assert. If the end comes when the Gospel is preached in all the world, it cannot continue to be preached a thousand years, or three hundred and sixty thousand—and then another thousand for an apostasy, or another hundred, or one year, or one day. When all have heard the gospel for a witness, then cometh the end. When the flag of Christ has been hoisted on the last mountain in the sense there specified, then the last trump will sound, and Christ will appear to judge the world in righteousness.

And mark, reader, as *when* Christ comes to reckon with the church, one half of its members will be without oil—without light; as when he comes the world will be in the state it was before the flood; so the preaching of the Gospel in all the world, for a witness to all nations, cannot be the *conversion* of all the world. The Gospel has been preached in New York city for some two centuries, for a witness to all its citizens; but, perhaps, not one out of ten have been converted to God. So it may be in all the world. And it is not essential that this should be done at the same moment. God may send it in one age to one nation, and,

on account of its rejection, it may turn to another; and thus, like the sun, in a revolving year, shine on all, but not on all at the same moment of time. I do not understand, however, that the Gospel is to be preached in all the world, as it has been in New York, for the fulfilment of that passage; but only to be sent out as "a witness to all nations."

G. F. COX.

Portland, March 17, 1842.

CORRECTION.—I see, by my article embracing general objections to the theory of a temporal millennium, I have quoted Rev. xi. 15, erroneously. It should read, "And HE shall reign forever and ever," referring to Christ, rather than his children. I believe, however, the argument is not affected by this error, as the same sentiment is conveyed in Daniel, where the saints are said to "possess the kingdom forever, even FOREVER and EVER." And the promise in Psalm cxxxii. 12, to the faithful children of God, is, that they "also shall sit upon thy (Christ's) throne for evermore." It is implied also in the fact, that the saints are "joint-heirs with Christ." Rom. viii. 17.

G. F. COX.

THE MORNING STAR.

THE night is wearing fast away,
A streak of light is dawning,—
Sweet harbinger of that bright day,
The fair Millennial morning.

Gloomy and dark the night has been,
And long the way, and dreary;
And sad the weeping saints are seen,
And faint, and worn, and weary.

Ye mourning pilgrims, cease your tears,
And hush each sigh of sorrow;
The light of that bright morn appears,—
The long sabbatic morrow.

Lift up your heads—behold from far
A flood of splendor streaming!
It is the bright and Morning-Star,
In living lustre beaming!

And see that star-like host around
Of angel bands, attending;
Hark! hark! the trumpet's glad'ning sound,
'Mid shouts triumphant blending.

He comes, the Bridegroom promised long—
Go forth with joy to meet him;
And raise the new and nuptial song,
In cheerful strains to greet him.

Adorn thyself, the feast prepare,
While bridal strains are swelling;
He comes, with thee all joys to share,
And make this earth his dwelling.