

...THE...

# Union Seminary Magazine

---

VOL. XXI.

OCTOBER—NOVEMBER, 1909

No. 1

---

## THE SIN OF STRANGE FIRE

JAMES I. VANCE.

Text: "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not."—Lev. 10: 1.

Here is a weird and unique incident in the story of the chosen people. The text records a religious tragedy. It transpired during Israel's wilderness wanderings. It followed hard upon one of the sublimest hours in the nation's history.

The descent of the holy fire had just taken place. The tabernacle, that temple-tent of a pilgrim people, had been finished. The altars were complete and the sacrifices had been laid thereon. Around this shrine of their faith gather an expectant people in the solemn act of worship. There stands Moses, the man of God, who had led the nation out of slavery. And there is Aaron, the high priest, whose function is to mediate between the people and eternal mysteries. These two have just lifted their hands in benediction upon the great congregation.

Now will God answer? Every heart is intense. Will Jehovah indicate, by some outward sign, His presence and assure them that the cry of a nation's soul has entered into the heart of the Infinite?

Suddenly, as they wait, a flame of miraculous fire parts from the Shekinah in the holy place, leaps upon the altar, and

## "THE CONQUERING KINGDOM."

C. R. VAUGHAN.

"And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."—Matthew in his gospel.

Among the points on which the two parties called Premillennialists and Postmillennialists differ there are several which need more than the mere explanatory statements which were made in the last half of the previous chapter. These are the Conquering Kingdom, the Little Horn, the Man of Sin, the Two Beasts, the Two Resurrections and the kind of Watching which is required in reference to the Coming of the Lord. The views of the two parties on these questions have been explained sufficiently; it now remains to show which of the two are correct and scripturally founded. Touching the first of these questions to be subjected to logical proof, the Postmillennialists affirm that the Kingdom which is to conquer the world, is the Visible Church administered by the ordinances appointed by Christ, in the hands of men as the instrumental agents, and by the Messiah present in it as Mediatorial King—by the drawing of the Father—and through the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit as the efficient power. The Millenarian view is that the Visible Church is not the proper kingdom of Christ at all, but only a preparatory arrangement to introduce the real and efficient kingdom; and when this kingdom makes its appearance, the Visible Church will be superseded and abolished. It is certain that the Visible Church has been established as the agency for exhibiting the ordinances and means of grace and spreading the knowledge of the gospel. It is certain that this has been

true from the Eden dispensation to the time of Abraham—from the time of Abraham to the time of Christ—and from the time of Christ to the beginning of the Millennium. It is also apparent, both by the logical implications of the case and by the precedents of the past, that the change of the dispensation and its characteristic organization will be followed by a change of at least the characteristic ordinances. Thus circumcision was introduced at the supersedure of the unorganized Eden dispensation by the organized Church in the days of Abraham; and circumcision and the typical sacrificial system by the Baptism and the Supper, at the establishment of the Christian dispensation. Millenarians, at least some of the most prominent of them, admit and contend for this result. It is certain that the Visible Church was reorganized formally by apostolic men, who were commissioned to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and to prepare the Church for its grand propagandist work by stripping it of all the splendid equipment of its non-propagandist period, simplifying its ordinances so that they could be used in any place, and thus putting it into marching order. It is also certain that all these changes were ordered by the King himself, through the inspiration of his Spirit. It is certain that this reorganized Visible Church received the treasure of the gospel truth and ordinances to be put into earthen vessels, of deliberate design and the set purpose of the Master, and that too for the purpose of showing that the excellency of the power was of God, and not of men. These words do clearly and emphatically teach that the real efficiency of the Visible Church was never from the beginning in itself, or in the ordinances administered by men; but that its whole efficiency for its ends was in the distinct and separate energy of the Triune Divine Being, who was to work through and by it. To discount the Visible Church, then as a complete and unified arrangement which is not competent to accomplish its purposes and ends, is really to assail the power, from the first, made efficient in it. The Scriptures tell us plainly what that power is.

Paul defines it, generally speaking, as "the power of God." Specifically defined it is the power of the Holy Ghost, whose influence is alone sufficient to give effect to the truth. It is also the power of the Father, without whose "drawing" no man can come to Christ. It is also the power of the Son, who according to his promise is always with his Church and will be to the end of the world, and, who is not only the Head of the Church, but Head over all things to the Church. Such a power at the back of any institution is sufficient to guarantee its efficiency: for no higher can be conceived. Nor can we suppress the fear that any impeachment of any institution guaranteed by such power involves a very serious responsibility in any one daring enough to depreciate it. Any apparent slowness or incompleteness in the work and progress of such an institution can be altogether accounted for by the withholding of the power, for reasons that seem sufficient to the infinite wisdom that guides the infinite power. The restraint of the power is as honorable to the infallible wisdom which dictates it, as it is to the power and the grace that dictates the grant of the power. God is to be honored and trusted as much in the withholding as he is in the gift. The Millenarian theory is that the world can only be converted by the personal and visible appearance of Messiah. But the assertion is discredited by what has already been accomplished. The triumphs of grace are already proofs positive of what the power behind the ordinances can do, if it is pleased to exert itself. Besides this fact, the presence of Christ is equally real in the Church under his pledge to be with it to the end of the world, as his visible appearance can possibly be; and possibly more effective, since his visible appearance would affect only those who saw him; whereas his invisible presence is everywhere and available to all, instead of a limited number at a time. Moreover, his power is equally great, whether he is visible or invisible: the only difference is in the mode of manifesting both presence and power. Nor would his actual presence have any efficiency to convert a human heart, and imbue in it that faith which works by love and purifies the heart, and over-

comes the world. It might qualify the conditions of an historical faith, and the outward manifestations of regard to his will. But the doctrine of the Scriptures is clear and positive that it is only by the exceeding greatness of his power—by what they call a new creation, and a resurrection from the dead—that a soul actually dead in trespasses and sins can be renewed into eternal life. If these are truths of the Christian Faith, the Millenarian doctrine of the sweeping away of the Visible Church, the ordinances of worship and the means of grace, and the change of the dispensation of the Spirit, seems to imply a marked change in those conditions of salvation. Now it is not to be denied that the power of the Son, the second person of the Trinity, is infinite, and as such competent to the regeneration of a human soul; yet it is evidently taught in the holy record that in the arrangements of the Covenant of Grace between the persons of the Trinity, the work of Redemption was assigned to the Son and the application of that Redemption was assigned to the Holy Spirit. It is, therefore, unauthorized to qualify the relations of the Blessed Spirit to the entire work of saving the elect, on any terms or at any period, before the end of the work of grace in the world. It is unquestionable, that so far as the teachings of the Scriptures give any account of the conversion of a soul, they ascribe it—so far as the subjective processes in the soul itself are concerned—uniformly to the power of the Spirit; not because there is any incompetence in the Father or in the Son, but because the arrangements of the great Covenant assigned this department of the work to the Holy Spirit as the immediate agent in every case. The Creed of the Church has always recognized this truth. It has also, at least for the most part, recognized that the souls of the saved have been saved on the same principles, however the ordinances may have been altered at the change of dispensations; and that this great fact will continue down to the end of the world, when the number of the elect is complete, and the process of salvation comes to an end. The Millenarian holds that the “Bride of the Lamb” will be complete at the Advent before the Millennium, and that the subsequent devel-

opment of the human race will not need salvation by grace, being a naturally holy race just as the angels of heaven are. In this point too, they sever themselves from the great body of the people of God. We have no right to assume the salvation of any part of the human race, at any time, and under any dispensation, except through the redemption that is in Christ our Lord, and while he still occupies the Mediatorial Throne. To construe the continued holiness of all who are born in the fleshly state for all eternity to come, and after Christ has resigned that throne is unauthorized. It is barely conceivable that the generations coming after the Judgment Day should be born holy, as the descendants of Adam may have been had he not fallen; but the notion that the post-judgment generations should be established in holiness independent of the Mediator, and after he has resigned his Mediatorial Throne, is without warrant in the Scriptures.

Again; To deny that the Visible Church is the kingdom of God, although it was established to propagate the Gospel under the administration of Messiah, already seated on the Mediatorial Throne, although supported by the "drawing" of the Father, and the animation and guidance of the Holy Spirit, is altogether inadmissible. The Visible Church is expressly called the "Kingdom of God." It is said in the passage at the head of this chapter that the keys of the Kingdom of heaven were given to Peter. No apostle was ever authorized to admit into that form of the kingdom called "Heaven," the dwelling-place of the blessed, nor into that form of the kingdom said to be "within you." Peter showed what the kingdom was, whose keys he received, when he admitted believing Jews into the re-organized Church of the New Dispensation, on the day of Pentecost, and when he opened it to the Gentiles by the example of Cornelius at Joppa. Those doors have remained open ever since and can be opened no more. Peter's special function ended with its use, and he reverted to the same level with all the other apostles when his own unrepeatable work was done. The passage in Matthew which conferred this peculiar and un-

transferable function on Peter, settles that the Visible Church is the Kingdom of God—the Kingdom of Christ. It also positively settles a second point against the Millenarian—that the Visible Church will not fail. Messiah positively declares, “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Not only this decisive testimony from Matthew, but all those passages of Scripture in many places which declare the supreme kingly power into which Messiah was inducted when he was made Head of the Church, and was formally established on the Throne when he ascended to heaven, are all proofs that the Visible Church is his “Kingdom”. His Royal Power extends not only over this Church, but to all other things on the earth; for he is pronounced, not only Head of the Church, but Head over all things to the Church. It is absurd to make him a King over all things on the earth as Head of Church, and deny him a kingdom. The Millenarian conception that he can never reign on David’s Throne until he reigns visibly at Jerusalem is equally contradictory to Scripture testimony. David had foretold the Messiah as hearing the grand decree of Jehovah, “Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Luke commenting on this under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, says, “David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself,” Jehovah said unto my Lord, “Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” That throne he had just defined as the throne of David. Christ, the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, was to be raised up to sit on his throne. The resurrection of Messiah, not only inducts to a throne, but that throne is the throne of David. Luke in these words quotes Peter in his Pentecostal address. Paul explains the same prophecy in the same way. The uniform testimony is that by his resurrection from the dead, he had thoroughly qualified himself for the Mediatorial Kingdom, and entered formally into the administration of it, as the son and successor of David who was the type and representative of

the Royal Messiah. It is therefore clear as light itself, that it is not to speak according to Scripture, to say, that the Visible Church is not a real kingdom of Christ, but only a preparation for the true kingdom which is not yet set up. It seems as if the fact remains unnoticed that there is a fourfold form of the kingdom, each equally real, each the evolution of the other—two of which are already in operation, and two to be developed in the future, without losing the unity that pervades them all. One is the reign of Christ through the work and indwelling of the Holy Spirit; this is that kingdom which is said to be “within you.” The second is the Visible Church under the Abrahamic Covenant, militant in the world, The third is that same Visible Church in the glory of its final ascendancy in the Millennial ages. The fourth is that kingdom of God which is called “Heaven”—the eternal state of absolute blessedness, from which the subjects of the Mediatorial Kingdom shall go out no more forever. No one denies that the Millennial form of the kingdom is a part of the true kingdom of our Lord, and in it He will reign a thousand years. It is a reign which is distinguished in the Sacred Record from the other developments of the kingdom by three definite marks: first, the completeness of its conquest over the kingdom of Darkness; and second, the co-ordinate reign of a certain class of his saints with him; and third, the definite limitation of its period. But the guarantees of success are complete under all the dispensations to the final victory of the saints. Under the Abrahamic dispensation, the Patriarch received the absolute promise that in him “all the families of the earth should be blest.” Under the Mosaic dispensation the assurance was given that when the prophet like unto Moses appeared “him shall ye hear.” Under the typical king, the son of Jesse “the heathen are promised for the inheritance of the coming king, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.” Under the last dispensation assurance is given that the song would be raised at the latter day, “the kingdoms of the world have become the kingdom of the Lord and his Christ.” If anything can guarantee



the success of the Visible Church, the Awful Powers at the back of it, and the positive guarantee against failure given to Peter, are altogether sufficient. The guarantee against failure is the guarantee of success; and although the Witnesses are to testify in sackcloth from the beginning up to the time they are "called up in heaven" and put upon their triumphant career, the assurance of success is inflexibly determined, and lays the foundation for quietness and confidence for all the intervening generations of the saints of every age. The promise is the assurance of the success, and the Millennium is the realization of the success. The triumph is not to be expected in the days of sackcloth. It is to be expected when the time appointed comes, but not before. The relation of the Visible Church militant, to the victorious Church of the thousand years is just the relation of a small kingdom which sets out to enlarge its dominion, and succeeds on a wide scale. It is the same kingdom in its earlier days and in its final growth to a great dominion. The difference between the Church in its sackcloth days, and its ultimate victory, is like that between a gifted youth, who in his manhood has realized the aims of his struggle for success. He is the same man; and what he has gained does not affect the identity of his person, nor the high qualities which carried him to his goal. There will be enormous differences in the outward manifestations of the Church in its Millennial state, and the state it exhibited when struggling to win this triumph; but those differences will not affect its identity; they do not at all qualify the unity of the kingdom which made the fight, achieved the success, and then afterward enjoyed the victory.

But the importance of the point in the collision between the Millenarian and the Postmillennialist views makes it necessary to develop more completely the testimony of the Scriptures on the subject. It has already been shown that the Abrahamic Covenant on which the Visible Church was founded positively promised that in Abraham, "all the families of the earth should be blessed." Paul declared centuries after, that in these words

“God had preached before the gospel unto Abraham”, thus marking out the Spiritual element in the Abrahamic Covenant. He confirmed this teaching by affirming that circumcision, the sign and seal of this covenant, was “a seal of the righteousness of faith.” The Visible Church then founded in the family of Abraham, received this assurance of success which should include “all the families of the earth”. This is a clear and resistless testimony that the Visible Church should ultimately embrace all the Gentile nations. This testimony is in itself sufficient to settle this question between the Millenarian and Postmillennial parties. But this testimony leads further yet: it gave the keynote to all the prophets of Israel. It is also of great importance in another respect, it enables us not only to understand the Prophecies, but to comprehend much of the peculiar vocabulary of the Old Testament, in its allusion to the coming kingdom of Messiah. Identified with the race of Israel, the Spiritual kingdom of Messiah is continually spoken of under various characteristics of the Israelite Nationality. The Church founded on the Abrahamic Covenant is called Israel; it is spoken of as Mount Zion; it is called the Temple of God; it is called Jerusalem—the city of the great king; and the triumphs and extension of the Church are described as the extension and the triumphs of Israel. Here then is the possible and probable source of Millenarian and Jewish error in applying the literal principle of interpretation to the Old Testament testimonies. If the literal principle is insisted on as applied to passages where the literal characteristics of Israel, as a people or nation, are applied to the Visible Church which is implicated in the delineation of Israel, it is obvious that things applicable only to the Church will be ascribed to the literal Israelite race. Jerusalem as the symbolic centre of the spiritual element in the Abrahamic Covenant, and in the Israelite Nationality will be taken as the actual city of Jerusalem which was the political capital of the Israelite Nationality in its political element, also embraced in the Covenant with Abraham. It will be readily judged what a serious difference the application of the

literal and figurative principles of interpretation will produce. Both elements may be sometimes involved, but it would be a grave error to ignore either in such cases.

Under these lights, let us look at a few of the Old and New Testament prophecies as they bear on this issue between the Millenarian and Postmillennial parties touching the "Conquering Kingdom" of Messiah. Isaiah predicts for the comfort of the Church, "Thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed, neither be thou confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame. If the Visible Church is a predestined failure, this glorious promise is falsified. If the spiritual Israel of God is not to inherit the Gentiles, but to give place to another kingdom which will inherit them, that pledge too is nullified. Isaiah says again, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." Again the same prophet says, "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night; ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence, and give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth." The Jewish and Premillennial interpreters construe these words of the literal Jerusalem. But even admitting what may possibly be true in some instances, certainly not in all, that there was a primary allusion to a literal Jerusalem, the secondary and more important allusion to the spiritual character of the Jewish people as the Church founded in the family of Abraham must be recognized under the very terms of the prophecy just quoted. It asserts a righteousness which was the product of Israel as a Church, but never the product of Jerusalem and Israel as a political body. So far from it the character of the bulk of the Israelite

nationality often provoked the just wrath of Almighty God, while at the same time many individuals in the nation gave noble evidence of the grace which was moderated to them by the ordinances and the truth taught them by Israel as the Church of God. Moreover, it is clear that this prophecy has not been fulfilled by Israel as a nation, but has been fulfilled by Israel as the Church. For over nineteen hundred years, no watchman has cried day and night on the walls of a literal Jerusalem, but they have cried day and night for all those years on the walls of the spiritual Jerusalem of Messiah's Visible Church—that identical spiritual body which was founded on the Covenant with Abraham. It is also resistlessly clear that the prophet foretells a glory and an expansion of Israelitish influence over the Gentiles, and an ascendancy of spiritual blessing which can never be fulfilled by Israel as a people or nation, but which is being gloriously fulfilled before our very eyes by Israel as the Visible Church of the Abrahamic Covenant. That the Church now Visible on the earth, and the Church triumphant in heaven, are both called Jerusalem and Mount Zion, and the temple of God is too familiar to call for special citations. In such cases, to apply exclusively, or even at all in cases like that just noticed in Isaiah, the literal principle of interpretation will lead to error beyond a doubt. Let us now turn to one or two of the parallel prophecies of the New Testament as to the identity of the Visible Church under both the Old and New Dispensations, and as to what is to be the Conquering Kingdom, which alone is to inherit the Gentiles, and to restore the Jews to the Covenanted Church of their father Abraham. The one we cite just now is a very clear and powerful testimony to both of these points. In the epistle to the Romans, Paul makes the following declaration. "For if thou wert out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree? For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye should be wise in

your own conceits), that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." This passage teaches plainly that "the natural branches were broken off because of unbelief," and that the wild olive branches were grafted into that from which the natural branches were broken off. Now what was that into which the Gentiles were grafted? Indisputably into the Church of Christ, commonly called the Christian Church. But the Jews were broken off from that into which the Gentiles were grafted. This indisputably proves the identity of the Christian Church with the Church of the Abrahamic Covenant, and settles one of the two points to be illustrated—the unity of the Church under both dispensations. The same argument and illustration of the apostle declares that into that same body the fulness of the Gentiles should come in, and that after that event the Jews should be grafted in again. If this does not prove that the existing Visible Church is to be the conquering Kingdom of our Lord, by which the fulness of the Gentiles was to be brought in and into which the Jews were to be grafted in again, there is nothing that can be conceived as proved beyond any question by the testimony of the Scriptures. It thus demonstrates that the Millenarian idea is false, that the Visible Church of Jesus Christ will be as complete a failure in the future as they say it has been in the past, and that the time is coming when it will be swept away to make room for a more effective administration"; and that until this is done the Gentiles will not be brought in, nor the Jews grafted in again into the Church of their fathers. The assertion that Messiah has properly no throne of his own, and will not have until he ascends the literal throne of David in a literal Jerusalem is demonstratively refuted. He is on the Mediatorial throne at this moment and has long been. Peter in his sermon on the day of Pentecost utterly refutes this notion. Referring to the prophecy of David that God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, he declares

that the resurrection of our Lord did place him on David's throne. The angel who announced his birth to Mary declared that the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David. The angel made the promise; Peter showed that it was fulfilled. If David's throne is even now occupied by that king of whom David was a type and who is even now the King and Head of the Church, it is utterly vain for the Millenarian party, by giving a literal interpretation to the "Throne of David," to evoke the idea of a kingdom yet to come which will supersede the Visible Church of God, to which so many promises have been made and which is backed by all the persons of the Trinity. Messiah already reigns on David's throne. The notion of a future kingdom to take the place of the Visible Church under the Abrahamic Covenant, is not only without foundation in the Scriptures, but positively contrary to their plainest and most positive teaching. It is, in truth, nothing but an inference, and warranted inference because its promises are false, a mere inference from the combination of the notions that Christ is to reign visibly at Jerusalem on the literal throne of David, and that this visible appearance of the king is indispensable to the conversion of both Jews and Gentiles. Neither of these notions are true as we have abundantly seen; for he will not return from heaven as the angels on Olivet declared, until the time for "the restitution of all things," as the word of God has plainly taught. He will not appear visibly to the eyes of all men until he appears for judgment at the last day. Then every eye shall see him. If he returns before the Millennium according to the Millenarian theory only a part of the dead and living will see him. By express testimony of Scripture he is already reigning on David's throne as the King of Covenanted Israel, which is the Visible Church of God under the Abrahamic Covenant. That is a fact testified by prophet and apostle in terms too clear to be denied except under strong delusion. The demonstrated fact is not qualified or affected by the co-existence of that political kingdom which was developed under the judges and kings of Israel as a nation, when

the natural increase of the Israelitish people demanded stronger and more effective political institutions than the Patriarchal institutions could furnish. The two characters of the Church and the State were never separated, but in all the progress of the people of Israel, even in the highest days of the Jewish monarchy—in the days of David and Solomon, the character of the Church took precedence of its political character. Proud as the Jew was of his splendid monarchy, he plumed himself far more on being a member of the Church of God, and a son of the head of the Abrahamic Covenant.

---

“Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.”—St. John, in Revelation.

We have stated the grounds on which the Postmillennialists or the Church generally has held that the “Conquering Kingdom” of our Lord is the Visible Church, animated by the positively promised presence of Messiah, sustained by the “drawing” of the Father, and under the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit. It now remains to state the grounds, or at least some of the most important grounds, on which the Millenarian party justify the views they entertain. We shall only state these briefly—with a few words of comment upon each, because a fuller discussion in the sequel will serve to expose the errors which are involved in them.

1. The first ground of the Millenarian theory which we notice is that the Scriptures teach contrary to the theory generally accepted, that so far from the state of the world at the commencement of the Millennium being in a condition of great gospel advancement as it supposed, it will be in just the opposite condition. It is only necessary to remark at this point that this ascription of a great and unbroken success is not properly ascribed to the Postmillennialists as has been already shown. All are agreed that up to the beginning of the thousand years the witnesses will prophesy in sackcloth, until they are actually killed. All the representations of the Second

Advent declare that it will occur when the world is given over to the eager pursuit of this world, as in the time of Noah. This is equally true of the time before the Millennium, and during the Little Season of the second apostasy. Probably the only difference in these two periods of abandonment to worldly evil may possibly be in the more reckless and abandoned spirit of the Little Season, since Satan will come down at that time with great wrath, feeling that his time is short. But the period before the thousand years will be reckless enough in all the phases of utter worldliness and abandonment to all sorts of evil. Both parties are substantially agreed that the scenes on the earth will be such as to make the tribes mourn when the signs of the great retribution appear, whether those signs be the great judgments just getting on foot, or the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven. Millenarians say that every prophetic announcement of the Millennium represents it as produced by vast desolating judgments, which they very properly construe as inconsistent with a state of great spiritual prosperity. As they make the Second Advent, as they understand it, the producing cause of the Millennium by its attending judgments, it is consistent in them to ascribe the happy period to the judgments. The objection to this view is that it ascribes too much to the judgments, and not enough to the grace that accompanies and makes them effectual, to those who profit, and are not destroyed by them. All this scene of reckless wickedness and retaliating judgments they say is inconsistent with the Postmillennial idea of a world filled with triumphant grace, and full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. Instead of the Millennium being the result of gradually victorious gospel ordinances, it is the result of a Visible Saviour and of the vast afflictions occasioned by incorrigible refusal to obey the gospel. In proof of this position, they cite the Old Testament prophecies, which in almost every prediction connect the grand visions of triumphant grace with scenes of precedent violence. A single example in our limited space must represent the whole class of these passages. Isaiah says, "For thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will ex-



tend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream; then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees. As one which his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem." This is construed as a prediction of the Millennium. "For behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots, like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh: and the slain of the Lord shall be many." This is taken as the judgments by which the happy state of the thousand years will be introduced. The New Testament evidence is taken from the words of our Lord: "As it was in the days of Noah so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all." The Saviour's question is also adduced as proof that there will be little or no true religion in the world at the advent of Messiah, instead of a great and advancing tide of it. "Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find on the earth?" The irony in the question strongly implies that he will not find any. All this proves indeed that there will be very little true religion to be found. No Postmillennialist does expect to find it in the Little Season, any more than the Millenarian expects to find it in the world before the Millennium. More will doubtless be found before the Millennium, insignificant as the amount will be after the witnesses are killed, than will be likely to be found during the Second Apostasy, when Satan shall come down in great wrath because he knows his time is short. In all these calculations of the Premillennialists, they seem to have entirely lost sight of the fact that there is to be a Little Season of the Second Apostasy, in which all the scenes of the period of the Slain Witnesses will be reproduced in what will be, in all probability, a much worse form. It is evident, therefore, that the conditions will be generally the same, however different in degree on the Postmillennial theory as on the Premillennial. The wickedness that will overspread the world of the beast—

perhaps the whole world—at the time the witnesses are killed, will not fulfill the conditions which are to precede the Advent of Christ not one whit more perfectly than the scenes in human life during the Little Season. It is consequently no certain and exclusive basis for the Millenarian theory of the Second Advent before the Millennium; there is an equally appropriate basis for the Postmillennial theory. When Satan is turned loose at the end of the thousand years, and is permitted to deceive the nations once more, he succeeds on a scale that dwarfs his vast malignant triumph in the First Apostasy. To construe the advent of our Lord in the clouds of heaven as occurring during the Little Season, preserves the consistency of the circumstances belonging to this whole Millennial era, and the Judgment Day, at the end, far more completely when interpreted of the Little Season, than when interpreted of the period just before the Millennium. It cuts away all the difficulties that attach to the Millenarian theory, and leaves the awful and splendid line of events to open out without a tangle or any puzzling problem to be solved. In that amazing Second Apostasy will be found space enough for all the wickedness, all the unrestrained absorption in the affairs of the world, which follows the persecutions and the death of the witnesses—and for all the open and audacious scoffers foretold by Peter in his Second Epistle—who went about sneering and mockingly saying, “Where is the promise of his coming?” All this is in perfect accord with the Postmillennial theory of the thousand happy years; for that period will have come and gone; and an apostasy covering all the race, except a few faithful Jews, and perhaps Gentiles, at Jerusalem. No doubt vast judgments will precede the Advent at the Judgment Day. No doubt great judgments will precede the Millennium; for Antichrist will certainly be destroyed before the Millennium, and not very long before it begins, at the call of the witnesses up in heaven, and their endowment with great power for the accomplishment of their work of testifying the grace of God. How then can the Millenarian construction of the Postmillennial theory—great and steadily improving success—possibly be

true, during the sackcloth period? Are the Judgments of God to come on a world nearly brought to obedience before the thousand years begin? Not at all; the difficulty lies altogether in the utterly mistaken apprehension of the Postmillennial position, by the Millenarian party. The grand coming triumphs of true religion will be in the Millennial era, and not in the precedent events of the long ages before and up to the beginning of the happy ages themselves. In all those precedent events, the chequered fortunes of a militant Church will be seen. The witnesses will continue to prophesy in sackcloth, as they have done from the beginning of this struggling era in the history of the Church. All the agencies of grace will continue to be used, and will be aided as they have always been by the events of providence, prosperous and afflictive. There will be ample space and ample reason for the divine judgments up to the Millennial period, as there has been before it; and if such judgments appear, there need be no wonder, and no compulsion to the inference that these judgments are the judgments just before the Millennium. Many are disposed to construe the calamities of the last few years as in all probability the judgments before the thousand years. But this is wholly unauthorized, because the witnesses are not yet slain, and the man of sin as the Millenarians construe him has not yet appeared. On Millenarian principles then the above inference is not warranted. We are only entitled to construe these late calamities as we have been compelled by the testimony of time and history to construe many similar events in the past. Afflictions often bring individual sinners to repentance; great judgments in the shape of war and civil convulsions have not unfrequently opened the barred gates to the entry of the gospel; similar judgments in the shape of pestilence and earthquake have often checked the spread of vice and general wickedness, when apparently uncontrollable. It is plain that the Millennium will succeed the judgments before that happy era, and that it will be in part the effect of those vast calamities, as much on the Postmillennial theory, as on the Premillennial. Neither recog-

nize the Millennial success before the Millennium comes. Premillennialists have charged the Postmillennialists with holding the view of a constant progressive success, making the successful process leading up to the Millennium complete, before that happy era is established. They construe the successful effort as altogether distinct from the result. Postmillennialists hold no such view. In point of fact, the successful effort is the Millennium, the Millennium begun; and when that success is complete, the Millennium is complete, and will then have nothing to do in the way of propagating the gospel among the nations; and will only have to hold its conquest and ripen the graces of its blessed subjects. The overlook of this distinction underlies all the Millenarian reasoning on the success of the Visible Church, as it is held by Postmillennialists, and vitiates it. A like inadvertence of the just basis of the judgments before the Second Advent, which is found in the Little Season, has a similar misleading effect on their views touching the supersedure of all judgments before the Millennium by the supposed success which they attribute to the Postmillennialists. No such success before the happy era is expected by that party; they certainly expect those judgments, not less than do the Millenarians; but they do not confound them with the judgments of the Little Season, nor overlook them; they expect judgments at both periods. So in point of fact do the Millenarians, but in their eagerness to discredit the idea of a steady progressive success of the Visible Church, they charge Postmillennialists with ignoring the judgments before the Millennium, and with confounding the judgments at the Little Season with or rather instead of the judgments before the Millennium. Postmillennialists do not confound them, neither do they assert a Premillennial success which would supersede those before the Millennium; they expect both classes of the judgments, but each in its place. They are however, satisfied that neither class will discount the promise to the Visible Church under the Abrahamic Covenant, that in the patriarch and his seed, "all the families of the earth should be blessed," and annul the

guarantee of the same Church under its Apostolic form, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

2. The second general ground on which the Premillennialists base their doctrine is the testimonies of the prophets of both grand divisions of the Holy Scriptures—the Old and New Testaments. The field of investigation laid open by these words is so broad and difficult, that a formal attempt to discuss it in a short series of expositions would be altogether unsatisfactory. To give any adequate idea of the full force of the argument from prophecy will be absolutely impossible in a mere specimen exposition. All that can be done in such a sample of the argument from prophecy, will be to cite one single prophetic statement, as it is expounded by Millenarian writers with a few brief comments, indicating the different views of the other party.

In the prophecy of Daniel, a number of particular prophecies, extending over the vast sections of human history, some of greater, and some of less extent in their application, and some of them down to the end of the world, and embracing the most important events of the Church of God, are placed on record. The prophecies are delivered in symbols, couched in the most striking and sublime expressions of the Oriental imagination. Under the symbolism of four monstrous and gigantic beasts, he foretells the rise and history, and fall of the four great ancient world empires. The first beast was a lion, and had eagle's wings. The second was like a bear raising itself on one side, with three ribs in its mouth. The third was like a leopard, with four heads, and with four wings of a fowl on its back. The fourth is not likened to any known form of animal life, but is described as "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, with great iron teeth with which it devoured all before it, and stampeth the residue with its feet, and was diverse from all other beasts; and had ten horns." But for the clue afterwards given by the prophet himself, no one could possibly know what to make of these symbols of beasts and horns, but he afterwards explains: "These great beasts, which are four,

are four kings," or as he still farther on explains "four kingdoms." A horn is also the symbol of a king or kingdom. The word "king" is used to represent a "kingdom" whose whole power was autocratic and absolute, and entirely vested in the king's own person. Thus in one kingdom there was a "great horn which was between his eyes;" indicating the subjection of the power to his intelligence and will. It is all important to the understanding of the prophecy to keep in mind the symbolism and the authoritative explanation of the meaning of the prophetic beast and horn. Both are used of the same organized power. If there is any difference, it is that the term "beast" represents a larger aggregate of kingly power, called an "empire," and a horn a single kingdom or a smaller association of more than one kingdom. Sometimes the word "king" or "horn" is used to designate a particular individual monarch; but when this is the case, the context indicates the fact. But as commonly employed, a prophetic "beast" or "horn" means an earthly political organization, whether under the actual form of a kingdom, or empire, or any other form of organization, such as a republic or oligarchy, or any other form, provided it is an independent and effective sole government of a nationality, great or small. Generally, however, well-nigh universally, a beast and a horn are used to designate an empire or a kingdom. Consequently where the word "king" is used without the restriction of the context, it is always to be understood of a "kingdom" or an aggregation of kingdoms into an "empire." It seldom refers to a single individual; it almost universally designates a regular succession of kings. The fourth beast which the prophet says in one verse was one of "four kings", he says a few verses after, was "a kingdom upon earth." It is plain that this rule of interpretation which is authoritatively determined by the prophet himself, will have a decisive effect upon the question which divides the two parties of the Pre and Postmillennialists—whether the Little Horn of Daniel, and the Man of Sin of Paul was an individual person, or an organized body. The first of these terrible beasts

is afterwards explained by the inspired expositor, to be the vast Babylonian Empire, existing in the prophet's own day. The second beast was the grand Medo-Persian Empire founded by Cyrus the Great. The third was the Grecian or Macedonian Empire founded by Alexander the Great. The fourth was the greatest of them all—the Great Roman Empire, developed out of its Republican forms which it never relinquished by the genius of Julius Caesar, and the successors to his power and policy. This great beast had ten horns, which are afterwards explained by the authoritative interpreter, to be ten kingdoms which shall arise out of this great Roman World-Empire. While the prophet was absorbed in gazing on these ten horns of his vision, there came up among them another "Little Horn," which plucked up three of the other horns by the roots. "This Little Horn" is the most remarkable of the whole series of these mighty ancient empires, notwithstanding its pointed and designed insignificance, as will be abundantly seen. This Little Horn was distinguished by between fifteen and twenty marks which will render it impossible to find a substitute for it, and will discover it to every intelligent and candid judgment. The Man of Sin of St. Paul is also distinguished by the same number of marks, the large majority of which coincide exactly with the marks of the horn, with one or two additional marks. These singular facts have had the natural and irresistible effect of leading well-nigh all the interpreters to the conclusion that the Little Horn and the Man of Sin are the same person, whether taken to be an individual or a corporate body. The double symbol of the Two Beasts of John have an equally larger list of identifying marks, the great majority of which are absolutely coincident with the consentaneous marks of the Horn of Daniel and the Wicked One of Paul. This still more singular conjunction of a third set of identifying marks, all finding their object in the same subject, make the discovery of that subject inevitable and resistless. The same extraordinary conjunction of three independent writers in what is indisputably the same catalogue of identifying marks is also decisive of the

issue between the Premillennial and Postmillennial parties as to the nature of the Man of Sin—whether he is to be construed as an individual or a corporate body. The three lists are as follows, and from them the reader can judge for himself without trouble beyond an attentive comparison.

## THE MARKS OF THE LITTLE HORN.

1. Its size: it was a "Little" Horn.
2. Its intelligence: it had "Eyes"—the symbol of intelligence.
3. Its imperious Words.
4. Its haughty and imperious "Looks."
5. Its merciless cruelty.
6. Its hatred of the "Saints."
7. Its War and conquest of the Saints.
8. The Time or Length of its domination over the Saints.
9. Its Blasphemous spirit.
10. It plucks up three kingdoms.
11. Its disposition to change Times and Laws.
12. Want of desire towards Women.
13. Its ungodliness—no regard for any God.
14. Its honor of Mahuzzim or created Beings of another Life.
15. His continued existence until the indignation is past.
16. Honors a "Strange" God.
17. Divides lands.
18. His end by violence: killed by fire.

## MARKS OF THE MAN OF SIN.

1. The product of a falling away—a religious development.
2. He should sit in the temple of God—a nominal Christian.
3. He should be a ruler in the Church.
7. He would exalt himself above all that is called God.
8. He should change Times and Laws.
9. He would do False Miracles.
10. He would rule by the Arts of Deceit.
11. He would introduce Doctrines of "Daimones."



12. He would prohibit the use of meats.
13. He would forbid to marry.
14. He becomes a horn.
15. Period when he becomes a horn.
16. Period of his ascendancy—1260 years.
17. Period of his destruction.
18. Method of his destruction.
19. War on the Saints—the Church in the Wilderness. 1260.
20. Period of the witnesses in sackcloth—1260 years.
21. Kings give their power to him.
22. Afterwards make war on the beast.
23. The Seven-hilled City—the Great City that ruled kings.
24. Method of his destruction—Bright coming and spirit of Mouth.
25. Other events at the same time make a mark of the Man of Sin—the Sanctuary trodden down—the Jews restored—Ottoman ruined—the fateful period—1260 years for them all.

MARKS OF ST. JOHN'S TWO BEASTS.

- 1 The Location and Seat of the beast—the City on Seven Hills.
2. A mouth of imperious Authority used to Men.
3. A mouth speaking blasphemies against God.
4. Period of domination—1260 years.
5. War against the Saints.
7. Killing of the witnesses—same period 1260 years.
8. Colors of the beast—purple and scarlet.
9. Seven governments—the eighth to go to perdition.
10. Second beast—like a lamb and like a dragon.
11. He lives to aggrandize the first beast.
12. He is the administrator of all the power of the first beast.
13. He makes an Image of the first beast.
14. Makes the Image talk and say great things.
15. Does False Miracles before the first beast.
16. Makes all the world worship the first beast and his image.

17. Exercises tyrannical power over trade and hospitality.
18. Number of the beast 666—a cryptogram strangely significant.
19. He puts a mark on the foreheads and right hands of his people.
20. This second beast has two horns—kingly power in two spheres.
21. Kings give their power to the beast.
22. Afterwards destroy him.
23. City of the beast destroyed by earthquake and fire.
24. Trade of the Great City in one singular article—souls of men.

An examination and comparison of many of these marks will satisfy any intelligent mind, not stained and colored in its field of perception by preconceived and immovable predilections—that the subject alluded to under the names of the Little Horn, the Man of Sin, and the two beasts of the Revelation, is not an individual person, but a corporate body with a continuous life. That an individual king should occupy the attention of three of the greatest prophets of the Old and New Testaments to so large an extent, especially when the whole career of this person, however extraordinary he may be conceived to be, is limited, as it is, by the principles of interpretation of those who assert him, to 1260 days or three years and a half of natural time, is absolutely incredible. The fancy comes in conflict with the rule that events must be in accordance with the common laws of the divine procedure. No merely human experience supports such an idea. The only being who has made such a record is the Divine Saviour of the human race. The proofs of the corporate character of the horn is found in many of the marks by which the prophet has taught us to discover the truth in the case. The horn is a “kingdom” “upon earth” whose period, alone, of 1260 years annihilates the very possibility of an individual person, in a royal office.

3. The third basis for their doctrine which the Millenarians claim, is alleged to be the parables of our Lord in the New

Testament. Here too, we can only give a single specimen instance to illustrate their views and their mode of handling the parables and extracting an evidence in favor of their theory. In the parable of the Ten Virgins, five of whom were wise and five were foolish, it is said: "They all slumbered and slept." The Premillennialist construes this slumber of the wise virgins as demonstration that there will be no wide-awake, active, and successful Church when the Bridegroom comes. It might be enough to say in reference to this parable, it describes a condition of things by no means uncommon while the witnesses are prophesying in sackcloth, a condition of things which obtains in the most earnest individual Christian's experience, and also in the most active and revived condition of the organized Church. There is never an adequate awakening of the mind to the grand realities of life, and the importance of complying with the conditions of the Divine mercy. In this lack of adequate sensibility on the part of the individual Christian and the organized Church, is discovered that slumber of the "wise virgins" to which the parable alludes. Yet there is always some sensibility in both of these parties, enough to secure effort more or less eager, producing a constant, but defective activity in the way of duty. These five "wise virgins" are certified in the parable as true and faithful servants of the Master; yet they are said to slumber. Their slumber is, however, radically different from that of the "foolish virgins," who are totally insensible to the peril of the unsaved around them—never think of it; never care for it; never put themselves to any trouble on account of it. Now if there is a true sense, in which the true servants of Messiah can be said to slumber, without destroying their claim to be called "wise and faithful," it is unfair to construe their slumber into proof that they are altogether wanting in saving grace. If this condition of things may be true of five virgins, it may be true of any number, and it is a false inference to draw that the Church in the sackcloth ages of the kingdom is either useless or fatally deficient. Such a Church may be "slumbering" because its sensibilities to its

work are inadequate; yet it may be sufficiently awake to be of real and it may be of important usefulness. But leaving this explanation and defence, let us look to another and an additional one. Let it be remembered that from the days of the unorganized and uncovenanted Church in the Eden dispensation, all through the history of the Church, down to the actual commencement of the Millennial Triumph, the Kingdom of God will be in a struggling conflict, the witnesses will be testifying in sackcloth, victory and defeat will alternate continually. Is it not injustice to such a Church, in such an era appointed for it, to denounce it as a failure, as being in a dead sleep, as utterly wanting in efficiency? Who ordered this sackcloth state of things for his kingdom? Whose guarantee still guards his work, and certifies the ultimate victory of his tried and faithful servants—his Visible Church? The triumph will come when the appointed time for it comes, but not before it. It will come when the witnesses are called up in heaven and the Millennial ages begin and not before. If we are to take our Lord's words literally, as we are bound to do, they appear to qualify the notions entertained of the success of the kingdom during the Millennium which represent it, not merely as preponderantly successful, with an enormous preponderance, which may be true, but as literally embracing every member of the whole human family. Our Lord in the parable of the Tares represents some tares as still growing in his field—some foolish virgins. He teaches plainly that the tares are to stand until the harvest, which is the end of the world; the reapers are the angels, who are to gather both wheat and tares at the same time. But neither the parable of the Virgins nor the Tares, nor any other parable of our Lord, warrants the idea that the Visible Church under the Abrahamic Covenant, will fail to accomplish its task, even though tares and foolish virgins may be in it down to the end of the world. It will accomplish it in spite of them. The only absolutely perfect state of the Church will be developed when it is presented to the Father, spotless and without blemish. The Mil-

lennial Triumph will advance from one degree of perfection to another, and in the long ages of its highest attainment will probably reach far towards an absolute completeness of victorious grace. Then as the slow decline sets in, it is more than probable that the preparation for the approaching Apostasy will be going on. The tares will appear more and more among the wheat, until well-nigh the whole field seems to be covered with nothing but tares. This state of things is recognized as probably true by both parties. But the argument from the parables in support of the Millenarian theory is not conclusive, it is equally effective in support of the opposing system.

4. Another ground on which the Millenarian claims support for his views is found in those passages which exhort believers to live watchful, and in constant view of their Lord's coming. "Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock crowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you, I say unto all, watch." It is strenuously affirmed, that there is no sufficient justification for this exhortation to constant watchfulness for our Lord's appearing, if his coming is not before the Millennium, and may occur at any time. It is alleged with great vigor that the early Christians were taught by the apostles to look constantly for the Coming of Christ, and that they did live in the constant expectation of it. From Paul's pointed directions to the Thessalonian Christians, not to be shaken in mind or troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as that the day of Christ is at hand, this statement needs modification. He then proceeds to show that many things were to happen before that day should come. This is an apostolic endorsement of the mode of argument used by Postmillennialists to correct this notion of the Millenarians. The apostle furnishes a positive denial that the apostles were accustomed to teach the early Christians to look daily for the Second Advent, as well as a mode of reasoning against that idea. Yet it is alleged that this expectation is indispensable to keep the Church alive to its re-

sponsibilities, and that all the best effects of Christian fidelity and spirituality of mind are conditioned upon this expectation and the doctrine on which it rests. Consequently many Premillennialists do seriously cherish this expectation, and endeavor to live in the daily apprehension that our Lord may come at any moment. On some it does produce a stimulating effect; but the sincere apprehension of a thing even though there may be no actual ground for it, may produce just such a result. Moreover, the constant expectation of a speedy death, or of some approaching calamity may have the same effect. The stimulus to more earnest consecration is not due exclusively to this expectation of the Second Advent, and it is unsound reasoning to ascribe that desirable effect to that expectation exclusively. Besides, in some cases, another effect not so desirable is often produced. It sometimes produces a carelessness about present duties, and an undervaluation of the ties and interests of the present life which lead to unhappy results. Events in the history of the Church have proved this beyond a doubt. The use of the doctrine of the Advent to quicken piety, and to excite the affectionate delight of his saints in the anticipation of his appearing is as completely appropriate on the Postmillennial as on the Millenarian theory. Postmillennialists can "watch" for that coming, just as truly as Premillennialists, without incurring the hazard of the difficulties attached to the latter method of "looking" for it. "Watching" for an event is simply keeping it in mind; and there is no compulsion to expecting it every day and hour. The "love of his appearing" is just as possible and appropriate to the Postmillennialist as it is to the Millenarian Christian. The glorious benefits to every believer which are conditioned on the Advent are as surely promised, and as highly valued by the one class of Christians as by the other, and each has the same reason and right to anticipate them with delight as the other. The Lord's coming is necessary to complete the adoption and the redemption of all his saints: it is necessary to redeem their bodies from the grave; to give them the benefit of the Great

Redemption, to their bodies, as well as their souls, and to endow them with the full franchise of that heavenly glory into which their disembodied souls entered at death. The advantages which the coming of the Lord will bring to his saints, and the great increase to the Glory of the Father, Son, and Spirit by the triumphant fulfillment of his promise to conquer death are altogether sufficient to account for the delight with which his children look for his appearing. On any theory of his coming, this is true. But to say that it is indispensable to secure these effects of increased spirituality; to indulge an expectation of His coming in the clouds of heaven at any moment, is unwarrantable. Before that can happen, even on the Millenarian theory, some great events must happen. To say then that the best effects of Christian fidelity are conditioned on the expectation of the Advent at any moment is a false expectation. For instance, Millenarians agree that the Man of Sin must arise and do his dreadful work before the coming of the Lord, as he is to be destroyed by it. This Man of Sin they construe to be an individual monarch, but none of them admit that the Man of Sin has come. The gospel must be preached for a witness among all nations before the Advent. None of them assert that the gospel has yet been preached among all nations, especially with a fulness and to an extent that would justify national judgments for rejecting the truth. Events which must happen before the Advent—events which according to their own ideas, are still future—must necessarily postpone the Advent still farther than these future events. Therefore the conclusion is compulsory, that to expect daily and hourly an event, admitted to be subsequent to other events still future, is a false expectation; and to condition the best results of Christian living upon that expectation, is to condition them upon a falsehood. The state of mind that admits good and intelligent men to suffer such delusion to control their convictions is amazing. The happy spiritual effects that are sought by the cultivation of this delusion, are far more powerfully conditioned on the certainty of death which waits for ev-

ery man, and on the uncertainty when it will happen—and by the certainty of the rewards of fidelity in living—than by a vague, and to all generations of Christians except one, an unfounded expectation of our Lord's appearing. Death in a certain sense conditions the Advent; for as death leaves us, the Advent will find us, but death is near. It is certain in event; it is uncertain in period; and is far better calculated to awaken the conscience than an event which though certain as death is probably not very close by its own being. The Advent of Messiah is not dependent for its good effects upon any such construction of it as that made by the Millenarian party.