

Footnotes.

[1] No Post-Millennialist has attempted to show that our interpretation of this passage is false, or unlikely, or unnatural. All they assert is, that *another is possible*. And thus they "get over" the difficulty. Would it not be better to *yield* to it?

[2] See vol. ii., pp. 361, 362, 374, 479, 480. I have been struck with the resemblance to Jerome in these expressions. He is perpetually recurring to the Millenarians, and never fails to bestow some hard epithet upon them; at the same time, he acknowledges that very many (*plurima multitudo*) even in his day held that doctrine,—so much so, that he tells us that he foresees "the fury which he is likely to raise against himself" in opposing it (*ut praesaga mente jam cernam quantum in me rabies concitanda sit*).—Jerome, Proem to the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah. The reference to this passage in Kitto's "Cyclopaedia" is inaccurate, and the translation is second-hand; but the article on millenarianism is good and fair.

I may notice here, also, how of late Anti-millenarians have been too much led into that spirit of sharpness and self-confidence, which, about twenty years ago, they used (and with justice) to condemn in their opponents. Is it too much to expect that brethren should argue mildly and calmly, however firmly, in discussing with each other the things concerning the King?

[3] "The doctrine of the Millennium, or the reign of saints on earth a thousand years, is now rejected by all Roman Catholics, and by the greatest parts of Protestants; and yet it passed among the best of Christians for 250 years, for a tradition *apostolical*, and as such, is delivered by many fathers of the second and third century, *who speak of it as the tradition of our Lord and his Apostles*, and of all the ancients who lived before them, who tell us the very words in which it was delivered, the scriptures which were then so interpreted; and say that it was held by *all Christians that were exactly orthodox*."—Whitby's "Treatise on Traditions". Whitby, it is well known, was a *Post Millennialist*, so that his testimony is the more striking.

[4] There are two classes of "difficulties,"—the direct, or scriptural, and the inferential, or rational. If the objections adduced by our opponents were of the first class, they would be legitimate, even though ultimately overruled by stronger evidence. But almost all of them belong to the second class, being inferences of human reason, which can only be taken up after positive evidence has been disposed of.

[5] Several of the opponents of rationalism have embraced the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent and reign. I have already quoted Olshausen, I may here quote a sentence from Gess: 'The dead saints, at the appearance of Christ, are to be organised again with the material bodies. This is to take place a thousand years before the awakening of the other dead. They are to reside again upon earth, and to live and reign with Christ for a thousand years.'—*The Revelation of God in his Word*, pp.227, 228.

[6] Having occasionally been called to take up some prophetic points in one of our periodicals, I have not scrupled, in the present volume, to avail myself freely of what I have written.

[7] See Isaiah 45:11; Matthew 16:3; 24:25; Mark 13:23; Luke 24:25; 2 Peter 1:19; 3:17; Revelation 1:3; 19:10; 22:7,10.

[8] See on some of the above points, the able Lectures on Prophecy, by the Rev. James Kelly.

[9] "A period will come in which the spirit of Christ shall not only prevail in secret and guide men's minds; but will also gain the victory eternally, and found a kingdom of peace and righteousness upon earth. WITH THE ARRIVAL OF THE REIGN OF PEACE THERE WILL BE CONNECTED, ON THE ONE HAND, THE APPEARANCE OF CHRIST and a resurrection of many saints and pious men, and on the other, a previous mighty struggle on the part of evil."—*Olshausen on the Gospel*, vol. i. p. 108.

[10] This argument of our opponents takes, of course, for granted, that the day of the Lord spoken of, is really the second Advent. If so, then they must admit that this is the same coming that is to destroy Antichrist; for the coming is only postponed, if we may so speak, until Antichrist shall arise. That which was "not to come" until the falling away should take place, must be that very same thing which does come as soon as that apostasy has taken place.

[11] See Dr. Candlish's statements on this point in his work on Genesis, p. 190, and in his letters to Mr. Elliott, p. 88.

[12] Lowth, in his notes upon this chapter, states the connexion thus. His interpretation is given in very general terms, but it is very explicit as to the order and connexion of events:—"These two chapters make one distinct prophecy: an entire, regular, and beautiful poem, consisting of two parts; the first containing a denunciation of Divine vengeance against the enemies of the people or Church of God; the second, describing the nourishing state of the Church of God, *consequent upon* the execution of these judgments...It seems reasonable to suppose with

many learned expositors, that this prophecy has a farther view to events still future,—to some great revolution to be effected in later times, *antecedent* to that more perfect state of the kingdom of God upon earth, and *erving to introduce it.*"—*Lowth's Isaiah*, p. 296.

[13] So thought John Bunyan, who thus writes in one of his works:—"The Quakers are deceivers, because they persuade souls not to believe, that that man that was crucified and rose again, flesh and bones (Luke 24:38-40) shall so come again, that very man in the clouds of heaven to judgment, as he went away—and at the very same time shall raise up all the men and women out of their graves, and cause them to come to the Valley of Jehoshaphat—because there will He, that very man, sit to judge all the Heathen round about. I say, they strive to beat souls off from believing this, though it be the truth of God witnessed by the Scripture, Joel 3:11, 12, as also Acts 1:10,11. This same Jesus which is taken from you into heaven shall so come (mark, the very same), in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven," and his feet shall stand in that day (the day of his second coming) upon the Mount of Olives.' Where is that? Hot within thee ' hut that which is without Jerusalem, before it, on the east side."— *A Vindication of Gospel Truths opened according to the Scriptures*, Works, vol. v., p. 486

[14] "I look upon the language of Scripture as the simplest, truest, most reasonable language of all that has ever been uttered."—*The Epistle of the Hebrews*, &c., by F. D. Maurice, M. A., p. xxxviii. A work deserving study; masculine all over.

[15] Vol ii. p 285.

[16] This passage has been quoted to prove that, after Christ comes, conversion cannot go on upon earth, for *all* his saints are to come with him. I confess I am surprised at the stress laid upon the word *all*, as if it necessarily meant every one. Owen, in his work upon the Death of Christ, after pointing out the many passages in which the "all" has a restricted meaning, thus concludes,—"Therefore, from the bare word nothing can be inferred, to enforce an absolute unlimited universality of all individuals to be intimated thereby." But passing from this, let me observe, that when Christ is said to come with all his saints, it must of course mean *all who are saints at the time when he comes*. It can mean nothing more. It cannot, of course, mean that he is to come with those who shall be saints after he comes. That is an absurdity. And if this passage simply means all who are or have been saints up to the time of his coming, it of course settles nothing as to future conversions. *That must be determined by other passages*. To determine it by this is an entire begging of the question. There are many direct texts which prove

that there are to be conversions after he has come. But I do not enter on this here.

[17] Or rather, we should say their error was that the day of the Lord "had arrived," for this is the meaning of *ἐνέστηκεν*. See Romans 8:38—"Neither *things present*, nor things to come;" See also 1 Corinthians 3:22; 7:26; Galatians 1:4; Hebrews 9:9.

[18] I do not think it needful to quote the Greek, as I am not writing a critical treatise: but if any one will carefully consult the original; he will find the above statements not only verified, but mightily confirmed. I might establish, what is advanced here by reference to the ablest critics; but I merely quote two, as a specimen of the rest. Schoettgen thus translates the expression, "The Advent of Christ, which shall refulgently strike every eye, and whose majesty and glorious splendour no one shall be able to deny."—*Horae Hebraicae, in loc.*, p. 846.—Again, Kuttner paraphrases it, "The Advent of Messiah, illustrious by its splendour and majesty."—*Hypomnemata in Nov. Test.*, in loc., p. 465.

[19] I would notice here that many of the expressions in this passage are precisely the same as in Peter,—only they are repeated and heightened, and magnified by the prophet far beyond those of the apostle.

[20] Thus, for instance, let them take those passages in which the Coming and the Kingdom are both spoken of; and show from these that the Kingdom is *before* the Coming. We ask positive texts which *directly* state or show that such is the order. We have adduced some to show that it is not. Why not meet us on *this* ground?

[21] Upon supposition of the obedience of Christ in this life and the atonement made by his blood for sin, with his exaltation thereon,—there is nothing in any essential property of the nature of God, nothing in the eternal unchangeable law of obedience to hinder, but that God might work all those things in us unto his own honour and glory, in the eternal salvation of the Church and the destruction of all its enemies *without a continuance of the administration of the offices of Christ in heaven*, and all that sacred solemnity of worship wherewith it is accompanied."—OWEN'S *Christologia*, chap. 20.

[22] On the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap 1:14.

[23] I am persuaded that a careful perusal of Butler's "Analogy of Religion" would tend greatly to the removal, not only of the above difficulties, but of the *ground* on which they rest. "The things objected against (says the Bishop), how foolish soever they may appear to men,

may be the very best means of accomplishing the very best ends."—Part ii. chap iv., sect. 2. In his sermon "On the Ignorance of Man," we have such statements as the following, "We may learn with what temper of mind a man ought to inquire into the subject of religion; namely, with the expectation of finding difficulties, and with a disposition to take up and rest satisfied with any evidence whatever, *which is real*. He should, beforehand, expect things mysterious, and such as he will not be able thoroughly to comprehend or go to the bottom of. To expect a distinct comprehensive view of the whole subject, clear of difficulties and objections, is to forget our nature and condition; neither of which admit of such knowledge with respect to any science whatever. And to inquire with this expectation is not to inquire as a man, but as one of another order of creatures...It is thought necessary to be thoroughly acquainted with the whole of a scheme, even one of so narrow a compass as those which are formed by man in order to judge of the goodness or badness of it; and the most slight and superficial view of any human contrivance comes abundantly nearer to a thorough knowledge of it, than that part which we know of the government of the world does to the general scheme and system of it, to the whole set of laws by which it is governed. From our ignorance of the constitution of things, and the scheme of Providence; from the reference which the several parts have to each other and to the whole; and from our not being able to see the end and the whole, it follows that, however perfect things are, they must necessarily appear to us less perfect than they are."

[24] See also Revelation 17:12—"They receive power as Kings one hour with the beast." Does this mean literally an hour, and no more?

[25] Letters on the Seventy Weeks, pp. 32, 33.

[26] Trench's "Hulsean Lectures," a work, like the author's other works, rich in thought, though rugged in style,—fresh and original, even in research.

Since the first edition of the present work came out, the Rev. James Kelly has published a small volume, chiefly in reply to Mr. Elliott's "Apocalyptic Scheme." With many of Mr. K.'s statements I agree: with others I cannot. In his Appendix he refers to the preceding chapter, and suggests some considerations in answer to what I have advanced above. I cannot say that I am shaken in opinion by these considerations, but this is not the place to argue the point. I must also say that I do not assent to his interpretation of "the Lord's day." The amount of proof in favour of his interpretation is just that it may be so—no more. I may say the same of Mr. Maitland's "Letters," and Dr. Todd's note to his "Discourses on the Apocalypse." If their meaning be the true one, the Epistles to the Seven Churches must refer to what is *still* future; nay, the Churches themselves must be still "Churches of the future" entirely: for

John saw them as "the things which were," *i.e.* the things which were in existence at the time of the vision.

[27] Jerome's commentaries exhibit many a singular specimen of the above-mentioned plan of exposition. Yet fanciful as he generally shows himself, there are some places in which he betrays his want of confidence in this system, and his approval of something more literal. I quote the following passage from his remarks on Jeremiah 19:10:—"Quamquam sibi Judaei auream atque gemmatam Hierusalem restituendam putent rursusque victimas et sacrificia et conjugia sanctorum et regnum in terris Domini Salvatoris ; quae licet non sequamur tamen damnare non possumus, quia multa ecclesiasticorum virorum et martyres ista dixerunt."—*Opera*, apud nos, vol. iv. p. 272, D.

[28] "None ever saw this world as it was in its first creation, but only Adam and his wife; neither shall any ever see it until the manifestation of the children of God, that is, *until the redemption or resurrection of the saints*...Adam, therefore, as a type of Christ, reigned in the Church almost a thousand years. The world, therefore, beginning thus, doth show us how it will end, *viz.* by the reign of the second Adam, as it began with the reign of the first. These long-lived men, therefore, show us the glory that the Church shall have in the latter day, even in the seven thousandth year of the world—that *Sabbath when Christ shall set up his kingdom on earth*. According to that which is written, 'they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.'...Hence, therefore, in the first place, the dragon is chained for these thousand years."—JOHN BUNYAN *on the First Chapters of Genesis*.

[29] "Non sine evident! causa aut necessitate proprietatem deserendam."

[30] "A sensu proprio non recedendum est, nisi extat frigidus, ridiculus, aut contradictorius."

[31] "The latter chapters of Ezekiel, describing the erection of a certain temple, are involved in so much obscurity that it seems difficult to arrive at any determinate conclusion respecting the import of that mysterious prophecy. *It is certain that the attempt to spiritualise it produces little besides perplexity and confusion; nor have we any example in Scripture of an allegory so perfectly dark and enigmatic as it must be confessed to be, on that supposition.*"—ROBERT HALL. *Works*, vol. iv. p. 405.

[32] "Christ did never absolutely deny his having such a visible glorious kingdom upon earth, as that which his disciples looked for; only *he corrected their error as to the time of this kingdom's appearing*. Christ did not say to them that there should never be any such restoration of the

kingdom to Israel as their thoughts were running upon; only he telleth them that the times and seasons were not for them to know; thereby acknowledging that such a kingdom should indeed be, as they did, from the holy prophets, expect. Herein was their error; not in expecting a glorious appearance of the Kingdom of God, but in that they made account that this would be immediately."—*The Mystery of Israel's Salvation*, by INCREASE MATHER, 1669, p. 130.

[33] The same remark will apply to Galatians 4:26. There are difficulties connected with this passage; but in whatever way these are solved, still the words "Jerusalem which is above" cannot mean the Christian Church. The epithet "above," and the whole scope of the apostle's argument, forbid this. The apostle's object was to prove that believers in Christ (or the Christian Church) are *free*. He does this by showing that they (or this Church) are the offspring of a Jerusalem that is free. Would it not be absurd, then, to say, "believers are free because the Christian Church is free," when the very thing to be proved was, whether the Christian Church was free; which the apostle does by proving her connexion with a "Jerusalem above," which all acknowledged to be free?

[34] "It appears to me evident that the scene of the future conversion of the Jews is their own land, where it is probable, from Zechariah, *that a supernatural interposition of the Messiah will take place* in their favour."—ROBERT HALL. *Works*, vol. iv. p. 404.

[35] About the middle of the 17th century, Samuel Petto published a work called "The Revelation Unveiled," which along with his book on the Covenants was republished in 1820, with a recommendation from Drs M'Crie, Paxton, &c. In it he makes very frequent reference to "Israel, and the things concerning them that are to fall out in the latter day." After speaking at length of the time of Jacob's trouble, he goes on to mention as next in order, "the setting up of the glorious kingdom of Jesus Christ, the new Jerusalem, or the glory of the Church here, a thousand years. Revelation 20:21. He then adds, "the rise or first state of this kingdom will be speedily after the resurrection of the witnesses, and the first conversion of the Jews, and before the thousand years begin...This thousand years will be a glorious time; not absolutely as if sinless; but comparatively, or compared with any former state of the Church. *Possibly it may be ushered in by a personal appearance of Christ in the clouds*; but I cannot say that it will be by the personal presence and continuance or reigning of Christ on the earth. Now will Ezekiel's city and temple be erected, the glory of which will be that the name of it from that day shall be Jehovah Shammah, the Lord is there. Here will begin the state of the New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven, and is not by our going up to heaven. Then shall be given to Christ, as Daniel

7:14, dominion and glory and kingdom."—P. 136.

[36] How can the blood of all the saints be found in Antichrist, if he rises up as a power by himself, in nowise connected with the previous powers of evil? And where is the blood of saints to be found, but in the Church of Rome,—at least for the last thousand years?"

[37] With reference to the above view of a *personal* Antichrist, I may quote Dr. Urwick, a well-known *anti-millennarian*. The idea of *personality* in Antichrist has generally been condemned as one of the dreams of patristic or of modern Chiliasm. Let Dr. U. be heard on this point. "The statements in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, with regard to the 'mystery of iniquity,' the 'man of sin,' the 'lawless one,'—though they have had a fulfilment in the Papacy,—will have a more precise and appalling fulfilment. I confess that the style of expression seems to favour the idea of some *one person*, rather than a succession of persons." On the Second Advent, pp. 222-225. Thus one of the ablest defenders of anti-millennarianism maintains what has often been branded as a millennarian absurdity.

I may mention also, that both Augustine and Jerome, who were strenuous *Anti-chiliast*, held the doctrine of a personal Antichrist. No one, for instance, can read the commentary of the former upon the 9th Psalm, without observing this. And as for the latter, he introduces the idea in numerous places both of his Epistles and Commentaries. He even goes the length of telling us, that Antichrist is to be a Jew, (vol. iv 523,) that he is to be hailed by the Jews as Messiah, (v. 133,) and that he is to perish on the Mount of Olives, *qui in Monte Oliveti consumendus sit*, (iv. 93). He gets the last of these ideas out of Isaiah 25:6, 7, and Daniel 11:45. I may notice in passing, that both of these fathers, though post-millennialists, frequently allude to the destruction of Antichrist by *the* second advent of the Lord. They do not attempt to explain away 2 Thess. 2:8.—If, then, the doctrine of a personal Antichrist be an unscriptural fancy, let both millennarians and anti-millennarians bear the blame of holding it. I suspect, however, that the question is very much one of words. Both parties hold that there will be a personal head of the Antichristian body; only the one lays greater stress upon the head than upon the body, while the other does the opposite.